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The Borders Committee provides oversight for planning activities that impact the borders of the San Diego region (Orange, Riverside, and Imperial counties and the Republic of Mexico). The preparation and implementation of SANDAG’s Binational Planning and Interregional Planning Programs are included under its purview. It advises the SANDAG Board of Directors on major interregional planning policy-level matters. Recommendations of the Committee are forwarded to the Board of Directors for action.

San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900  •  Fax (619) 699-1905
www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG! Members of the public may speak to the Borders Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Borders Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s 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 Borders Committee meeting.

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

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

+1.  APPROVAL OF BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES (pp. 7 – 26)  APPROVE
   a.  May 21, 2004 meeting
   b.  September 9, 2004 meeting
   c.  October 15, 2004 meeting (I-15 Interregional Partnership)

2.  PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

CONSENT ITEMS (3-5)

The Borders Committee will review the consent agenda without further discussion unless an item is pulled by a Committee member or a member of the public for comment.

+3.  COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO) MEETING SUMMARIES AND ACTIONS (pp. 27 – 48)  INFORMATION
   a.  July 6, 2004 meeting
   b.  August 3, 2004 meeting
   c.  September 7, 2004 meeting
   d.  October 5, 2004 meeting

+4.  BORDER ENERGY ISSUES GROUP (BEIG) MEETING SUMMARIES AND ACTIONS (pp. 49 – 60)  INFORMATION
   a.  June 14, 2004 meeting
   b.  September 13, 2004 meeting

+5.  ESTIMATING ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF BORDER WAIT TIMES AT THE SAN DIEGO-BAJA CALIFORNIA BORDER REGION: PROJECT STATUS (Elisa Arias, SANDAG) (pp. 61 – 62)  INFORMATION

SANDAG, in partnership with Caltrans District 11, is conducting a study to estimate the impacts of border delays on the economy of the San Diego and northern Baja California border region. This item summarizes the status of project activities.
REPORTS

6. TOUR OF IMPERIAL COUNTY (Supervisor Victor Carrillo, Imperial County) (pp. 63 – 64)
   As requested by the Borders Committee, a tour of Imperial County is scheduled for Thursday, December 2, 2004 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The tour will cover housing developments, transportation facilities, ports of entry, agricultural, retail, and industrial developments, airport facilities, and energy infrastructure, among other areas. A draft tour itinerary is included.

7. REPORT FROM AD HOC GROUP THAT ADDRESSED ISSUE OF UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRATION IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (Councilmember Phil Monroe, City of Coronado) (pp. 65 – 70)
   The Borders Committee created an ad hoc group of its members to examine the issue of undocumented migrants and their impact on the San Diego region. The ad hoc group has held several meetings and developed three recommendations for consideration by the Borders Committee. The Borders Committee is asked to approve the ad hoc group’s recommendations.

8. COBRO’S RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2004 BINATIONAL SUMMER CONFERENCE AND FY 2005 WORK PLAN (Paul Ganster, COBRO Chair) (pp. 71 – 94)
   Paul Ganster, Chair of the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO), will present the outcomes and recommendations from the 2004 Binational Summer Conference on border cooperation. The report includes COBRO’s recommended work plan for FY 2005, which incorporates actions to address recommendations from the summer conference. The Borders Committee is asked to discuss and approve the COBRO recommendations.

9. BINATIONAL BORDER TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY (Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans)
   Pedro Orso-Delgado will make a presentation about the Binational Border Transportation Infrastructure Needs Assessment Study (BINS). Prepared for Caltrans by SourcePoint, the purpose of BINS was to identify major transportation corridors in the U.S.-Mexico border region, to develop a quantitative procedure to evaluate the needs of these corridors, to identify transportation projects to meet the needs of the corridors, and to identify possible funding sources.
ITEM # ACTION

+10. I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP UPDATE (Susan Baldwin, SANDAG) (pp. 95 – 102) INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION

The California Department of Transportation awarded SANDAG and the Western Riverside Council of Governments a $240,000 grant to continue work on the I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP). On October 15, 2004, the I-15 IRP Policy Committee and Technical Working Group held a workshop to discuss a proposed work program for Phase Two of the I-15 IRP. This item summarizes the workshop discussion. Attendance at the past two I-15 Policy Committee meetings has been low. The Borders Committee should discuss whether a different meeting day and time should be considered to help increase attendance.

+11. UPDATE ON THE UNITED STATES VISITOR AND IMMIGRANT STATUS INDICATOR TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM (Hector Vanegas, SANDAG) (pp. 103 – 104) INFORMATION

The United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US VISIT) Program was developed to enforce 1996 regulations requiring an automated entry and exit control system in all ports of entry to collect records of arrival and departure from every foreign visitor entering and leaving the United States. The report provides an update on the implementation of the US VISIT program and its potential effects on the region.

12. NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION INFORMATION

The next meeting of the Borders Committee will be the tour of Imperial County on Thursday, December 2, 2004 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

+ Next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The regularly scheduled meeting of the San Diego Association of Governments Borders Committee was called to order at 12:34 p.m. by Chair Crystal Crawford (North County Coastal). Other members in attendance were Patricia McCoy (South County), Ed Gallo (North County Inland), David Allan (East County), Ralph Inzunza (City of San Diego), Greg Cox (County of San Diego), Victor Carrillo (Imperial County), and alternates David Powell (North County Coastal), Phil Monroe (South County), and Judy Ritter (North County Inland). Ex-officio members in attendance were Thomas Buckley (Riverside County), Javier Diaz (Republic of Mexico), James Bond (San Diego County Water Authority), Bill Figge (Caltrans), and Elsa Saxod representing the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO).

Chair Crawford welcomed everyone to the meeting and self-introductions were made.

1. APPROVAL OF APRIL 16, 2004, MEETING MINUTES

Action: The Borders Committee voted unanimously to approve the April 16, 2004, meeting minutes.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Councilmember McCoy announced that next week, on May 27, 2004, California Connections on KPBS will highlight the issue of the triple border fence. Show participants include Duncan Hunter, the lawsuit participants, and various local individuals. The show airs at 8:00 p.m. She felt that this would be of interest to the Borders Committee members as this will impact the environmental integrity of the coastal border between Tijuana and Imperial Beach.

Councilmember Monroe expressed concern that the County of San Diego’s representative went on the Roger Hedgecock show and denounced the proposed TransNet extension. He added that he was disappointed that she referred to the measure as deceitful and dishonest, which he took personally. He indicated that TransNet is important to the entire region and the elected officials should communicate to their individual supervisors how important that is.

Councilmember Bond asked what the County’s reasoning is for not supporting the TransNet extension. Councilmember Monroe responded that the County wants more funding in the extension to be focused on highways and to eliminate any future changes to the measure, regardless of any new circumstances that may arise.
Councilmember Crawford asked Supervisor Cox if the County Board of Supervisors intends to discuss this issue prior to the next SANDAG Board of Directors meeting. The second reading of the TransNet Ordinance will take place at that meeting. Supervisor Cox indicated that the issue will come back before the County Board of Supervisors next month and agreed to bring back any pertinent information to the Committee.

Chair Crawford announced that the Committee has a new alternate from Imperial County, Mayor David Ouzan, from the City of Calexico. Supervisor Carrillo commented that he will bring him to the next meeting to introduce him.

Chair Crawford added that she, along with Councilmembers McCoy, Monroe, and Guerin, recently met with Dr. Robert Bach, the keynote speaker for the upcoming COBRO Summer Conference. From 1994 to 2000, Dr. Bach served in the Immigration and Naturalization Service at the United States Department of Justice as Executive Associate Commissioner for Policy, Planning, and Programs. He has worked extensively on border issues with Mexico and Canada to facilitate economic development while increasing security along the border. Currently, Dr. Bach provides independent consulting services to the United States Department of Homeland Security, Border and Transportation Security Directorate, and the Transportation Security Administration. He has a great deal of knowledge and background in border affairs and has offered to be a resource to SANDAG, specifically to the Borders and Public Safety Committees.

Councilmember Monroe pointed out that Dr. Bach will be a wonderful resource to the Committee. He is very balanced in his thinking about issues and wants to enhance the economic viability of the border along with the national security demands in a way that will benefit the entire region.

Chair Crawford pointed out that the San Diego Congressional Delegation is hosting a Homeland Security meeting and Councilmember Allan (East County) will be representing the Borders Committee at that meeting.

CONSENT ITEM

3. COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO) SUMMARY AND ACTIONS FOR APRIL 6, 2004

Action: The Borders Committee voted to approve the Consent Item.

REPORTS

4. LAUNCHING OF THE BORDERS SECTION OF THE SANDAG WEB SITE

To reflect the new structure of the Borders Committee and its planning activities, the “Binational” section of the SANDAG Web site has been revamped. The section is now called “Borders,” and its structure reflects the three perspectives—interregional, binational, and tribal—that create the working framework for Borders Planning and Coordination. There is an introductory section which includes the guiding principles and goal of the Borders Committee.
Each subsection contains current projects, resources, publications, and committees and working groups associated with that subsection. Through the process of restructuring the site, staff was able to pilot several new features to the general SANDAG site, such as on-line registration for conferences. Staff noted that this is a work in progress and encouraged all Committee members to go to www.sandag.org, look under “Borders” in Programs on the right bar menu, review the Web site and provide any additional input and/or changes that need to be made.

Councilmember Monroe suggested that in order to make the Web site more user-friendly, in addition to posting downloadable PDF files on the Web site staff also should consider converting downloadable files into an HTML format. Staff responded that creating HTML files is very resource and labor-intensive. At this time, there is insufficient personnel and resources to be able to convert all files on the Web site to HTML format. Staff will explore other methods of making html files available, such as being able to search for a specific word or phrase.

Chair Crawford applauded staff’s efforts and looks forward to the evolution of the Borders section of the SANDAG Web site.

Action: The Borders Committee accepted this report for information.

5. BORDERS COMMITTEE WORK PLAN FOR FY 2005

Staff reviewed the FY 2005 Borders Committee Work Plan with the Committee, which includes the Committee’s priorities and strategic initiatives that were accepted for inclusion in the Implementation Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The framework for this Work Plan is the Borders Chapter of the RCP. The Borders Chapter of the RCP addresses border issues from three perspectives: binational (for the issues that are related to the border with Mexico), interregional (for the issues related to Imperial, Riverside, and Orange Counties), and tribal government (for the issues related to the 17 tribal governments within the region). The Borders Chapter identifies several planning areas including access to affordable housing, transportation, water and energy supply, environment, economic development, and homeland security. The Borders Committee decided to concentrate its efforts on obtainable goals over the next year. Staff prepared a calendar for FY 2005, which suggests that each month the Borders Committee focus on a specific issue and relationship, have a goal, and have a product.

Chair Crawford commented that the calendar will give the Committee the opportunity to make sure that it focuses on a limited number of issues but addresses key issues with each neighboring region.

Councilmember Monroe stated that the Committee should focus some additional attention on tribal governments and Orange County. Staff noted that they are currently working on establishing a liaison program with the tribal governments.

Councilmember Buckley suggested that tribal governments be discussed in February 2005, along with the County of Riverside issues. Staff concurred, and added that an update on the report entitled “Rural Transportation Needs Assessment” could be provided at that time. This study focuses on tribal governments and transportation issues.
Chair Crawford mentioned that in October 2004, the Committee could include Imperial County on that agenda and discuss common issues that are shared along the U.S./Mexico border.

Councilmember McCoy would like to see water issues on a future agenda, as they relate to tribal governments.

Councilmember Monroe noted that the issue of undocumented immigration is not listed on the calendar and questioned whether that was an oversight. Staff stated that undocumented immigration subject was not included because there needs to be a meeting with the subcommittee to discuss the timing a workshop on that issue.

**Action:** The Borders Committee approved the Borders Committee Work Plan for FY 2005.

6. **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW LEADERSHIP AND ISSUES RELATED TO MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO)**

Chair Crawford commented that the current Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) Chair, Elsa Saxod, will be leaving her position next month. She noted that Ms. Saxod has been the Chair for the past two years and has done a wonderful job leading that Committee. She thanked Ms. Saxod for all her efforts and hard work.

Elsa Saxod, COBRO Chair, thanked the Committee for the opportunity to serve the COBRO Chair for the past two years. She recommended that Paul Ganster, representing the Institute for Regional Studies of the Californias, San Diego State University (SDSU), and Cindy Gompper-Graves, representing the South San Diego County Economic Development Council, serve as the COBRO Chair and Vice Chair, respectively, for the term May 2004 to May 2006. She added that the new Chair and Vice Chair will do fine and felt that the Borders Committee will be pleased with their performance. In addition, Ms. Saxod highlighted some changes that the COBRO would like to have made in regard to the COBRO criteria and membership. Those changes are listed in the staff report.

Councilmember McCoy suggested that a representative from the Tijuana River Natural Estuary Research Preserve be added to the COBRO. If they cannot be added as a member of the Committee, at a minimum, they should be invited as a resource to participate in the COBRO meetings. There are approximately 24 preserves nationwide; however, this is the only one that sits on an international border.

**Action:** The Borders Committee approved the COBRO recommendations.

7. **REPORT ON U.S. BUREAU OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES (CIS) AS PART OF CONSOLIDATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

Chair Crawford introduced Debra Rogers, San Diego District Director for the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, and John Ramirez, Community Liaison Officer for the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services to the Committee.

Ms. Rogers stated that the purpose of her visit today is to introduce the agency to the Committee. The Bureau is one of many under the Department of Homeland Security. It provides
services to immigrants in San Diego and Imperial Counties, such as information regarding immigration and citizenship issues and makes decisions on applications and petitions that are filed with the agency. The agency also is focused on improving national security; all of the applications received go through an extensive security background check before being processed. Some goals for the agency, both nationally and locally, are: (a) to improve customer service by eliminating the backlog of applications; (b) to be consistent and reasonable in the decisions that are made on applications through training; and (c) to improve information through innovation and outreach. Currently, two applications are available to be filed on-line: the employment application and the application for advance enrollment. Six more applications will be available on-line over the next six weeks. There also are three district offices: Downtown San Diego; Chula Vista Customer Service Center; and Imperial Valley Sub-Office. There are also application support centers in San Marcos and on El Cajon Boulevard. The Bureau answers approximately 150,000 questions per year through its information line and completes approximately 50,000 applications per year.

Councilmember McCoy questioned what kind of flexibility the bureau has for permanent residents that have language barriers or another type of disability. Ms. Rogers indicated that provisions are made. The language requirement is waived for permanent residents who have been in the United States for more than 15 years. The language requirement also is waived for those who have been in the United States for less than that time, but who have a medical condition or difficulty learning the language.

Supervisor Carrillo commented that there is cultural barrier for those immigrants on the Mexican side of the border because they do not understand or have access to electronic technology. Ms. Rogers agreed and pointed out that the San Diego offices still provide over-the-counter services and will continue to do so.

Ms. Rogers indicated that the Bureau also handles customers via e-mail, which may eliminate the need for an applicant to physically visit the office. In addition, the bureau is working on reducing the processing time, which is how long it takes the Bureau to qualify an applicant for an interview once an application has been submitted.

Javier Diaz commented that the Consul General’s office has been working closely with the Department of Homeland Security and is willing to help do whatever it can to assist the Bureau in its efforts.

John Ramirez noted that there is a summary of a report included in the information packets distributed to the Committee from the Urban Institute, which discusses issues regarding naturalization and citizenship. The full report is available on-line at the Urban Institute's Web site at www.urban.org.

