California's Integrated Border Approach Strategy (CA-IBAS)

Improving Regional Mobility in California's Border Communities

Phase 1 Final Report

California Department of Transportation

December 02, 2014

Prepared by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 11 in consultation with METRANS Transportation Center

CA-IBAS Phase 1 Report Contents

California's Integrated Border Approach Strategy (CA-IBAS) Phase I Final Report

"California's border communities suffer mobility, security, and infrastructure constraints. This translates to a loss of efficiency that negatively impacts our business community. The current California-Baja California cross border experience has a bearing to many, including employees commuting to work and businesses that transport goods. We need to create an environment that facilitates the economic activity of our border business community. Improved infrastructure, efficient mobility services, and fast multi-modal connectivity will facilitate logistics and international trade. Equally important, the bi-national businesses community needs to participate in the development of mobility and security solutions that address their needs."

Cindy Gompper Graves, President and CEO, South County Economic Development Council

I. Introduction to the CA-IBAS Strategy

The California Integrated Border Approach Strategy (CA-IBAS) is a multi-agency initiative led by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). CA-IBAS seeks to improve mobility and the traveler experience at California's border communities. These communities are affected by negative impacts from pedestrian, vehicle, and truck traffic generated by land Ports of Entry (POEs). The goal of the CA-IBAS is to propose institutional framework(s) that will identify, plan, prioritize, program, fund, and implement integrated mobility and security improvement strategies in California's communities adjacent to land POEs. While the focus of the Border Approach Strategy is on partnerships across public agency and jurisdictional boundaries, the hope is that new models will facilitate better coordination between the public and private sectors to address and jointly fund solutions to issues of shared concern.

In San Diego and Imperial Counties, the development of a Border Master Plan (BMP) in 2008 created an initial institutional framework for the identification of key projects to improve the border crossing experience for both people and goods. The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Service Bureau prepared the plan under the direction of Caltrans in partnership with the Secretariat of the Infrastructure and Urban Development of Baja California and the oversight of the U.S./Mexico Joint Working Committee. The BMP helped establish a dialogue among government stakeholders and recognized the need for a process to bring those stakeholders together on a regular basis to revise the plan and secure funding for future projects.

The 2008 BMP was successful in establishing a project-focused dialogue among various border government stakeholders in both the U.S. and Mexico. Much work has been done to date laying the groundwork for sustained communication among those groups. However,

economic, environmental, security, and mobility needs have changed. An update to the BMP recognizing changed circumstances was released in the summer of 2014. Some traditional funding sources have been eliminated or greatly reduced, such as the Federal Highway Administration's Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program. Other potential revenue sources, such as public-private partnerships or a Border Infrastructure Bank, need to be revisited in light of current economic conditions. New potential sources of revenue including multi-agency partnerships for multi-jurisdictional projects also need to be researched.

The CA-IBAS is designed to focus on the unique institutional needs related to mobility and service delivery near the southern border of California. The purposes of the 2014 California Integrated Border Approach Strategy (CA-IBAS) are:

- Underscore the importance of the border to the local community, region, State, and nation.
- Propose rules of engagement for stakeholder coordination in project delivery at border communities that take into account the planning horizons of public agencies, and the speed and agility of private sector service providers.
- Provide a means of addressing conflicting goals between cross border security, economic development, and mobility, as well as environmental justice, in border communities.
- Identify possible solutions for different planning scenario and project delivery challenges.
- Develop a framework in which border-related projects can be identified, developed, funded, and built.
- Identify the role played by California and federal statutes in either facilitating or hindering multi-agency coordination or public-private partnerships.

This CA-IBAS: Phase 1 report provides an update on the state of the practice for improving mobility and the traveler experience in California communities adjacent to California/Mexico land POEs. It provides an overview of agencies involved in mobility and security issues surrounding California's border communities