Councilmember Monroe stated that this was a wonderful presentation and he applauded their efforts to do better. He was surprised that an e-mail response could take up to two weeks. Ms. Rogers commented that two weeks is the maximum response time that an applicant will have to wait. Usually, e-mail response time is no longer than three days.

Chair Crawford thanked them for the presentation and welcomed them back anytime.
**Action:** The Borders Committee accepted this report as information.

8. NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

The next meeting of the Borders Committee will be held on Friday, June 18, 2004, at 1:30 p.m. at Temecula City Hall and will be the final meeting of the Inter-Regional Partnership (IRP).
BORDERS COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS SPECIAL SESSION ON NEW CALIFORNIANS MEETING
OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2004

The Special Session on New Californians was called to order by Committee Chair Crystal Crawford
(North County Coastal) at 3:11 p.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Crawford thanked and welcomed the guests for attending. She announced that the
regularly scheduled meeting of the Borders Committee, to be held on Thursday, September 30, 2004, could potentially be cancelled. Details will be forthcoming.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

Thomas Buckley (Riverside County) commented that March Air Force Base (AFB) will be
converted into a Homeland Security Center, which will eliminate the site from being
considered as a passenger terminal. However, cargo and freight will still be transported. He
added that there is a proposal to link March AFB and San Diego together, and provided a
report to the Borders Committee Chair on this issue.

3. REPORT FROM THE LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION ON NEW CALIFORNIANS (INFORMATION)

Chair Crawford noted that she requested that Mayor Pro Tem Monroe, a member of the
Borders Committee, be the facilitator for today’s meeting.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe (City of Coronado) pointed out that this issue was originally brought
to the SANDAG Executive Committee by Councilmember Jack Feller (Oceanside). The Executive
Committee referred the issue to the Borders Committee for discussion at one of its meetings. In
April 2004, the Borders Committee discussed this issue and tasked a group of its members to
further investigate this issue. Mayor Pro Tem Monroe indicated that today the Borders
Committee will hear from Mitch Mitchell and Toby Ewing, representatives from the Little
Hoover Commission (LHC). The Little Hoover Commission, formally known as the Milton Marks
“Little Hoover” Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy, is an
independent state oversight agency that was created in 1962. Its mission is to investigate state
government operations and - through reports, recommendations and legislative proposals –
promote efficiency, economy, and improved service. By statute, the Commission is a balanced
bipartisan board comprised of five citizen members appointed by the Governor, four citizen members appointed by the Legislature, two Senators, and two Assembly members.

Mitch Mitchell, member of the LHC and Vice President of Public Policy with the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, thanked Mayor Pro Tem Monroe for the introduction. Mr. Mitchell noted that he has been with the Commission since early 2004. He introduced Toby Ewing, staff member of the LHC and project manager for this particular report, “We the People: Helping Newcomers Become Californians,” which will be presented to the Committee today. He noted this region needs to figure out the best approach to handle the issue of facilitating the process of migrant inclusion in our communities in California. There has to be some effort to move people to become citizens and residents of the United States. He commented that the report goes a long way to discuss areas of concern related to this issue. Mr. Mitchell then turned the floor over to Mr. Ewing to present the report to the Committee.

Toby Ewing, LHC Project Manager, mentioned that reports are written so that they are readable, understandable, and thought-provoking. He thanked the Committee for being willing to discuss this issue. He indicated that the report was written for several reasons: (1) the Governor’s Office wanted to discuss the economics of immigrants becoming California citizens; and (2) those that are not directly related to the social services system need identification of who will pay for social services. Mr. Ewing noted that these are challenging discussions for the Commission. The Commission wanted to investigate policies that relate to immigrants in general, regardless of legal status. The report was adopted unanimously by the Commission. The Commission recommended that there should be a bar set—which should not be based on legal status, but rather willingness to become a contributing member of a community. He commented that Assemblymember Juan Vargas requested that his staff review the report and then draft legislation on this issue. However, the legislation did not move forward. Mr. Ewing provided the Committee with an overview of the Commission’s report and explained the key components.

Mr. Ewing noted that there are many federal challenges with documenting immigrants. The process for documentation is complex and has a significant impact on states. The Commission took the stand that immigration matters within the state of California. It also was determined that federal policy does not work for the state of California. The Commission noted that immigration needs to be fixed—especially in the State of California. The Commission identified that it cannot change federal policy—so what can it do? He highlighted issues involving immigrants, such as key tensions, the value of integration, barriers to integration, the principles to guide policy, and the role of the state in this process. The Commission wanted to shift the attention from what is to be done about undocumented immigrants to what the Commission wants to accomplish through public policy with regard to immigrants. The Commission focused on what is being done with the immigrant population when they are here, rather than how they got here. There is a lot of confusion and complexity regarding who is eligible for what benefits and how the State of California responds to this issue. The Commission also recognizes that there should be some expectations and responsibilities in the public sector regarding this issue. It is important to reward citizenship in the region. The Commission asked whether citizenship matters. There is no requirement that if you become a permanent resident you have to become a citizen. Based on its findings, the Commission recommended the creation of a Golden State Residency Program (GSRP). The GSRP is for people who have demonstrated that they want to become contributing members of their local
Eligibility for the GSRP would be for all immigrants, whether documented or undocumented. He summarized his points and asked the Committee members if there were any questions.

Discussion

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe (City of Coronado) thanked Mr. Ewing for the overview. He asked what type of taxes undocumented immigrants pay. Mr. Ewing responded that the Internal Revenue Service is not concerned with the legal status, only with tax dollars. Many undocumented migrant workers pay taxes with a special identification number, and the Social Security Fund is holding these taxes in trust. It is estimated that approximately 30 percent of the filings in this trust originated in California.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe questioned if barriers between countries are up in Europe. Mr. Ewing noted that the populations in the member countries of the European Community move about quite fluidly, as they have a common passport and collaborative labor laws.

Councilmember Jim Bond (San Diego County Water Authority) also thanked Mr. Ewing for his insight. He pointed out that the Commission has done a good job identifying problems and possible solutions; however, the implementation is lacking. What can realistically be done? Mitch Mitchell commented that part of the problem is that solutions require cooperation between government offices, which has been challenging.

Mr. Ewing noted that this is a perennial problem for the Commission, as well as for those who have taken the Commission’s recommendations to heart. The role of the Commission is one of fact finding and making policy recommendations. It is then the role of other agencies and constituencies to adopt the policy recommendations. The Commission has sponsored legislative bills, but they require a significant base of support. He indicated that he was uncertain what local governments can do to help this process along.

Mr. Mitchell noted that there needs to be some ownership in the state legislature. He pointed out that there are migrant camps in North San Diego County. The conditions under which these workers live are unhealthy, unsafe, and inhumane.

Rosemary Johnston (Interfaith Coalition for Immigrant Rights) asked if there was any information on immigrants established in the Los Angeles area. Mr. Ewing responded that some counties have responded, but have not responded in a way that would produce an end result.

Staff noted that undocumented immigrants contribute to the economy and asked if the Commission looked at other alternatives such as creating a guest-worker program or a process that allows for the immigrants to work in San Diego and live in Mexico. Mr. Ewing noted that the Commission did not investigate alternatives because that was not what the report was focusing on. The state needs to develop a process that would allow for the “out of the box” type of thinking. The Commission noted that the State needs to be thoughtful. The GSRP proposal was intended to serve as an interim approach before future policies were developed.
Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans) stated that there are communities in Mexico that are populated by women and children who do not get to see the men in their families, because they come to the United States to work and cannot go back to Mexico. The immigration reforms of the early 1990s have made it very difficult for men working in seasonal jobs here to continue circular migration. Instead, they have to either leave their families or bring them with them. Immigrant labor is an important component of our economy. The problem of how to become a legal immigrant who contributes to the economy needs to be resolved.

Councilmember Bond (San Diego County Water Authority) commented on the completeness of the report and indicated that even though the solution is provided, the way to get there is not identified. The region needs to move forward toward that answer.

Councilmember Ritter (North County Coastal) added that becoming a U.S. citizen is expensive.

Mr. Mitchell commented that the big issues should be a priority, and used the process of obtaining a SENTRI Pass (Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection) as an example. The San Diego region does not do a strong enough job of demanding more from federal officials in terms of adequate resources.

Staff replied that this situation is broader than just the San Diego region. California's biggest strength is diversity in the state, which also is its biggest weakness. There is an uphill battle when going to Washington, D.C. to lobby for federal funds. There needs to be a united front. The counter example of Texas was raised. Texas counties and councils of government lobby Washington in coordination with one another.

Councilmember Buckley (Riverside County) mentioned that many Congressional members think that California gets too many concessions. But, he added, it is very important to create and develop a citizenship track. The line between legal and illegal is not what it is being made out to be. If it does not matter whether or not an undocumented immigrant is legal, what is the incentive to become legal? Moving toward increasing citizenship and providing benefits for achieving that goal is good, but there should be some consequences to not achieving that goal. **Mr. Ewing responded that the Commission clearly states that if progress for the undocumented immigrant to obtain citizenship is not being made, then services will not be provided.**

Councilmember Gallo (City of Escondido) stated that what needs to be done is to remove the stigma between legal and illegal immigrants. We need to provide the incentive to become a citizen. He added that if the guest-worker program was implemented, it would eliminate the need to try to track undocumented immigrants. **Mr. Ewing replied that it is the Commission's goal to force the state to take action on this issue.**

Rosemary Johnston (Interfaith Coalition for Immigrant Rights) pointed out that there are several cross-border organizations that have discussed this issue. She is glad that the region is finally looking at itself as the San Diego-Tijuana region. She noted that the guest-worker program is not going to work because there is a lot of mistrust between agencies in the region. She concluded that the region can prepare for what is going on and acknowledge it, or it can do nothing and continue to be in denial.
Javier Diaz (Mexican Consulate) noted that regarding this issue, population and demographics should be considered. He noted that when the Mexican government looks to find a solution, it is more of a short-term solution. It is a tragedy that Mexican citizens are willing to lose their lives to enter the United States. He pointed out that this issue is not working for Mexico either because Mexico is losing its work force and families. Another by-product of illegal immigration is the rise in human trafficking. Mr. Ewing indicated that the deliberation in California needs to be about the long-term investment in human capital and the payoff for the state’s economy and communities. The bulk of studies being done are regarding immigration policy, not the end result.

Councilmember Crawford reminded the group about a comment from Dr. Robert Bach that the region needs to develop local solutions and present them to the federal government. We hope that this meeting will result in some bottom-up solutions that can be developed and implemented and be taken to the state or federal government for assistance. She expressed concern that the Commission’s report will not be implemented and raised concerns regarding citizenship. More people could become citizens if they were encouraged to have legal status as opposed to requiring citizenship. She added that there needs to be respect for self-reliance, and the residents in the San Diego region need to find a way to live with that. Mr. Ewing commented that the Commission writes reports without a lot of detail to allow for communities to include what they like. He added that good public policy typically comes from the communities and is then brought to the lawmakers for implementation. It is the Commission’s opinion that promoting citizenship would be staking a claim in the region.

Elsa Saxod (COBRO) noted two things: (1) people that feel a sense of ownership and belonging are moving forward with becoming citizens; and (2) although the undocumented immigrants that cross into the United States are breaking the law, so are the employers who are hiring them. The point that needs to be remembered is that everyone is breaking the law.

Councilmember Buckley (Riverside County) stated that if laws regarding undocumented immigrants are going to be enforced, then both the employer and the worker should be penalized.

Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans) commented that the country will be severely impacted if it loses the undocumented immigrant workforce.

Virginia Gengor (Border Patrol) added that Mexican citizens do not have to give up their citizenship to become United States citizens.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe (City of Coronado) stated that the Committee should focus on one or two high-visibility programs and go from there.

Mario Lopez (Office of Congressman Bob Filner) thanked the Borders Committee for addressing this difficult subject. He challenged SANDAG to move forward and find solutions for this issue. He added that people in the region are not unified on this subject. However, SANDAG can facilitate a discussion of this issue in the region.
Councilmember Buckley pointed out that in Lake Elsinore, any resident can be appointed to positions on committees and commissions. They do not have to be citizens. He added that there are resident aliens on some of his Commissions and Boards.

Mr. Ewing stated that if criteria for services are established, the appropriate funds have to be available. The point here is not to create unfunded mandates.

Chair Crawford thanked Mr. Ewing for sharing his knowledge with the Committee and also thanked Mayor Pro Tem Monroe for facilitating the meeting.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.
The October 15, 2004 meeting of the I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP) Policy Committee was called to order at 1:35 p.m. at Escondido City Hall. Committee Members in attendance were Co-Chair Hon. Crystal Crawford (City of Del Mar), and Hon. Ed Gallo (City of Escondido).

The following I-15 IRP Technical Working Group (TWG) members and guests were in attendance: Bill Hodge (WRCOG), Bob Leiter (SANDAG), Kim Kawada (SANDAG), Linda Culp (SANDAG), Jane Clough-Riquelme (SANDAG), Marney Cox (SANDAG), Stevie Field (Southwest Riverside County Economic Alliance), Aaron Adams (City of Temecula), Jun Onaka (Onaka Planning and Economics), Maurice Eaton (Caltrans District 11), Sam Abed (Escondido Chamber of Commerce), Kevin Viera (WRCOG), Katherine Marks (North County Times), Rocky Solomon (Press Enterprise), Rick Bishop (WRCOG), and Lynne Baker (Endangered Habitats League).

1. Welcome and Introductions

Co-Chair Crawford welcomed members and guests to the meeting. Self introductions were made.

2. Public Comments/Communications/Members’ Comments

On August 2, 2004, Co-Chair Crawford attended the WRCOG Executive Committee meeting, accompanied by SANDAG staff, to present the final report for the I-15 Interregional Partnership. The report was accepted with enthusiasm by the council members, and they are looking forward to receiving periodic updates. She announced to them that the focus of Phase Two would be on economic development, and they were in agreement. Kevin Viera, WRCOG, added WRCOG is very concerned about the economic component of this project as it will have an impact on the other areas.

3. Workshop on Phase II of the IRP
   A. Economic Development Strategies

Marney Cox, SANDAG’s Principal Economist, laid out the background and framework for potential economic development strategies. He described how economies throughout the world are changing today, and the ways in which we analyze those changes are inadequate. We often look at manufacturing as the driver for economies. The employment classification system currently in use is inadequate. Employment cluster analysis looks at whole economic system and connections. We are
still looking for industrial sectors that generate products, but it is also necessary to look at the associated businesses. Cluster analysis provides a more powerful way to examine the economy and the business-to-business connections. To perform the cluster analysis in Riverside and San Diego Counties, the first step is to identify the clusters in Riverside and then the connections to industries in San Diego. Then, an analysis would be done to develop strategies and public policy changes necessary to strengthen both economies. We also need to explore potential opportunities for the two counties to work together in the economic development arena.

He then went on to explain the tools for the analysis: (a) development of an input/output model for Riverside; and (b) connecting it to the San Diego model, which already exists. He commented that obtaining the names of businesses and codes is essential. It is critical to employ a consultant in the Employment Cluster Study who is knowledgeable about the economy of southwestern Riverside County. By doing this, the know-how stays in Riverside and the county can update the employment cluster analysis as needed.

Councilmember Gallo mentioned the fact that a few years ago, the company Hewlett-Packard wanted to relocate in this region, but in the end decided against it. He was curious to know why they did not go through with the relocation. Cox replied that there are several reasons. The first reason related directly to economic market factors, and the second reason related to the property itself. At the time the property was fairly secluded and Hewlett-Packard wanted the public sector to invest quite a bit of money to make it compatible with their needs. The land also was a long way from the urban core. Possible strategies developed for the area should not only focus on obtaining new businesses but also retaining existing companies. Businesses continually expand, and it is important to identify what can be done to improve the rate of retention of businesses already in the county, as well as possible regional market drivers.

Co-Chair Crawford inquired as to when the update/analysis of clusters was scheduled for completion. Several steps have been outlined. She asked if Mr. Cox had a sense of how long it would take to complete some of the steps.

Mr. Cox explained that the employment update analysis for San Diego is currently in progress. A working group currently meets bi-weekly to update the San Diego cluster analysis. The next meeting is a week from this coming Tuesday, at which point they should be ready to present what the new clusters for San Diego look like. There has been a big change in the categorization/classification process and in the classification codes, and that has a big impact on how clusters are identified and defined. Publication is scheduled for the end of the year. Staff should have information available by the end of November 2004.

Co-Chair Crawford asked if Mr. Cox had anyone in mind for the economist from Riverside, and if not, she suggested that they expand their outreach and look into possible candidates from local universities.

Rick Bishop, WRCOG, commented that there were a few economists that they had in mind, and they also were open to continued outreach within the universities. Kevin Viera, WRCOG, suggested that a better option was to form a group of two or three people to get together to talk about responsibilities and the allocation of tasks for the position.

Co-Chair Crawford asked how the Economic Development Corporations (EDCs) would be involved.
Mr. Cox explained that a single database should be developed, which can then be used by the EDCs to orient their activities towards the same objective. It is necessary for them to become involved early in the analysis so they understand it and help shape the strategies that will eventually be created out of this set of information. Mr. Cox also commented that the technical component to the process is still an art, so the technical working group needs to have a good understanding of economics.

Stevie Field, Southwestern Riverside County Economic Alliance, mentioned that she represented various groups and offered her assistance in coordinating the technical group. She commented that she works very closely with the Riverside County workforce development center. This would provide a strong basis for the group.

Co-Chair Crawford emphasized the importance of getting started on the process as quickly as possible. She asked what people thought the first steps should be and if they could offer any additional input.

Mr. Cox mentioned that the first step was to contact everyone involved in order to make sure that they were on the same page. He also mentioned that he would be working with a colleague who has been working on the San Diego study.

Sam Abed, Escondido Chamber of Commerce, asked Mr. Cox what his opinion was about housing prices. Mr. Cox explained that the housing prices could go down, but that it did not seem likely. He mentioned that the prices would stabilize. He also explained that University of California at Los Angeles did a study that concluded that there is a large amount of equity built up in some of the homes in Riverside County, and that consumers have a lot of buying power.

Kevin Viera, WRCOG, commented that a technical working group to help in the implementation of the economic strategies would be formed. He explained the importance of tapping into the group’s resources and knowledge base. The information gathered from this group would be combined with the cluster study and then introduced to EDC and other groups in San Diego. He handed out a sheet with the basic goals and strategies.

Stevie Field explained that the Southwestern Riverside County Economic Alliance has a Web site resource that enables commuters to calculate the cost of commuting. The goal is to get people to examine the trade-offs between commuting and seeking employment in the region. People know what they spend on gas every month, but they are not aware of all of the extra costs involved in commuting. The “Commuter Computer” allows commuters to calculate their commuting costs and perform their own cost/benefit analysis. Another service that will be made available in the near future is a job bank of opportunities by sector in southwestern Riverside County, so they can evaluate alternatives within the region.

B. Transportation Strategies

Co-Chair Crawford explained that there are short- and long-term transportation strategies. There are many opportunities for the agencies to collaborate on programs. There are a lot of opportunities for integration and collaboration between all agencies represented in this meeting. Previously there existed one technical working group (TWG) for phase one of the I-15 IRP, but this time the suggestion is to have working groups involved in the particular strategies. It is suggested
that the IRP create one TWG for economic development and another for land use and transportation.

**Caltrans County Line Study – Districts 8 and 11**

Bill Figge, Caltrans, described the status of the I-15 County Line study. Caltrans has funded the second phase of the I-15 IRP, which has been recognized statewide as an innovative approach to interregional planning. Districts 8 and 11 came together because of a concern that there was increased funding for I-15 north of the county line and not south of it, and that the plans were not in alignment.

The two district staffs were brought together to examine the entire corridor. Caltrans staff has met to discuss transportation modeling issues in both districts. He commented that the existing daily volume of cars is currently 115,000. It will increase to 200,000 by 2020, and double by 2030. Congestion problems will occur around 2008, so there is some time to address the issues between the two counties. There is a good opportunity to work together and make sure the improvements are done in a manner and timed in a way that they will be compatible.

Co-Chair Crawford explained that the advantage of this corridor study is that the timeline and budgets have not been set yet. This way we can take a closer look at how we are going to coordinate these projects.

Bill Figge, Caltrans, explained that at the moment people are vying for the priority projects. Of the Transportation Unified Mitigation Fee Program (TUMPF) funds Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) collects, half stays with the cities and half goes to RCTC.

Kevin Viera, WRCOG, mentioned that the cities in Riverside County also can apply for funding for more buses.

Aaron Adams with the City of Temecula commented that many of the cities are waiting to see what happens with the reauthorization of the TEA-21.

Kevin Viera, WRCOG, asked if the IRP study would influence the next update of SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Bob Leiter, SANDAG, commented that SANDAG is currently in the process of starting the new RTP update.

Rick Bishop, WRCOG, his agency recently had a consultant perform a study for the purposes of projecting TUMPF revenues and their multi-fee plan. They surveyed 14 cities in the subregion in the county with regard to future residential and non-residential development. He mentioned that at the moment, southwestern Riverside County has 500,000 existing housing units, and 230,000 projects in its sub-regional pipeline which are to be completed in the next five years. This means that in reality, these projects are not long-term, and it is necessary not only to expand the arterial roads but also to think about land use issues with an increasing amount of urgency.

Kim Kawada, SANDAG, mentioned that SANDAG’s RTP is beginning to be updated now. Currently it is done in three-year cycles.
Bob Leiter, SANDAG, commented that the last RTP was adopted in February of 2003. The transportation reauthorization bill that is currently in Congress will extend the update cycle to four or five years, if passed. If it is extended by another year, then their plan is to do a significant update of the forecast and take the results of the studies and complete a better, more comprehensive update of the RTP. He commented that the situation is awkward in that they are currently working on two RTP schedules, but they remain confident that the reauthorization will indeed happen. The risk is that they will have to continue with the three-year update cycle which would not include new analyses. However, SANDAG would still be working on a more comprehensive update to be adopted a year later.

Lynne Baker, Endangered Habitats League, mentioned high-speed rail service. The corridor could potentially receive higher priority of funding for high-speed rail based on the amount of development planned in southwestern Riverside County. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service should be planned to integrate with future high-speed rail service.

Co-Chair Crawford asked what happened to the Route 76 bus ride and commented that perhaps it is possible to explore other ways of encouraging transit use. Kevin Viera, WRCOG, commented that the fare was dropped from $4 to $1, which increased the ridership substantially.

Rick Bishop, WRCOG, mentioned the idea of broadcasting the decrease in price and combining it with a study of how long it takes to get from point A to point B so that commuters have something tangible with which to compare their commutes.

Case Studies in Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Linda Culp, SANDAG, made a presentation on BRT strategies in SANDAG’s current RTP and case studies on BRTs in the San Diego region. The focus of SANDAG’s RTP was on the four components of overall mobility:

- Connecting land use and transportation
- Managing demands on the current system
- Managing the existing system better
- How the system was developed

Stage 1 of the I-15 BRT Project is under construction. A video of the I-15 BRT System was shown. There are three BRT stations under construction. An extension of the BRT along the I-15 Corridor is included in SANDAG’s current RTP. A BRT project is under development in Otay Ranch. The corridor was originally reserved for light rail, but the decision was made to go with BRT. Heritage Village is designed with wide sidewalks that lead to the center near the station. A pedestrian bridge also leads to the BRT station. A retail center is sited near the station with a senior center, day care center, and a large medical center all located nearby. The project shows that transit-oriented development sells and designing for pedestrians ultimately benefits the transit systems.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, explained that the City and County of San Diego collaborated on the Otay Ranch master-plan in terms of land use and regional transportation needs. It was the largest unincorporated property remaining in San Diego County in the mid-1980s. When the owners decided to develop the property, it was decided that it needed to be planned to benefit the City, County, and the community. The developer was required to set aside the right-of-way for regional
transportation. Thirteen years later the funding had not come through. It is planned that upon completion, BRT will be accessible to every village, and it is hoped that TransNet and federal and state funds will be able to put this in motion. The transit stations are a relatively small investment and as such are not very expensive to build. The real cost is purchasing the equipment and actually operating the buses.

Rick Bishop, WRCOG, commented that Riverside has nothing this complex. People, he added, do not generally get excited about transit due to the relative lack of density in the area. But he felt that the Otay Ranch example shows how forward-thinking can be done in areas that are not as dense. He suggested that a presentation be arranged for RCTC to see the Otay Ranch example.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, mentioned that 11,000 of the 23,000 acres that make up the project in Otay Ranch are reserved for permanent open space. Within the area that was urbanized, the highest density was found in three-story townhouses and condominiums. He explained that it is not necessary to have high density to warrant transit planning. Different smart growth place types exist, and it is not necessary to have to the kind of density of downtown San Diego. Furthermore, he mentioned that overall density of the villages is not all that different from a typical master-planned community.

Stevie Field, Southwestern Riverside County Economic Alliance, asked about the cost of such a system. Bob Leiter replied that the BRT would have had the same subsidies as the light rail transit.

Lynne Baker, Endangered Habitats League, commented that at the interregional level there are projects that can be undertaken cooperatively, and that high-speed rail falls into that category. By 2030 there will be 200,000 vehicles crossing the county line daily, so it makes sense to study how much it can actually carry and how it can be integrated into the existing systems. She also commented that the San Diego-Riverside high speed rail corridor would not be the first corridor taken to the voters for funding. If different agencies can work together, they could promote the project. It is an issue that needs to be addressed as soon as possible. The California High Speed Rail Commission has a template for what their stations will look like, and the preferred technology is steel rail that allows for dual use with local commuter rail. It makes sense that if those stations overlap, it should be taken into consideration. It is important to secure a space that is big enough for a station, parking, and potential parking expansion. If through the I-15 IRP we can coordinate and communicate so that those stations serve various purposes, then hopefully when it does come up it will not be necessary to retrofit and cost the taxpayers more money. If high-speed rail is one of the serious options, it is necessary to accommodate and integrate our plans to make sure that what we are doing is compatible. Linda Culp, SANDAG, commented that SANDAG encouraged the coordination of the High Speed Rail and BRT stations in the I-15 corridor.

Co-Chair Crawford inquired about any possible disconnect between the steel wheel high-speed rail service and MagLev, and if there was any effort underway to coordinate the two technologies.

Aaron Adams, City of Temecula, explained that the City is already looking at corridors to set aside right-of-way and that this is the perfect time to investigate corridors for future rail.

Lynne Baker, Endangered Habitats League, explained that it was necessary to coordinate all of the BRT projects with both steel rail and dual rail.
Co-Chair Crawford mentioned that it makes sense that all of the rails line up and that some type of coordination is necessary.

Rick Bishop, WRCOG, commented that within the southwestern portion of the Riverside County, there is not much interest in either of the high-speed rail projects, and perhaps it is due to a lack of understanding of how they will work. MagLev is supported by a very small group and there is a strong lack of commitment from the majority of residents. MetroLink commuter rail service is supported over both of the high-speed rail technologies.

Lynne Baker, Endangered Habitats League, explained that perhaps people are more interested in commuter rail in the southwestern county due to the fact that the population is close to rail. She commented that the I-15 Corridor does not have rail. It is important to the I-15 Corridor and its long-term economic viability in terms of moving goods, services, and people. Rail has contributed to the economic growth of other regions.

Aaron Adams, City of Temecula, explained that Temecula Councilmember Ron Roberts is very involved and is an advocate for MagLev. He commented that at the moment, Mr. Roberts was in Tokyo learning more about rail technology. He suggested that Mr. Roberts attend a future meeting to discuss high-speed rail and MagLev plans.

Co-Chair Crawford proposed that he visit the group at a future date and make a presentation.

**Housing Strategies**

Susan Baldwin, SANDAG, commented that housing constitutes is the third policy area of the I-15 Interregional Partnership. The first step is to study opportunities in both counties. The second phase needs to focus on “smart growth” and different ways of providing more housing.

She also commented that one of the most important things that the agency is currently working on is the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), which needs to be updated. Housing elements are due in June of next year. The jurisdictions have been working on the regional housing needs to prepare for that. This dovetails with the current RCP framework and smart growth opportunities. She mentioned that presently they are working with different jurisdictions to identify smart growth opportunities and incentive programs. If TransNet passes it will provide more money to fund incentive programs particularly focused on smart growth opportunities.

There are funds available to provide affordable housing to low and very-low income households, not for moderate income housing. Moderate income housing is not being built in the San Diego region and there is a chance that the same situation will occur in Riverside County in the near future. The Orange County Interregional Partnership focused on infill development options and looking at providing a variety of housing choices throughout the Riverside area.

Kevin Viera, WRCOG, explained that in that Riverside-Orange County partnership they developed a tool kit (video and workbook). Even though there is a lot of land available, the type of housing is not appropriate for the population that is coming. It is necessary to build a mix of housing to accommodate different needs within the population. He commented that within the policy arena, it is important to demonstrate that the current situation is inappropriate and ineffective. This tool kit...
is intended for use by the jurisdictions. Sharing information is the most important part of this relationship.

Sam Abed, Escondido Chamber of Commerce, mentioned that no incentives for local governments to encourage more housing when building retail brings in so much more revenue to the cities.

Councilmember Gallo mentioned that he hopes that some of the lessons learned in San Diego and Riverside Counties can be analyzed in light of the rapid changes in Imperial County.

Rick Bishop, WRCOG, commented that the community in Riverside still feels as though the area is a frontier in which you have your land and a nice-size home. He explained that in 20 years, Riverside County will be doing the same as San Diego and Orange Counties, and that it would be smarter to plan in anticipation of demographic changes rather than trying to retrofit in the future. It is necessary to investigate future growth and the inability of existing land use patterns to accommodate that growth. He mentioned that WRCOG received an award from the Building Industry Association for smart growth and mixed use.

Lynne Baker, Endangered Habitats League, mentioned that within the last month, Newsweek did a large article on how seniors are looking for infill housing near amenities. More and more seniors are choosing walkable communities as they are unable to drive. New communities should be less automobile-oriented and more pedestrian-oriented.

Program Strategies

Co-Chair Crawford commented on the importance of the legislative agenda and public outreach, and the monitoring of key performance indicators as part of Phase Two. She also commented on the importance of developing baseline indicators.

4. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

The next meeting of I-15 IRP is tentatively scheduled for Friday, January 21, 2005, in Temecula.
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 is 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 available to the public shortly.

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, to 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 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. The City of Tecate offered to host that meeting.

THE ATTENDANCE LIST IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.
COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO) SUMMARY OF AUGUST 3, 2004

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; Mónica Monge, Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego; Antonieta Beguerisse, Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad; Luz Maria 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, 2005 through August 22, 2005, 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 DEITAO), 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 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. in SANDAG’s 7th floor conference room.
COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO) SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2004

The September 7, 2004, Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities meeting was called to order by Chair Paul Ganster. The meeting was held in SANDAG. In attendance were: Javier Díaz, Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego; Javier Barreto, State of Baja California; Antonieta Beguerisse, Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad; David Fege, U.S. EPA; Silvia Flores, COLEF; Cindy Gompper-Graves, South County EDC; Eduardo Gonzalez, City of Tecate; Joaquin Luken, Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce; Haydee Martinez, IMPLAN; Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego; Angelika Villagrana, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce; Bill Figge, Caltrans; Nathan Owens, San Diego Dialogue; Lisa Dye, FHWA; Juan Pujol; Ramón Riesgo, GSA; David Shirk, USD Trans Border Institute; Humberto Peraza, Office of U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer; Clarissa Falcon, Office of Senator Denise Ducheny; and SANDAG staff.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

2. MEETING SUMMARIES OF JULY 6 AND AUGUST 3, 2004

The meeting minutes from July 6, 2004, were approved by the Committee with minor corrections. Page 6, number 5, should indicate that Elsa Saxod works for the City of San Diego, and not the County of San Diego.

The minutes from the meeting held in the City of Tecate in August 3, 2004, unanimously passed.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS’ COMMENTS

Javier Diaz, Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego, informed the group about the Mexican Independence Day ceremony “Ceremonia del Grito” being organized by the Consulate. Consul General Luis Cabrera will be conducting the ceremony on Wednesday, September 15, 2004, at the embarcadero south.

Eduardo Gonzalez, City of Tecate, also invited the Committee to their Independence Day celebration being held on Wednesday, September 15.

Angelika Villagrana, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, reported on an article that stated that San Diego was not interested in the US VISIT program. The Chamber then wrote an article that made it into the US VISIT newsletter and it clarified that San Diego is very interested in the
program. The US VISIT outreach meeting is scheduled for September 14 at SANDAG from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.

4. STAFF REPORT

Hector Vanegas, SANDAG, informed the committee that the list of upcoming events and the proceedings from the last summer conference are included in the agenda packet. He also petitioned the group to read the 2004 Binational Summer Conference Proceedings in order to make the corresponding recommendations to the Borders Committee.

From the last COBRO meeting the committee requested staff to begin thinking about potential topics for 2005 Binational Summer Conference. Staff recommended having the next summer conference structured in relation to the FY 2005 Work Plan. The proposed objective is to utilize the conference to showcase the progress of this committee, based on the binational strategic initiatives directed by the Borders Committee.

Elisa Arias, SANDAG, presented an update on the Economic Development and Security study that SANDAG is coordinating. There will be an advisory committee set up and an economic impact model developed. The timeline for completion is June of 2005.

Chair Paul Ganster commented that he has a couple of corrections for the proceedings. He asked Hector Vanegas to better explain the recommendation.

Hector Vanegas, SANDAG, explained that to make this recommendation the seven previous summer conference topics were reviewed and that the group decided to make an evaluation of eight years of working in the field of border cooperation. In the last COBRO meeting the committee decided to include the outcomes from the 2004 summer conference to the committee's work plan. We are not recommending a specific topic, but rather to incorporate FY 2005 within the framework of the regional comprehensive plan.

Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego, asked that if the objective of the 8\textsuperscript{th} summer conference was to review what has been done in previous conferences, then how was the recommendation different from previous conferences?

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, clarified that the idea is to tie COBRO's work plan to SANDAG's work plan. SANDAG is working on several binational issues and the idea is to have COBRO showcase that work to the stakeholders in the region. The work to be done by SANDAG, with a binational emphasis, will lead to some studies and conclusions in a number of different areas. The study about border wait times is an example. During the conference SANDAG could present the results of these studies and get the different stakeholders to review them and give feedback. The goal is trying to make a link between the work that SANDAG is doing on binational planning and the summer annual conference.

Chair Paul Ganster thanked the staff for working on the 2004 Binational Summer Conference evaluations report. He commented that the evaluations were not surprising. For example, more networking opportunities is always a request.
5. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP)-BORDERS CHAPTER (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.

Bob Leiter commented that we don’t want to debate what drives what (transportation or land use), but we need to understand the connections between them; the land use and transportation nexus is important.

The themes of the RCP are: (a) connecting Land Use and Transportation; (b) use those connections to guide other decisions; and (c) use incentives rather than regulation to get there.

The Regional Transportation Plan, recently adopted, shifted this region in the direction of transportation improvement, developing regional transit corridors rather than adding more freeways. These transit corridors help us to find smart growth opportunities areas. By the year 2030 the region will have more transit alternatives, better connection between existing and planned transportation corridors, and reserved right-of-way for light rail and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in communities that are currently being developed, such as Otay Ranch where there is a lot of congestion.

Another of the focuses of the RCP is a better mix of jobs/housing/transportation/open space. There is no a one-size-fits-all philosophy. There are other scales of smart growth—even in rural areas. A Smart Growth matrix designates places throughout the region.

The study examined the local jurisdictions and how the various areas of planning are integrated/or not. They found a lot of disconnects. The RCP is an attempt to connect those areas of planning into a single general framework in which all of the jurisdictions can contribute and collaborate.

The premise of the RCP project was that SANDAG would not be given any more responsibility or regulatory authority. So we need to work from the perspective of incentives and collaboration, rather than regulatory authority. There will be no additional levels of government.

The second theme of the RCP is strengthening the connections between local and regional plans. Many issues need to be dealt with from the perspective of a smaller geographic area. Subregional studies seem to be the way to go (certain issues may deal with just two or three cities over a specific issue).

The third theme has to do with making it happen through incentives and collaboration. We will provide financial incentives and resources to the cities that will apply smart growth measures.

One of the major accomplishments of the RCP was to identify key issues beyond our region. The Borders Chapter is a major innovation and critical component of the RCP.

The RCP was approved and now we are focusing on strategic initiatives with relevant work plans. We are looking at setting up a process for monitoring the different performance indicators, and measuring the progress collaboratively.
The Smart Growth Concept Map illustrates the areas where cities and the county are committed to pursuing smart growth initiatives in the region; where local jurisdictions are committed and where SANDAG should focus its transportation investments.

6. **I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (IRP) (SUSAN BALDWIN, SANDAG)**

The IRP was formed in 2001 and approved by SANDAG and Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) in August 2004 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). This project was initiated to identify and implement strategies to reduce both the demand for this interregional commuting, and the congestion impacts it is having on the I-15 Corridor.

The participants in the project are the IRP Policy Committee, which includes SANDAG's Borders Committee and elected officials from Riverside County. The Technical Working Group consists of organizations and agencies from both San Diego and southwestern Riverside regions, including Caltrans Districts 8 and 11.

The IRP initiated from an informal conversation between elected officials from San Diego and Riverside at a Padres game. An existing conditions report was carried and some of the findings were that prior to partnership there was very little coordination between agencies from the two regions; 85 percent of the 29,000 interregional commuters drive alone causing traffic congestion on I-15, and that moderately priced housing is a primary reason why people choose to make the long interregional commute.

The IRP strategies are: Housing and Economic Development proposed to reduce the demand for interregional commuting; Transportation designed to reduce the congestion impacts of long-distance interregional commuting; and program strategies include an ongoing outreach program and legislative advocacy for programs that provide incentives for balancing jobs and housing.

Long-range transportation strategies include: support for high-speed rail service, support for interregional transit services through transit shuttle services and rights-of-way preservation, and the implementation of high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) facilities.

**Discussion**

Cindy Gompper, South County EDC, commented that she believes there should be a decentralization of employment centers. She would like to hear about creating employment centers in various places so people don’t have to move.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, replied that it was actually one of the conclusions of the study.

Cindy Gompper, South County EDC, wanted to know how Smart Growth creates opportunities for decentralized employment. Example: Otay Mesa.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, answered that if there are plans that provide jobs and housing that make sense, then it should be part of the priority setting for transportation spending.
Cindy Gompper, South County EDC, asked if we are thinking of Riverside as a center for manufacturing, can we also think of strengthening existing potential in Otay and Baja California?

Chair Ganster commented that in the RCP the focus was on San Diego County and, in his opinion, “just added” the Borders Chapter. He stated that there seems to be a disconnect between the population projections and the Borders chapter. The population growth in Baja California will have a significant impact on the San Diego region.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, agreed that the understanding of the binational aspect of the region has become better through the process of the RCP. He sees planning going in that direction. Many key stakeholders were unfamiliar with how Baja was integrated into the region until after reading the RCP.

Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego, stated that there isn’t much “representation” of South County in Borders committee. People don’t understand the needs of the South County or Baja. People still do not understand the potential of Otay Mesa as a center for manufacturing and distribution. This group is only a taskforce and is not able to accomplish much. She asked, “Who will the champions be?”

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, stated that that is exactly why we want to move ahead with more focused work on the binational component. We have increased resources and want to intensify work.

Hector Vanegas, SANDAG, commented that he wouldn’t underestimate the influence of COBRO. COBRO has been around for eight years. The IRP was presented with the intention of showing a partnership model that could be used for the border region.

Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego, stated that she would love to know that the Board of Directors is reading about what COBRO is doing. She mentioned that COBRO has been around for eight years; however, the Riverside partnership received funds for a study almost immediately. The SR 125 is a big issue. This will require a study of equal importance in the binational area.

Chair Paul Ganster asked the committee to look at the IRP as a potential model and the fact that Mexico is creating a parallel organization to SANDAG, the “Comisión de Conurbacion,” can support COBRO’s efforts. Perhaps it would make sense for Caltrans to look at the binational corridor. Perhaps we can start moving toward doing this.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, added that the City of San Diego is doing a major update on the Otay Mesa community plan. The regional transportation plans being used in that planning process do not accurately reflect adopted SANDAG plans. There are some interesting opportunities and COBRO could help get that focus in place.

Javier Barreto, State of Baja California, agrees that the IRP study is very interesting. Currently, there are some studies for the planning of the various cities in Baja California. At the state level, it would be very interesting to do a similar study which includes Baja California and offer to “intercede” to ensure the participation and support this kind of project.

Bill Figge, Caltrans, commented that it should not be a problem to do a study like this for the San Diego-Baja California region. We have the application in for the Border Partnership and
hopefully it will be successful. He stated that Caltrans realizes that issues in South County are important, but sometimes the funding just doesn’t coincide. It just happened that Riverside got the funds to do their study. He commented on the importance of having the facts to back up your position.

Hector Vanegas, SANDAG, commented with regard to the strategic initiative for Borders/Mexico. The strategic initiative is to form a partnership with Mexico and work on transportation, energy, homeland security, and the environment.

7. DISCUSSION OF FY 2005 WORK PLAN (PAUL GANSTER, COBRO CHAIR)

Chair requested that an ad hoc committee meet between now and the next meeting to study the work plan for FY 2005. Volunteers were: Angelika Villagrana, Elsa Saxod, Cindy Gompper-Graves, Javier Diaz, and Chair Ganster. There is a complicated set of alternatives and we need time to discuss and assess the alternatives.

Chair informed the committee that attendance and the issues of membership have been very critical. Staff has put together an attendance list and the committee agreed to have that passed out at the next meeting so people know how they are doing.

8. ADJOURNMENT, AND NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

Motion to adjourn.

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.
COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO) SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 5, 2004

The October 5, 2004, Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities meeting was called to order by Chair Paul Ganster. The meeting was held at SANDAG. Members in attendance were: Paul Ganster, IRSC/SDSU; Javier Díaz, Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego; Hector Vindiola, Consulate General of the United States in Tijuana; Carlos de Orduña, Asociación de la Industria Maquiladora; Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans; Gustavo Pérez, City of Chula Vista; Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego; Marisol Manzanos, City of Tijuana; Joakin Luken, Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce; Nathan Owen, San Diego Dialogue; Angelika Villagrana, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce; Cindy Gompper-Graves, South County Economic Development Council; and SANDAG staff.

Alternate members included: Alex Hidalgo, SDSU; Consul Lydia Antonio, Consulate General of México in San Diego; Sergio Pallares, Caltrans; Bill Figge, Caltrans. Full list of guests is available upon request.

1.  WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2.  MEETING SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2004

The meeting summary for September 7, 2004, was approved unanimously (Motion: Villagrana; Second: Saxod; unanimous).

3.  PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS’ COMMENTS

Mario Lopez, Senator Filner’s office, announced a Town Hall Meeting to discuss Proposition 71: The Stem Cell Research and Cures Initiative to be held October 7, 2004, at the Chula Vista City Council Chambers at 4 p.m. He had flyers available for distribution.

4.  STAFF REPORT

*Brown Act.* Staff reviewed the Brown Act with COBRO members, explaining that this committee is subject to the Brown Act. This implies that the meetings are public and must comply with certain requirements, including 72-hour notice of agendas prior to the meeting and restrictions on actions outside of the San Diego jurisdiction. In addition, it is necessary that voting members be clearly distinguished from alternates and guests. Staff has prepared tents to indicate which member is voting. The sign-in sheet is part of the public record; therefore, any guests who do not wish to have their information subject to public review should not sign in.
Economic Development and Security. Staff presented an update on the status of the study. The consultants have been selected and are working already. They have recently turned in the literature review and methodology. An Ad Hoc Technical Advisory Group has been formed and has reviewed the methodology. At that meeting the consultants reviewed several similar studies which will inform the design of this study. There will be another meeting of the advisory group next week to examine the economic model. The anticipated completion is June 2005. Updates will be available on the SANDAG website.

5. EMERGING INTEGRATION OF THE CALIFORNIA AND MEXICO ECONOMIES

Howard Shatz, Research Fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California, presented findings from a report he prepared on the integration of the economies of California and Mexico.

Mexico has become a key partner in California's global economic relations for the following reasons: (a) Trade and foreign direct investment (FDI) between California and Mexico have increased dramatically in the past 10 years; and (b) most of this economic activity takes place along a relatively short border. The intense activity around the border presents challenges, and has important policy implications.

Economic integration is a binational goal because: (a) economic integration has driven economic development worldwide; and (b) U.S. and Mexico both want integration because it will help Mexico develop, expand both economies, and stem undocumented immigration.

California is a front-line state in the effort to integrate for the following reasons: (a) the large number of California residents born in Mexico (4 million); (b) Mexico has been California’s top export destination since 1999; and (c) joint production and busy border crossings knit together Baja California and San Diego and Imperial Counties.

California-Mexico trade involves production sharing. More than half of California’s exports to Mexico are electrical and non-electrical machinery. Nearly half of California’s imports from Mexico are in these same commodity classes. Two-thirds to three-quarters of California’s exports to Mexico go to Baja California.

Californians and Mexicans invest in different Industries. On the one hand, Mexican investors focus on wholesale and retail trade affiliates in California—35 percent in wholesale and retail; 18 percent in transportation and communications; 15 percent in manufacturing. On the other hand, California investors focus on manufacturing affiliates in Mexico—55 percent in manufacturing; 20 percent in wholesale and retail trade; 18 percent in services, especially technology services.

A continuing California-Mexico relationship is inescapable because of: (a) shared geography, history, and population all working toward continued integration; (b) both regions can benefit, and a policy goal is to ensure that they do benefit; (c) key challenges include the border, spreading economic relations beyond the border; and (d) long-term progress requires continued Mexican reforms and support from the United States government.

It is important to emphasize that even if Mexico “gets it all right,” the gap between the two countries will not close for a very long time, if ever. If, for example, Mexico grows its economy at a solid 5 percent per year, in 2056 it would catch up to the United States.
Discussion

Chair Ganster: How do border transactions fit in your analysis—retail etc.—that don’t show up in national trade figures? Shatz: It doesn’t. If someone living in Tijuana goes to San Diego to shop for the day and doesn’t declare their activity, we don’t have it. I don’t have that data. There is a mismeasurement of California exports because there are goods sent from California to Texas, for example, and put in warehouses that then go to Mexico. We don’t have that data. Tourism and Travel is not well measured either. Education is very sketchy too because of the difficulty of measurement. I was surprised to find so few Mexican nationals in California universities.

Chair Ganster: I can explain that. I am sure there is quite a bit of slippage in educational data and for good reason; many Mexican students look for ways to become residents so they don’t have to pay out-of-state tuition.

Pedro Orso, Caltrans: There are also U.S. citizens living in Mexico and attending community colleges.

Kristen Aliotti, Porter Novelli: CONACYT might have data. Through its grant system, it might be able to track down private-college students.

Sergio Pallares, Caltrans: Is there a sense that NAFTA is not a good deal for the U.S.? Why were you surprised? Shatz: At the time of NAFTA, bilateral agreements were not common. Most agreements were multilateral as in the GATT. Also, relations between Mexico and the U.S. were not on particularly good terms at that time. There was a lot of opposition to NAFTA.

Chair Ganster: What was the motivation for the study and what kind of feedback did you get from policy circles? Shatz. When I came onboard, most of the work done on Mexico at the PPIC was focused on immigration. The focus of my work at the Institute was to look at California in the global economy. One of the keys to that is the relationship to Mexico. The President of the Institute accepted this topic. As for acceptance in policy circles, state staffers were interested. The general knowledge of the global economy and how California fits was limited and focused on “exporting jobs” type of concerns. The report, however, hasn’t led to an actionable policy yet. One recent issue has been regarding Mexican trucks crossing into the United States and assuring compliance to environmental standards.

Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego: It seems that we have a long way to convince the state of the importance of Mexico to California. A key indicator is the closure of the California-Mexico Affairs Office. Shatz: It is my interpretation that the state administration is interested in running foreign affairs from Sacramento.

Pedro Orso, Caltrans: I wanted to mention that in the case of commercial vehicles inspection stations, Air Quality Resources Board (AQRB) regulates this. Most trucks already have dual licensing (CA/MX). The bill may help for additional AQRB staff to be there at the station with the California Highway Patrol. They are not there full time, so if they go to 100 percent inspection, it might provide more resources for inspections.
Carlos de Orduña, Asociación de la Industria Maquiladora (AIM): There have been some drastic changes in maquiladora profile (automobiles, biotech, etc.) in recent years. What kind of shifts do you see in the profile in the next few years? Shatz: Anything that involves labor-intensive investment will not grow. It has to be heavy industry, which requires capital. Anything that requires labor-intensive industry is going to China.

Javier Diaz, Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego: You made some projections and the need for infrastructure. Do you foresee the geographical constraints limiting growth and integration? Shatz: You have a report from SAIC which indicates there is quite a high tolerance for border wait times. There seems to be a high tolerance for congestion. There are some technology changes that can reduce congestion without expanding infrastructure.

Kristen Aliotti, Porter Novelli: I just wanted to comment about the legislative process. I have just returned from six months in Sacramento. There are tremendous opportunities for groups such as COBRO to provide critical input and support legislation that can have an impact on the border region. No one knows as much about the border as the stakeholders in this region.

Chair Ganster thanked Mr. Shatz for his report. We will be able to use some of these findings to advocate in Sacramento.

6. SUMMER CONFERENCE 2004 RECOMMENDATION AND UPDATE OF THE COBRO FY 2005 WORK PLAN

A blue sheet was handed out that outlines an updated work plan. Chair Ganster explained how the outcome of the conference can be linked to the work plan. Secretary Arturo Espinoza (SIDUE) mentioned the creation of a Comisión de Conurbación may be able to facilitate border coordination on transportation, infrastructure, data sharing, technology, and coordinating data generation. Focus efforts in a set of activities as described in the report, including: (a) facilitating communication; and (b) more coordinated planning between the two regions.

We are missing many opportunities and many problems could be avoided. San Diego and Tijuana are dealing with the same issues in parallel and could be coordinating efforts. SANDAG is currently proposing to Caltrans a partnership proposal to create a Border Interregional Partnership.

Possible topics include: (a) development of the Comisión de Conurbación; (b) development of the Corridor 2000 program and its impacts on the binational region; (c) understanding the Municipal Planning Institutes in Baja California; (d) in San Diego, the Cities of San Diego and Chula Vista are updating community plans in the border region (Otay Mesa and Chula Vista).

There are several topics that might be better dealt with in the form of workshops. Topics might include data sharing, for example. The idea would be to have two or three workshops that focus on particular issues where we need to draw on a broader audience than the members of COBRO. The specific timeline for meetings and workshops will be worked out as we go and assess the availability of those who need to be involved.

Sergio Pallares, Caltrans: One critical issue is funding. How can we attract funding into the region? Perhaps that could be the topic of a workshop.
Lisa Dye, FHWA: We should examine innovative funding options and public-private partnerships. That is where the money is—in public-private partnerships.

Pedro Orso, Caltrans: Baja California has recognized the importance of having something like developer impact fees. Mexico is looking at that. It’s harder for us to do because we don’t have the legal framework/legislation, but its worth looking at.

Hector Vanegas, SANDAG: If COBRO focuses on the 2000 Corridor, we should look for innovative financing options. We could look at how to finance the third port of entry at Otay Mesa that way.

Angelika Villagrana, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce: Can SANDAG sponsor legislation?

Chair Ganster: It would be helpful to look at concrete examples. In the lower Rio Grande, they put in an inspection facility with a private business partner. It is up and running, and cheaper than if it would have been done by the state.

Angelika Villagrana, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce: We should have the workshop in time for this legislative cycle.

Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego: I think we need to wait for the data to come in from the Border Wait Times Study. If we are going to ask for funding, we need to be able to back ourselves up with hard data. The Economy and Security study will give us the justification. We should wait for that.

Sergio Pallares, Caltrans: That is just one in a toolbox of ways to advocate for the infrastructure.

Chair Ganster: Well, we should definitely dedicate one of the workshops to innovative financing options, including public-private partnerships. These recommendations will be presented to the Borders Committee in December as they are going on a tour to Imperial Valley in November.

**Action:** Adopt the recommendations for the Summer Conference and Work Plan 2005 (Motion: Cindy Gompper-Graves; seconded by Angelika Villagrana; passed unanimously).

**Border Trade Alliance Meeting in Mexico – US VISIT**

Paul Ganster, Chair: The Border Trade Alliance meeting was held in Mexico. The representatives from US VISIT presented their outreach presentation. It was the same as was presented here, and there is growing concern that there is not timely information and that there is misinformation. Everyone is concerned regarding how this is going to affect trade. Border communities are not getting timely information and feel that the outreach teams are doing public relations, but not really providing substantive facts and details.

Pedro Orso, Caltrans: I think they are developing the program in-house and they really don’t know how it is going to unfold. I don’t think it’s a conspiracy, but rather they are not sure what will work. They seem to be open to suggestions and input, but there is a feeling that they are really not sure what is going to work.

Hector Vanegas, SANDAG: I had a very bad experience at Newark Airport. The implementation of US VISIT at our borders is an opportunity, but we need to be vigilant.
Paul Ganster, Chair: The bioterrorism issue is going to impact small and medium companies. The inspection process is going to affect them because they cannot absorb the additional cost of meeting the new requirements. They don’t have the technical personnel to deal with this.

7. ADJOURNMENT, AND NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

Next meeting

Since we have adopted our work plan and we want to extend the meetings to Tijuana, Chair Ganster suggested meeting in Tijuana. November 1st and 2nd are holidays in Mexico and November 2nd is Election Day in San Diego, so the Chair proposed to meet in Tijuana on Wednesday, November 3rd. It was also suggested that the members of the new municipal administrations be invited to attend.

The next meeting of COBRO will be held on Tuesday, November 3, 2004, from 3 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. in Tijuana. Staff will contact members and interested parties regarding the location.
BORDER ENERGY ISSUES GROUP DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of June 14, 2004

The June 14, 2004, meeting on Border Energy Issues Group was called to order by Councilmember Crystal Crawford, Chair of SANDAG’s Borders Committee. The meeting was held at SANDAG. Also in attendance were Luis Cabrera, Consul General of Mexico in San Diego; Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office; Manuel García-Lepe, Economic Development, State of Baja California; Julian Torres, SEMARNAT; Jeremy Martin, Institute of the Americas; Alex Hidalgo, San Diego State University; Carla García Zendejas, Border Power Plant Working Group; D. Rick Van Schoik, San Diego State University, SCERP; Rob Swette, WGA and Swette Associates; Ramsey Green, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce. Additional staff from these agencies were also in attendance.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Crawford thanked those in attendance and proceeded with self-introductions.

2. MEETING MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM FEBRUARY 9, 2004

The meeting minutes from February 9, 2004, were approved by the Committee with minor corrections.

Crawford Chair mentioned that one of the items from the BEIG February 9th agenda was working with Border 2012, and, that in the month of March, several Committee members attended Rosarito’s Border 2012 meeting, including SANDAG staff. Chair added that Javier Diaz, Deputy Consul General of Mexico in San Diego, talked about BEIG during this event. Good questions and feedback were given. In general terms, people had health concerns and were worried about having LNG plants located in their communities. The event helped clear up many misconceptions.

Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG, reported that it was a good opportunity to talk about what BEIG stakeholders are doing with regard to air quality and water issues, and how BEIG might be able to contribute to the Borders 2012 process.

Javier Diaz, Deputy Consul General of Mexico in San Diego, added that during the Borders 2012 meeting he talked about energy issues on both sides of the border, and clarified that BEIG does not have decision-making power.
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS, MEMBERS AND CHAIR REPORTS

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, reported on the Western Governors’ Association on Energy Efficiency in the Border Region meeting held in April, in which many committee members participated. The meeting was well attended and, during one energy workshop, he got to talk about energy issues. Mr. Sweedler met with the Chairman of the North American Energy Working Group (established between Canada, Mexico, and the U.S.), who was very interested in attending a BEIG meeting in the near future.

Rick Van Schoik, San Diego State University, SCERP, informed us that the Department of Energy has expanded the public comment period for the Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) of the Imperial-Mexicali 230-kV Transmission Lines until July 30, 2004. In addition, the public hearings for receiving comments on the Draft EIS originally scheduled for June 17, 2004, have been rescheduled for July 14, 2004. He noted that the EIS does not take into consideration the energy power plants’ impact on the Mexican side.

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, suggested having the working group write a letter to U.S. energy parties expressing BEIG’s views on energy issues of a binational nature, and urging them to consider the Mexican population on all cross-border energy issues.

Luis Cabrera, Consul General of Mexico in San Diego, commented that Mexican impact studies on energy issues have been developed and that certain groups do not acknowledge what is happening in Mexico due to political interests. He added that one of Mexicali’s energy plants was following U.S. EPA standards in addition to Mexico’s standards, but that California’s standards were much higher to comply with.

Manuel García-Lepe, Secretariat of Economic Development, State of Baja California, mentioned that while the SEMPRA energy power plant complies 100 percent with California’s environmental standards, the Integren power plant only complies with 50 percent and will invest a total of $10 million in order to comply with the other 50 percent.

Carla García Zendejas, Border Power Plant Working Group, reported that one company has implemented scrubbers technology that helps avoid certain types of emissions, even though it is not a requirement.

Chair Crawford mentioned that the issue of the common air basin keeps coming up during the working group meetings. The Committee does not have enough resources to analyze all the work that has been done with regard to energy issues, but the group could write a letter and have the EIS review the work that has been done on the Mexican side. The Committee could also consider ways for the sharing of energy-related information and promote a better working arrangement.

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, in reference to the power plant’s lawsuit said that this incident helps us understand what not to do. In reference to the letter, he said that it should not necessarily give the specifics about the lawsuit but should lay the groundwork and inform authorities that BEIG has met and discussed energy issues. The letter should also suggest that having a set of norms in the border region is feasible for California and Mexico’s economic development.
Manuel García-Lepe, Secretariat of Economic Development, State of Baja California, thought the letter was a good idea but made clear that the State does not make any suggestions with regard to energy issues. Consul General Cabrera would be the most appropriate liaison with Mexico’s Federal Energy Commission (CFE). Also, the working group needs to figure out whether the CFE has a representative in Baja California. Mr. García-Lepe added that there are 17 power plants in the border region and that the working group needs to inform the CFE of existing problems. The CFE has not experienced an international issue like this before. He proposed writing another letter to Mr. Enrique Guzman, Superintendent of Energy in Baja California, inviting him to the next BEIG meeting.

**Action:** The Committee agreed to write a letter stating that there are cross-border energy issues and that actions need to be taken. Mr. Rick Van Schoik and Mr. Manuel García-Lepe will each write a sample letter and have it ready by Friday, June 18, 2004. SANDAG staff will work with the Consul’s office to write the final letter. Staff will circulate it by e-mail before next meeting.

The working group agreed to invite the South County Economic Development Corporation to become a member of the Border Energy Issues Group.

4. **STATUS OF THE ENERGY WORKING GROUP (Rob Rundle, Project Manager)**

Staff member, Rob Rundle updated the group on the status of the Energy Working Group which advises SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee on issues related to the coordination and implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy adopted by SANDAG’s Board of Directors in July 2003.

The Regional Energy Working Group met on Friday, June 11, and agreed that the subcommittees would be the following: (a) Public policy, (b) Demand side of energy resources, (c) Supply side of energy issues, and (d) Funding (SANDAG is trying to identify long-term funding sources). The Regional Energy Working Group has analyzed different energy issues that are happening at the State level at the California Public Utilities Commission. The working group thinks that the San Diego region needs to provide a unified voice for different specific energy issues. The Regional Energy Working Group is moving in the right direction and is trying to figure out how different issues integrate with the BEIG and with other planning issues.

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, reported that he informed the Regional Energy Working Group that BEIG is the only group that addresses binational energy issues and that it is imperative to have good communication between both groups.

Chair Crawford pointed out that the Borders Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan recognizes the need for increased energy production due to an increasing demand on both sides of the border.

Manuel García-Lepe, Secretariat of Economic Development, State of Baja California, commented that it is good to know about the Borders Chapter, as it may help Baja California’s effort to work with the Western Governors’ Association (WGA). The State and WGA have been working together on a study about energy related issues (power plants, interconnection between both countries, etc) along both sides of the border. The findings will be beneficial for both parties and will focus on the border’s power capacity and projected needs by 2020.
Chair Crawford mentioned that SANDAG is hoping to have the updated version of the Regional Comprehensive Plan approved by the Board in the month of July. The borders chapter is still a draft and recommendations by stakeholders are welcome.

5. LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS FOR NORTH AMERICAN NAFTA ENERGY ISSUES, PREPARED BY NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY WORKING GROUP (Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG)

Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG, informed the group that as a starting point for coming up with a standardized approach for border energy issues, the group may use the document “North America-The Energy Picture” prepared by the North American Energy Working Group in June 2002.

6. REPORT ON THE GLOBAL LNG SUMMIT (Bill Powers, Co-Chair, Border Power Plant Working Group)

Carla García Zendejas, Border Power Plant Working Group (BPPWG) presented the principal findings of the Global LNG Summit, held in June 1, 2004 at the University of San Diego’s Kroc Institute for Peace and Justice which brought together non-governmental organizations, public officials, and independent scientists who discussed environmental issues surrounding the rapidly expanding world of liquefied natural gas (LNG) production, shipping, and use.

7. REPORT FROM THE WESTERN GOVERNORS’ ASSOCIATION ON ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN THE BORDER REGION (Manuel García-Lepe, Secretariat of Economic Development, State of Baja California)

Manuel García-Lepe, Secretariat of Economic Development, State of Baja California, presented a study prepared by the Western Governors’ Association that examines strategies for potential energy savings through the implementation of industrial and commercial energy efficiency projects in the border region.

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, asked SANDAG staff to review the study and extract the projects that relate to our region. The study could help the working group to come-up with energy efficiency strategies in our region, as well as to identify financing opportunities, such as the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC), NadBank, and California Infrastructure Bank.

Manuel García-Lepe, Secretariat of Economic Development, State of Baja California, commented that the study offers 16 recommendations, and that some of the final remarks were that wind energy costs are low; financial and regulatory policies that encourage regionwide construction of wind-oriented transmissions are needed; wind-generated electricity could play a major role in helping address the multi-sided energy crisis; and others. The complete study can be downloaded from www.westgov.org. Mr. García-Lepe also reported that Baja California is currently undertaking a project on wind farms in la Rumorosa that would generate 120 Megawatts during its first stage; and that the State is about to sign a joint venture project that will generate additional wind energy in the next three years. He invited the working group to the Border Energy Forum (BEF) taking place in Tijuana in the month of October. The Committee thought it was interesting to see how the WGA is discussing the same issues as this working group and should look for ways to collaborate.
Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, added that one of the action items from the previous meeting was to write a letter to the U.S. EPA and SEMARNAT to request information about the Tijuana-San Diego and Mexicali-Imperial common air basin areas. He requested to have staff draft the letter.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee agreed to meet on a quarterly basis on the second Mondays of the month: September 13, 2004; December 13, 2004; March 14, 2005; and August 13, 2005. The meetings will switch between Tijuana and San Diego. Raul Avila from the City of Tijuana offered to host the next meeting.
BORDER ENERGY ISSUES GROUP (BEIG) SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 13, 2004

The September 13, 2004, meeting on Border Energy Issues Group was called to order by Councilmember Crystal Crawford, Chair of SANDAG’s Borders Committee. The meeting was held at SANDAG. In attendance were Luis Díaz, Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego; Raúl Avila, City of Tijuana; Tom Blair, City of San Diego; Manuel Garcia-Lepe, Economic Development, State of Baja California; Kelly Goodnight, Institute of the Americas; Bill Powers, Border Power Plan Working Group; Mike Smith, California’s Department of Energy; Irene Stillings, San Diego Regional Energy Office; Alan Sweedler, San Diego State University, San Diego Regional Energy Office; D. Rick Van Schoik, San Diego State University, SCERP; Doug Paul, South County EDC; Mónica Monge, Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego; Dulce Félix Saguchi, Comisión Federal de Electricidad; Abelardo Borquez, Comisión Federal de Electricidad; Claudia Hernández, Secretaría de Energía de México; Jane Clough-Riquelme and Alejandra Romero, SANDAG.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Crawford thanked those in attendance, introduced guest speaker Claudia Hernandez from the Secretaría de Energía (Mexico’s Secretariat of Energy), and proceeded with self-introductions.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS, MEMBERS AND CHAIRS REPORTS

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, reported the speech delivered by Governor Schwarzenegger during the Borders Governors’ Conference that focused on energy, and acknowledged that it is a very important issue in our region. He talked about how critical it is to develop clean energy renewal resources and energy conservation strategies; increase California’s commitment to renewal use, specifically in Border States, and to create a marketing system. Alan Sweedler also informed the group about talks with the Energy Commission’s on sponsoring workshops, either in San Diego or Tijuana, dealing with border energy issues. Results will be part of the integrated energy policy report that needs to be updated every two years.

Mike Smith, California’s Department of Energy, commented that last November the Energy Commission adopted it’s first ever Integrated Energy Policy Report that encompasses all energy issues. State law requires the Commission to generate this report every two years, and to produce an update in-between the two reports. The objective of the update is to focus on key issues raised in the report, such as accelerating the use of renewable energy in the state, the liability and environmental concerns about our continued reliance on border power plants, and looking into developing a comprehensive transmission plan. They will release the first draft report on September 15, and they will schedule different hearings throughout the state, one of which will be in San Diego On October 1 at 10 a.m. During these meetings they will present a summary of the
findings of the report and provide a set of recommendations. The Energy Commission has also begun to work on the 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report and it will be submitted to the Governor and Legislature by November 1, 2005. What is important about this report is that the Commission has identified key areas of concern on border energy issues. For the 2005 report they will also have at least one workshop and one hearing in San Diego. Governor Schwarzenegger, unlike any other past governor, has set a high-level priority on energy issues. These hearings are a very good opportunity for this group to present itself.

Chair Crawford asked staff to consider if SANDAG would sponsor that hearing. We have to make sure that SANDAG’s Energy Working Group participates in that meeting.

Rick Van Schoik, SCERP, mentioned that there are some people with the opinion that projects that are capitalized in Mexico with U.S. investment, and the transfer of electricity from Mexico into the U.S., can be counted towards the Renewal Portfolio Standard (RPS). He is investigating how to take advantage of that, and thinks that it could also be true in the case of other border states. With regard to the connection between border energy and border air quality, an article published last week compared the levels of air quality standards in the L.A. basin; and it is nothing like what we have, our region is particularly at risk. We still don’t have an Energy Task Force, but we do have an Air Task Force. The Border Energy Forum will take place in October 22 in Tijuana, and the think-tank Policy Forum is scheduled to meet April 17 or 18.

Chair Crystal Crawford informed the group that an article published in The San Diego Union-Tribune wrote about the Ciudad Juarez plan for cleaning up 800,000 used tires. They will pay a cement plant for each tire burned and, in turn, the cement plant will use the tires as fuel.

Doug Paul, South County EDC, introduced himself and mentioned that energy is an important issue for the Council. He partnered with Governor Ernesto Ruffo to form a company, Border Infrastructure Solutions LLC, and provides a point of contact for organizing public/private ventures to pursue infrastructure solutions (energy, water, transportation, housing, and entertainment).

Irene Stillings, San Diego Regional Energy Office, admitted that her office did not leverage all the resources available with the BEIG members when it applied for an EPA grant to do some auditing and energy conservation activities for the maquiladoras in Tijuana. Unfortunately, the grant was turned down.

Manuel Garcia-Lepe, Economic Development, State of Baja California, reported on the one-day forum, 2012 Border Quality Air, to be held on September 23 in Canacintra in Tijuana. The CONAE and other agencies will be participating. The forum will be offered in Spanish from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. He will forward an e-mail invitation to the group.

The Air Task Force will meet in September.

Chair Crystal Crawford would like to have a list of events prior to the meetings, and they will be included in the agenda’s packet.

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, would like staff to work on the Border Energy Workshop and suggests that this group become the coordinating entity that works with energy agencies and makes it clear to Sacramento that there are groups working on border energy issues.
Also, to remind this group about the need to develop a set of rules to avoid these type of lawsuits, and see if it is possible to develop some guidelines or a binational regional energy strategy.

3. MEETING MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM JUNE 14, 2004

The meeting minutes from June 14, 2004, were approved by the Committee with no corrections.

Chair Crystal Crawford mentioned that there were different action items as a result from the previous meeting.

Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG, reported on the information requested to Ricardo Martinez about the common air basin area. Ricardo recommended directing our inquiries to Gabriel Ruiz. Gabriel Ruiz, EPA, commented that there is no legal base within the California Clean Air Act or the Federal Clean Air Act for creating a common air basin. He suggested using the structure of Border 2012 Air Task Force to look for alternatives. There is no set mechanism and no support from the San Diego Air District for supporting a common air basin.

Chair Crystal Crawford said that there may be no mechanism, but we would like to create a mechanism.

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, would like for this group to write a letter telling EPA and SEMARNAT why there should be a mechanism.

Chair Crystal Crawford asked Alan Sweedler, Rick Van Schoik, and Bill Powers to help draft the letter and then have the Consulate General’s office review it and provide additional feedback.

Doug Paul, South County EDC, asked if we were assuming that Imperial Valley and Mexicali will have a common air basin or if we’re planning on working with SCAG.

Chair Crystal Crawford answered that at this point we haven’t gotten that far, but that it is an important thing to consider down the road. However, first we need to focus in our region.

Doug Paul, South County EDC, asked about how big of a region we would define for the air basin, and how would a scientist define an air basin.

The Committee responded that it is currently being discussed.

4. SYNOPSIS OF THE WESTERN GOVERNORS’ ASSOCIATION REPORT: A MARKET APPROACH

Chair Crawford mentioned that staff provided a synthesis of the Border Energy Efficiency Study as requested at the previous BEIG meeting.

5. BEIG MEMBERSHIP LIST

Chair Crawford informed the Group that a list of BEIG members is part of the agenda packet. The list was approved and the information will be posted in SANDAG’s Web page.
6. **STATE OF BAJA CALIFORNIA’S UPDATE ON THE ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE IN BAJA CALIFORNIA**

Manuel García-Lepe, Economic Development, State of Baja California, started his presentation by stating that it is very important to reiterate that Baja California is isolated from the national pipeline system. We need to communicate with the CFE and Pemex to strategize ways to be independent. Baja California has the second-highest growth rate nationwide in terms of generating electricity.

Baja California is only depending on the United States for the supply of LNG through the Baja pipeline in Algodones. We are importing between 400 million to 500 million ft$^3$ per day. The pipelines that go through Mexicali – Distribuidora de Gas Natural (DGN) bring gas to the Rosarito power plant, and they supply gas to the local industry. The pipelines from the DGN plant go in two ways, north-south and east-west.

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, asked if Rosarito has gas coming from the Baja Norte pipeline and SDG&E.

Manuel García-Lepe responded that currently only DGN is supplying gas to Rosarito.

Abelardo Borquez, Comisión Federal de Electricidad, clarified that currently there is no gas coming from California into Baja California through the Baja Norte Pipeline. It is the decision of the owner of the pipeline.

Manuel García-Lepe commented that Baja California is only depending on the southeastern part of the U.S. for LNG and the growing demand for natural gas because of the state’s growth.

Baja California produces 2,288 MW in its two power facilities; that represents 14 percent of Mexico’s energy production, with only 2.8 percent of Mexico’s population. The State also holds the largest geothermal electric plant in Latin America, with a capacity of 720 MW. Two major projects under construction are Integren producing 1,000 MW and SEMPRA Energy producing 600 MW. If Baja California continues with the same level of demand, every four to five years the State would have to build another plant with a 500 MW capacity.

According to the National Energy Department, by the year 2014 the demand of energy in Baja California will grow at least 8 percent and the LNG plant will be saturated by local demand. The only solution to this demand is creating a natural gas alternative south of the region by building an LNG regasification terminal plant by the year 2008. The investment in an LNG plant entails investing in the liquefaction plant, the loading and shipment infrastructure, and the delivery pipelines, totaling more than $600 million to $700 million.

Abelardo Borquez, Comisión Federal de Electricidad, added that the only option for gas in our region is LNG.

Manuel García-Lepe, Economic Development, State of Baja California, commented that the site selected for the pipeline was Costa Azul in 1.5 km before Punta Salsipuedes; the construction of the water breaker will be granted at the end of October.
The original pipeline route that would connect the Baja Norte pipeline with the Costa Azul LNG plant was from Costa Azul to west of El Florido. Due to safety concerns it was changed to go through the west of Tecate. When the Costa Azul LNG plant is built by 2008 it will be completely saturated, 75 percent of its use will be local and 25 percent exported. They will get an outside contractor for the infrastructure. SEMPRRA Energy International, Shell Gas, and Power Global Solutions formed the joint venture for this investment.

The Chevron-Texaco project is in Federal hands now, and it requires an investment of $800 million. The proposed location is Coronado Major Island.

To conclude, the Pavement Integral Program and Air Quality project (PIPCA) will provide 14 million Mt\(^2\) of new pavement in the five state municipalities in order to facilitate traffic.

Claudia Hernández, Secretaría de Energía de México, added that SEMPRRA and Shell have a joint venture and the idea is to have a capacity of 1.5 ft\(^2\) per day; they are also planning in exporting some into the U.S.

7. **FEDERAL PERSPECTIVE ON BORDER ENERGY ISSUES FROM MEXICO’S SECRETARIAT OF ENERGY**

Claudia Hernandez, Secretaría de Energía de México, thanked the Group for the invitation and proceeded with the PowerPoint presentation.

From 2004 to 2010, 5.4 percent annual growth rate in electricity demand will be bolstered mainly by two sectors: industry and residential users. In that same period, 28,862 MW of new generating capacity will be added to the system, most of which will come from combined cycle plants.

Since 1996, 20 IRP projects have started operation or construction process, which represents a total capacity of 11,409 MW. The IRP projects going through a bidding process are Mexicali II in Baja California, Tamazunchale II in San Luis Potosí, Agua Prieta II in Sonora, and Norte in Chihuahua.

The CFE needs to incorporate additional generating capacity into the power sector, that is, 13,000 MW by the end of 2012. Some of the IRP projects to be tendered in this period include La Venta II, with wind technology in Oaxaca; La Parota in Guerrero; and Samalayuca IV in Chihuahua.

Natural gas demand will grow at an annual rate of 6.8 percent. About 59 percent of the increase in demand for natural gas will be related to power generation. Natural gas domestic supply will cover only 79 percent of domestic demand from 2005 to 2012. As the graph indicates, the Mexican production of natural gas—including LNG—will start dropping by 2008. The demand of natural gas will grow higher than both the Mexican production and the U.S. capacity to export natural gas into Mexico.

Mike Smith, California’s Department of Energy, noted that the graph shown in slide 11 indicates that there are other alternatives as far as exporting natural gas (not only LNG) into Mexico.

Claudia Hernandez added that anyone can get a permit for distribution of natural gas. Currently, the pipeline system in Mexico has a total 6,784.1 miles of infrastructure. Future pipelines will add to
the industrial sector 4,062.2 miles, and to the power sector 870.2 miles, for a total of 11,716.5 miles of existing and potential pipelines.

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, asked if it was more cost efficient to import LNG than to expand the internal system in Mexico, since Mexico has abundant reserves.

Claudia Hernández replied that it would represent more costs to expand the infrastructure than to continue importing gas from the U.S. Currently, the Comisión Federal de Electricidad is the importer and principal consumer of natural gas, and Petróleos de Mexico (Pemex) is the only entity able to explore expansion alternatives. Private participation can only be in distribution, storage, and transportation of gas. She added that transportation costs are very high.

Alan Sweedler, San Diego Regional Energy Office, commented that there is an evident increase in the demand of energy—and not only natural gas—in Mexico in the near future. He reiterated how important binational collaboration is.

Mike Smith, California's Department of Energy, wanted to know if the demand curve she is talking about reflects assumptions of energy efficiency, or if it is the highest demand curve.

Claudia Hernández, Secretaría de Energía de México, replied that the demand curve is middle range (conservative) and that it could go higher.

Abelardo Borquez, Comisión Federal de Electricidad, commented that in the case of investments for power plants, as an Independent Power Producer (IPP), Mexico does not make the investment, funds are allocated every month, and they are 20- to 30-year contracts. Mexico does not have the money to invest. As for LNG power plants, it is different because it is done through a bidding process.

ADJOURNMENT

The Energy Working Group would like BEIG to schedule its meeting the same day they do. It is also possible to have the meetings in Tijuana.

A standing item is to have a report from the Energy Working Group on each BEIG meeting.

Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 13, 2004. Garcia Lepe will see if it can be hold in Tijuana; also consider having it in November, and Raul Avila can still hold it.
ESTIMATING THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF BORDER WAIT TIMES AT THE SAN DIEGO-BAJA CALIFORNIA BORDER REGION: PROJECT STATUS

Introduction

SANDAG, in partnership with Caltrans District 11, is conducting a study to estimate the impacts of border delays on the economy of the San Diego and northern Baja California border region. This study is developing a database of border crossing and wait times data at the ports of entry (POEs) in San Diego and Imperial Counties. In addition, this project intends to strengthen collaboration among SANDAG, Caltrans, and federal inspection agencies in the U.S. and Mexico to help secure the border, manage wait times, and enhance the binational economy. This report summarizes the status of project activities.

Discussion

With assistance of a consultant team, SANDAG is developing and applying an economic model as an analysis tool, which will be based on information obtained from surveys and other relevant data. The approach being used to conduct this study is based on ongoing collaboration with SANDAG, Caltrans, and ad hoc working group or expert panel.

The expert panel consists of representatives from local universities, the business community, and government agencies, as follows:

- Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego
- Autonomous University of Baja California (Universidad Autónoma de Baja California - UABC)
- San Diego State University, Department of Economics
- The College of the Northern Border (El Colegio de la Frontera Norte – COLEF)
- University of California San Diego (UCSD) Extension, San Diego Dialogue
- University of San Diego, Trans-Border Institute
- Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce
- San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
- South County Economic Development Council
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Customs, and Border Protection (CBP), San Diego Field Operations Office
- Caltrans, Regional Planning
- SANDAG
The consultant team anticipates holding three meetings with the expert panel throughout the study. At the first meeting in September, the panel discussed the methodology proposed for the study. At the second meeting in October, the consultant team reviewed the data needs for the development of the economic impact model. The survey sampling methodology and the draft survey questionnaire also were presented.

The sampling plan, data collection protocol, and questionnaire were pre-tested at the Otay Mesa and San Ysidro POEs in late October. Surveys will be conducted at the San Ysidro-Puerta México, Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay, and Tecate-Tecate POEs from November 10 to December 5 to capture holiday and non-holiday travel and spending patterns as well as weekday and weekend samples. Travelers crossing the border from Mexico into the United States in autos, buses, and on foot will be interviewed. Additional surveys will be performed in mid-January 2005.

Technical reports documenting the work conducted to date have been posted to the project Web page (www.sandag.org/binational). The study is scheduled to be completed in June 2005.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contacts:  Elisa Arias, (619) 699-1936; ear@sandag.org
TOUR OF IMPERIAL COUNTY

During the preparation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the Borders Committee asked for a tour of Imperial County to learn more about the neighboring region and to help strengthen relationships between elected officials from both San Diego and Imperial Counties.

As requested, a tour of Imperial County has been scheduled for Thursday, December 2, 2004 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The tour will cover housing developments, transportation facilities, ports of entry (POE), agricultural, retail, and industrial developments, airport facilities, and energy infrastructure, among other areas. The following is a draft itinerary, which has been prepared by staff from SANDAG and the Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG).

Draft Itinerary:

8 a.m.  
**Departure to Imperial County from SANDAG offices**

10 a.m.  
**Meet with Imperial County officials at the I-8 rest area**

Imperial County officials will join Borders Committee members and will be available to answer questions throughout the day.

10:15 a.m.  
**Naval Air Facilities**

View existing naval air facility and potential site for regional airport cargo facility.

10:25 a.m.  
**Development in the Cities of El Centro and Imperial**

View housing developments in the Cities of El Centro and Imperial, which include entry-level, moderate, and above moderate homes. View hay crops in the area, which are exported to the rest of the nation and the world, and the growing industrial areas of the cities.

10:35 a.m.  
**Imperial County Airport**

View the existing Imperial County Airport and the location of a future cargo airport.
10:40 a.m. Mesquite Power Plant and Holly Sugar Plant
Visit two industrial developments.

11 a.m. City of Brawley
Visit the Brawley Beef Plant and the campus of the San Diego State University, Brawley, along State Route 111.

Noon Lunch with the IVAG Regional Council
The Borders Committee and IVAG representatives will discuss and explore opportunities to advance our institutional relationship.

2 p.m. Imperial Valley Mall and Geothermal Plant
Visit the Imperial Valley Mall and view a Geothermal Plant.

2:20 p.m. City of Calexico
View housing developments in Calexico along Cole Road and SR 98. View SR 7, which is currently under construction.

2:30 p.m. Calexico East Port of Entry
Visit the existing Calexico East POE and return to the heart of the City of Calexico.

3 p.m. Return to San Diego

5 p.m. Arrival at SANDAG offices
REPORT FROM THE AD HOC GROUP THAT AddressED THE ISSUE OF UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRATION IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION

Introduction

The Borders Committee created an ad hoc group of its members to examine the issue of undocumented migrants and their impact on the San Diego region, in a response to a concern raised by Councilmember Jack Feller at its April 2004 meeting. The ad hoc group held two meetings and recommended that a study produced by the Little Hoover Commission on the impact of immigrants in California be presented to the full Borders Committee.

On September 9, 2004, the Borders Committee held a special session on this topic. At the end of the special session, the Committee asked the ad hoc group to reconvene and discuss possible actions and recommendations consistent with the FY 2005 work program. On October 4, 2004, the ad hoc group met and developed several recommendations for consideration by the Border Committee.

Recommendation

The ad hoc group recommends that the Borders Committee approve the following actions during FY 2005:

1. Recommend to the SANDAG Board of Directors that the 2005 legislative program include support of legislation that would: (a) reduce the legal and socioeconomic barriers for the incorporation of immigrants into their local communities as law abiding, contributing members; and (b) reduce the fiscal impact of undocumented migrants on public services in the region;

2. Request SANDAG staff to provide further analysis regarding the advantages and disadvantages to the region of having the federal government reinstitute a guest worker program in the United States; and

3. Request SANDAG staff to provide relevant information on impacts of border crossings in the region through studies such as, “Estimating Economic Impacts of Border Wait Times at the San Diego-Baja California Border Region.” (See Agenda Item #5.) Such information could be used in analyzing the impact of various legislative proposals dealing with immigration and border security.
Discussion

At its meeting on February 13, 2004, Councilmember Jack Feller, City of Oceanside, asked the Executive Committee to talk about possible venues to discuss the effects of undocumented immigration in the San Diego region. The Executive Committee referred this matter to the Borders Committee. Councilmember Feller then presented his concerns on this topic to the Borders Committee at its April 16, 2004, meeting. During that meeting, the Committee decided to set up an ad hoc group to discuss whether this was an issue that the Borders Committee should address, and if so, what the most appropriate course of action might be.

The ad hoc group held two meetings. The first meeting, which was held on April 28, 2004, included a discussion with Robert L. Bach, former executive policy advisor to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. During the second meeting held on June 23, the group discussed whether to hold a workshop or conference focused on this issue, and if so, how best to approach it. Staff provided various background materials for consideration. Among them was a report on the issue of the impact of immigrants in California prepared by the bipartisan Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy, known as the Little Hoover Commission.

At the conclusion of its second meeting, the ad hoc group recommended that the Borders Committee hold a special session to hear a presentation on a report produced by the Little Hoover Commission. The objective of this special session was to discuss the origin of the report, learn how the information was gathered, and understand how the Commission reached its recommendations, and where those recommendations stand currently. As a bipartisan legislative commission that has examined this issue thoroughly, the ad hoc group considered this a good point of departure for any discussion on the issue. The Borders Committee accepted this recommendation and scheduled a special meeting to consider the Little Hoover Commission report on September 9, 2004.

Little Hoover Commission Report on Undocumented Immigration

More than 8.6 million foreign-born residents live in California, which is approximately 25 percent of the population. An estimated additional 2.5 million individuals are undocumented immigrants. The needs of this population can generate pressure on public programs and services with limited resources.

The Little Hoover Commission, formally known as the Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy, is an independent state oversight agency that was created in 1962. The Commission’s mission is to investigate state government operations and—through reports, recommendations and legislative proposals—promote efficiency, economy, and improved service. The full Commission selects study topics that come to its attention from citizens, legislators, and other sources and produces in-depth, well-documented reports that serve as a factual basis for creating effective reform legislation.

In 2002, this bipartisan commission examined the implications of immigrants (both undocumented and legal residents) on the state economy and social infrastructure. The Little Hoover Commission

---

stated in its report that California, faced with the impact of inconsistent and often contradictory federal immigration laws, “cannot quietly accept or suffer the consequences of federal policies that fail our families, our communities, and our businesses.”

Despite the differing views represented on the Little Hoover Commission, the members unanimously agreed on a set of guiding principles they felt should frame public debate on the issue:

1. All persons deserve dignity and respect;
2. All residents are obligated to be responsible community members; and
3. New Californians need the same opportunity as others to become self-reliant and responsible community members.

After collecting existing data and holding hearings with a variety of organizations and experts, they developed a set of policy recommendations. The Commission report arrived at a two-pronged strategy for local, regional, and state governments to consider. On the one hand, they should work aggressively to reform federal immigration laws to serve California. The regional and state agencies should “call attention to barriers in federal policy that restrict the ability of communities and their residents, particularly immigrants, to meet shared responsibilities and build a high quality of life.”

It also should be recognized that many undocumented immigrants are working, paying taxes, and belong to families that are establishing themselves in communities. The Commission concluded that denying services and opportunities to these residents only delays their integration, reduces their contributions, and increases state costs. Therefore, the Commission recommended that communities focus on the distinction between “responsible community members” and “those who flout state and local ordinances,” rather than legal status, and provide opportunities for all residents, including undocumented immigrants, to move toward and maintain self-reliance.

The Commission recommended the creation of a “Golden State Residency Program” to encourage immigrants to establish residency and become citizens, creating incentives for their integration, and supporting those who demonstrate a commitment to their new community. One of the cornerstones of this program would be the reform of criteria for local social services (see Attachment 1 on page 66). Rather than legal status, the criteria for participation would be: (a) commitment to establish citizenship; (b) responsibility to local community; (c) proficiency in English; (d) participation in civic affairs; and (e) responsibility for children and other family members.²

**Ad Hoc Group Recommended Actions**

Following the special meeting of the Borders Committee on September 9, 2004, the ad hoc group met again on October 4 to review the points that were discussed at the special meeting, and to form recommendations to the Borders Committee. The ad hoc group agreed that the Little Hoover Commission report provided a good foundation for understanding the complex issues raised by undocumented immigration, and recognized that many of the issues can best be addressed at the federal and state levels. However, they concluded that SANDAG, through the Borders Committee, should pursue three actions to further the regional dialogue on these issues:

1. Recommend to the SANDAG Board of Directors that the 2005 legislative program support legislation that would: (a) reduce the legal and socioeconomic barriers for the incorporation of immigrants into their local communities as law abiding, contributing members; and (b) reduce the fiscal impact of undocumented migrants on public services in the region;

2. Request SANDAG staff to provide further analysis regarding the advantages and disadvantages to the region of having the federal government reinstitute a guest worker program in the United States; and

3. Request SANDAG staff to provide relevant information on impacts of border crossings in the region through studies such as, “Estimating Economic Impacts of Border Wait Times at the San Diego-Baja California Border Region.” (See Agenda Item #5.) Such information could be used in analyzing the impact of various legislative proposals dealing with immigration and border security.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Héctor Vanegas, (619) 699-1972; hva@sandag.org
Current Policies are not Strategic

Under existing policies, public benefits are distributed in ways that do not necessarily reflect core community priorities. Public policies encourage all immigrants to attend public colleges, but place restrictions on who can access job training, health insurance programs and even state-supported foster care.¹⁹⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
<th>Documented Immigrants</th>
<th>Undocumented Immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rights</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Taxes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency and Basic Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenatal Care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free public education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 classes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Adult Education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English classes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship classes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Grants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement aid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Stop Center Job</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Welfare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BabyCal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Medical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-emergency)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Health Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Families⁵</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKS⁶</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC Supplemental Nutrition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization Services</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. State funding is not available to provide foster care services to undocumented immigrant children. Counties fund foster care services to these children.

b. Documented immigrants are eligible for these programs only after they have been in the country for five years.
**Proposed California Residency Program**

California could align public policies with community goals. All residents would receive emergency and basic services necessary to protect their personal and physical safety. Immigrants who make a commitment to their communities would be treated similar to citizens. Others would have the lowest priority for services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
<th>Program Participants</th>
<th>Other Immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rights</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Taxes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency and Basic Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenatal Care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free public education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 classes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Adult Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English classes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship classes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Grants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement aid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Stop Center Job Training Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Welfare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BabyCal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Medical Services (non-emergency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Health Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Families</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC Supplemental Nutrition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization Services</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COBRO’S RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2004 BINATIONAL SUMMER CONFERENCE AND FY 2005 WORK PLAN

Introduction

On July 16, 2004, SANDAG held its 8th Annual Binational Summer Conference entitled, “Cooperation across the California-Baja California Border: Where do we go from here?” Stakeholders from the United States and Mexico, including governments, the business sector, academia, non-governmental organizations, and community groups, convened at this conference to examine cross-border collaboration in the Californias. The focus of the conference was on formulating an effective framework for cross-border collaboration, comparing our region to others that are addressing similar issues, assessing what needs to be done to improve efforts in various sectors in which SANDAG has participated, and making specific suggestions on actions to be taken. (The conference proceedings are included as Attachment 1.)

Since July 2004, SANDAG’s Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) has discussed the conference recommendations, strategic initiatives in binational planning from the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and SANDAG’s work on other interregional partnerships. It has developed a work plan for FY 2005 and the following recommendations.

Recommendation

COBRO recommends that the Borders Committee:

a) Support the establishment of a formal interregional partnership (similar to the I-15 Interregional Partnership) with appropriate local, state, and federal agencies in Mexico for the exchange of relevant planning information and policy coordination; and

b) Endorse the COBRO FY 2005 Work Plan (described below), which focuses on furthering binational regional planning efforts in the area of transportation and related infrastructure.

The Borders Committee is asked to discuss and approve the COBRO recommendations.

Discussion

The function of COBRO is to advise and provide recommendations to SANDAG’s Borders Committee on its role in binational border-related planning activities. The framework for SANDAG’s involvement in borders-related planning is the Borders Chapter of the RCP, which includes a vision statement, goals, policy objectives, and actions in each of the following areas: access to
jobs/housing; transportation; economic development; environment; water and energy supply; and homeland security.

The Borders Committee helps build relationships within which cross-border planning issues can be discussed at a policy level. As one of its priorities for FY 2005, the Borders Committee approved the development of an interregional partnership with the counterparts from the Republic of Mexico. Consistent with the RCP, the priority planning issues for this partnership include transportation, energy and water supply, homeland security, and environment.

One of the overall recommendations of the 2004 Binational Summer Conference was to create a formal partnership in the binational region and establish a cross-border framework for collaboration. It was suggested that this framework must be integrated in a manner which facilitates the sharing of resources and decision-making. We should create a vision for the region in which the well-being of all in the entire binational region is considered. Solutions to cross-border planning should be guided by the regional stakeholders, and the federal and state levels should facilitate these efforts. The consensus of the summer conference participants was that a more focused approach needs to be made to establish mechanisms for harmonizing and coordinating planning in the binational San Diego/Tijuana region.

There are several activities now underway in the binational region, which are moving in the direction of establishing such a framework for coordinating regional planning. During the conference, Mr. Arturo Espinoza, the Secretary of Infrastructure and Urban Development of the State of Baja California, discussed the recent formation of a commission to address the regional planning issues of the greater metropolitan area formed by the cities of Tijuana, Tecate, and Playas de Rosarito. The COBRO has followed with interest the formation of this commission. It is seen as an excellent opportunity to strengthen efforts at binational planning and coordination.

The state government of Baja California has established the Tijuana-Rosarito 2000 Corridor Program, which involves the construction of a highway from Playas de Rosarito to a potential second port of entry in east Otay Mesa. At the same time, the City of San Diego is currently in the process of updating its community plan for Otay Mesa, which will have implications for the future development of the southern portion of the San Diego region.

Following the summer conference, COBRO agreed that it should focus its FY 2005 work plan on facilitating communication between the agencies engaged in these state and local planning efforts to support and enhance a more coordinated planning effort in the binational region. COBRO could provide a forum for exchange of information and serve as a venue for strengthening coordinated policy development between San Diego and Baja California.

The COBRO FY 2005 Work Plan emphasizes the binational impacts and opportunities created by the extensive binational corridor formed by the Tijuana-Rosarito 2000 (Corridor 2000) program in Baja California, Mexico, initiatives for the potential third port of entry at Otay Mesa, and the highway infrastructure in the Otay Mesa area of the San Diego region (including State Routes 11, 125, and 905). COBRO has developed its work plan taking into consideration the RCP strategic initiatives in binational planning, and welcomes the Borders Committee’s comments and input.
Milestones in the COBRO FY 2005 Work Plan include:

a. Identify and prepare a list of organizations that could participate in the interregional partnership. (January 2005)
b. Identify and prepare a list of studies and projects with binational impact in the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay area. (February 2005)
c. Review and comment on the assessment of impacts of border wait times on the economy of the San Diego-northern Baja California. (June 2005)

At the 2005 Binational Summer Conference in July 2005, COBRO would formalize the establishment of a collaborative institutional mechanism for binational planning.

SANDAG has submitted a grant application to Caltrans to develop an interregional partnership focused on border-related issues. The borders partnership would be modeled after the successful I-15 Interregional Partnership between SANDAG and agencies in southwestern Riverside County. COBRO would serve as a stakeholders working group and facilitate the development of this partnership.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1909; hva@sandag.org
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 (NADB Bank) 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
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.
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](http://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.
I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP UPDATE

The purpose of this report is to update the Borders Committee on the I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP). The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) are continuing work on the I-15 IRP using a $240,000 grant awarded by Caltrans in July 2004. The work element from SANDAG’s FY 2005 Overall Work Program is included as Attachment 1.

Discussion

A joint meeting of the I-15 IRP Policy Committee and I-15 IRP Technical Working Group to discuss the work program for Phase Two of the I-15 IRP was held on October 15, 2004 in Escondido. The focus of Phase Two of the project will be on implementation of economic development, transportation, and housing and land use strategies contained in the I-15 IRP Final Report. The focus of the grant-funded efforts in Phase Two and the discussion at the joint meeting are described below.

Economic Development Strategies

Phase Two of the I-15 IRP will focus on the following economic development strategies:

- Prepare an Employment Cluster Study with consultant assistance to identify specific employment clusters that drive the bi-regional economy, and appropriate strategies to foster these clusters to improve job growth in southwestern Riverside County.

- Facilitate greater collaboration among Riverside economic development agencies (EDAs), as well as between Riverside and San Diego EDAs.

At the October 15th joint meeting, members of the Policy Committee and Technical Working Group agreed that EDAs in Riverside County need to be strongly involved in the development of the Employment Cluster Study. SANDAG staff noted that the consultant for the study would need to have a good understanding of the economy of southwestern Riverside County, and suggesting using a consultant that could work with WRCOG to update the analysis in the future. WRCOG agreed to take the lead in establishing a technical working group to assist with the Employment Cluster Study and in associated economic development activities.
Transportation Strategies

Phase Two of the I-15 IRP will focus on the following transportation strategies:

- Identify outstanding transportation issues facing the I-15 corridor in the vicinity of the county line though the cooperative I-15 County Line Study initiated by Caltrans Districts 8 and 11, and propose multimodal solutions as inputs for future updates of SANDAG’s and the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG’s) regional transportation plans.

- Expand Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service and connecting shuttle services to meet the demand for interregional commuter travel in the I-15 corridor. Successful BRT services rely on priority treatments, such as exclusive HOV lanes, direct access ramps, bus lanes, or signal priority treatments, to maintain bus speeds along congested roadway corridors. Potential BRT corridors and opportunity areas where smart growth land use planning can help support the development of BRT services should be identified in both counties.

Participants at the joint meeting agreed that it was important to continue efforts to coordinate transportation planning and project development activities along the I-15 corridor. The Caltrans I-15 County Line Study is helping to identify differences in transportation forecasts and planned and programmed projects in the study area. Members also discussed the need to evaluate other transportation solutions, including as BRT, high-speed rail, commuter rail, and MagLev, and ensure that these solutions are integrated and coordinated. There are differing views on the applicability of the various rail technologies, and members asked that the next meeting include a presentation of the rail plans in southwestern Riverside County.

Housing and Land Use Strategies

Phase Two of the I-15 IRP will focus on the following housing and land use strategies:

- Continue implementation of on-going strategies identified in the San Diego Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) to increase the supply of housing in the San Diego region. These strategies include completion of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the San Diego region, and preparation of a Smart Growth Concept Map and Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program.

- Investigate and implement strategies to increase the supply of moderate income housing in the San Diego region.

- Implement smart growth strategies that provide a variety of housing choices and support BRT service in the southwestern Riverside region.

Participants at the joint meeting discussed the need to address the relationship between land use and transportation. Representatives from WRCOG expressed concerned about the tremendous growth in housing units being built in southwestern Riverside County and its impact on the transportation system. WRCOG staff noted that it will be important to plan for a variety of housing types in southwestern Riverside County in order to meet the needs of future generations.
SANDAG staff presented plans for BRT services in the San Diego region, including an example of the Otay Ranch development in the San Diego region. The Otay Ranch example demonstrates that suburban communities can be designed to be transit- and pedestrian friendly, and that three-story apartments and condominiums provide enough density to support regional transit service. Members noted that SANDAG’s presentation would be useful in helping educate local jurisdictions and transportation agencies in southwestern Riverside County.

**Performance Monitoring**

In addition to implementation of the strategies described above, a portion of the grant will be used for performance monitoring efforts. These include the preparation of a baseline monitoring report, establishment of short- and long-range performance targets, and preparation of an annual monitoring report on key performance indicators.

**Timeline and Next Steps**

The work program for Phase Two of the I-15 IRP is proposed to cover a two-year period from January 2005 to January 2007. SANDAG and WRCOG will be working on a detailed work program and timeline for the grant-funded activities. This work program and a discussion of high-speed rail issues will be included on the agenda for the next meeting of the I-15 IRP Policy Committee.

Because of low attendance at recent meetings, the Borders Committee should discuss whether a different meeting day and/or time should be considered to help increase attendance. The Committee has been meeting quarterly on the third Friday of the month from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Friday, January 21, 2005 in Temecula.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, [(619) 699-1943; sba@sandag.org]
PROGRAM WORK ELEMENT 30051
SAN DIEGO – RIVERSIDE INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP

BUDGET SUMMARY FOR OWP NO. 30051

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDS SOURCE</th>
<th>FUNDS APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA MPO Planning (5303)</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Transit Planning (5307)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Metropolitan Planning</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA CMAQ (5309)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Other</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning/Admin.</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Program</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Cluster Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRCOG pass-through; WRCOG to provide additional $26,000 in local match for project.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $274,000  TOTAL $274,000

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this work element is to strengthen the relationship with southwestern Riverside County by undertaking Phase Two of the I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP). Emphasis in FY 2005 will be on implementing specific economic development, transportation, and housing strategies that were identified in the first phase of the project.

PREVIOUS AND ONGOING WORK

The I-15 IRP was formed in 2001 to address the jobs-housing imbalance between the San Diego region and southwestern Riverside County, and the effects it has had on transportation and other regional issues. The I-15 IRP is a voluntary partnership between local elected officials of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG). The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), Riverside Transit Agency (RTA), Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Caltrans, and other agencies and organizations, also participate in the partnership.

Funded by a $515,000 grant from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), Phase One of the I-15 IRP lasted three years and included the preparation of an existing conditions report; a short-range strategy report, focusing on transportation strategies that could be implemented immediately; a public outreach program; and draft and final reports. The I-15 IRP Final Report was approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors on July 23, 2004, and the WRCOG Executive Committee on August 2, 2004.
In July 2004, Caltrans awarded SANDAG a $240,000 grant for Phase Two of the I-15 IRP. The Phase Two work program focuses on the implementation of specific economic development, transportation, and housing strategies identified in the first phase, and also would include the preparation of a performance monitoring reports for the I-15 IRP. SANDAG’s Borders Committee represents the San Diego region on the I-15 IRP Policy Committee, which also includes elected officials from southwestern Riverside County. The I-15 IRP Technical Working Group, which consists staff from SANDAG, WRCOG, Caltrans, and other involved agencies and organizations, acts in an advisory role to the I-15 IRP Policy Committee.

**TASKS**

01 Develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SANDAG and WRCOG that lays out the work program, timeline, and roles and responsibilities for completing Phase Two of the I-15 IRP Phase. (FY 2005 – 5%)

02 Conduct regular meetings of the I-15 IRP Policy Advisory Committee and technical working group(s) and provide staff support, as needed. (FY 2005 - 15%)

03 Conduct an Employment Cluster Study that identifies the “cluster” industries that drive the economies in the San Diego and southwestern Riverside County regions, and develop specific strategies to foster these employment clusters. Facilitate greater collaboration, via the study, among Riverside economic development agencies (EDAs) and between Riverside and San Diego EDAs and other partners. (FY 2005 - 30%)

04 Conduct performance monitoring activities for the I-15 IRP, including the preparation of a baseline monitoring report, establishment of short- and long-range performance targets, and completion of an annual monitoring report. (FY 2005 - 15%)

05 Conduct transportation planning studies that assess the need for regional highway facilities, public transit services, and related improvements to serve the interregional commute in the I-15 corridor. Work in this area includes the Caltrans I-15 County Line Study that seeks to identify short-term, mid-term, and long-term transportation issues facing the I-15 corridor in the vicinity of the county line, as well as bus rapid transit (BRT) and other interregional transit planning efforts conducted by SANDAG and transportation planning agencies in southwestern Riverside County. (FY 2005 - 20%)

06 Identify specific housing programs aimed at moderate income families that can be implemented to increase the supply and the choice of housing in the San Diego region. Identify opportunities for incorporating smart growth concepts and planning for a variety of housing choices in the southwestern Riverside region. (FY 2005 - 15%)

**Committees:** I-15 Interregional Partnership Committee; **Working Group:** I-15 IRP Technical Working Group(s); Project Manager – Susan Baldwin

---

1 “Employment clusters” are groups of complementary and interdependent industries that drive wealth creation in a region.

2 Moderate income families make up the bulk of the households that have moved to Riverside County.
PRODUCTS

- MOU between SANDAG and WRCOG for Phase Two of the I-15 IRP. (FY 2005, 2nd Quarter)
- Request for Proposals (RFP) for the I-15 IRP Employment Cluster Study. (FY 2005, 3rd Quarter)
- Establishment of short- and long-range performance monitoring targets. (FY 2005, 4th Quarter)
- Draft report of Caltrans I-15 County Line Study, and summary other transportation planning studies affecting interregional travel in the I-15 corridor. (FY 2005, 4th Quarter)
- Summary of housing and land use programs that can be implemented in the San Diego region and southwestern Riverside County. (FY 2005, 4th Quarter)

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Work on Phase Two of the I-15 IRP would continue through FY 2006. Expected activities during FY 2006 include, but are not limited to, completion of the draft and final reports for the Employment Cluster Study and preparation of the first annual performance monitoring report.
UPDATE ON THE UNITED STATES VISITOR AND IMMIGRANT STATUS INDICATOR TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Introduction

On November 15, 2002, and December 12, 2003, the Borders Committee received reports on the development of the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US VISIT) Program. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) developed the US VISIT program to enforce regulations from 1996 that require an automated entry and exit control system at all ports of entry, to collect records of arrival and departure from every foreign visitor entering and leaving the United States.

The US VISIT program is currently in place at 115 airports and 14 seaports, and the first phase of the program is scheduled for implementation at the 50 busiest land ports of entry by December 31, 2004. This report provides an update on the program and its potential effects on ports of entry within the San Diego region.

Discussion

The San Diego region’s three international land ports of entry are among those 50 crossing points where the US VISIT will be implemented by the end of this year. In 2003, 10.2 million pedestrians, 50.9 million passengers in 7.9 million personal vehicles, 183,000 buses, and almost 700,000 trucks were inspected entering the United States through San Ysidro, Otay Mesa, and Tecate ports of entry.

Authorities from DHS have stated that during the first phase of implementation, the US VISIT program will apply only to visitors holding a foreign visa or passport. In addition, entry procedures will not change for those carrying border crossing cards (BCC) or laser visas, as long as their stay does not exceed 30 days and they travel within the “border zone” (25 miles from the border).

Those required to be registered will need to go to secondary inspection, where they will file an electronic form (“I-94”), have their fingerprints taken, and be photographed. This is intended as an interim solution for land ports of entry, while the DHS explores the long-term solution to record the entry and exit of people at these land ports of entry.

The first phase, which includes only entry crossings, will be implemented by DHS by December 31, 2004. The next phase, which will consist of inspecting the exits at the land ports of entry, is not expected to be implemented before 2006. Recently, the DHS announced that exit procedures would
be tested at three ports of entry starting mid-June 2005: Port Huron, Michigan; Laredo, Texas; and Douglas, Arizona.

The San Diego Alliance for Border Efficiency (SDABE), a local voluntary coalition of binational border stakeholders that includes Caltrans and SANDAG, has been following the development of the US VISIT program. On November 15, 2002, the Borders Committee received a report from SDABE, which recommended that the impacts of entry/exit control be mitigated to ensure that exit inspection does not result in southbound traffic congestion similar to the current northbound congestion. The SDABE stated that its goal is to expedite the inspection and movement of people, goods, and services, without compromising national security and encourage the implementation of smart technology at the San Diego-Baja California ports of entry.

SANDAG will continue to work collaboratively with Caltrans and DHS to make sure that the implementation of the US VISIT program does not result in negative impacts to the region.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

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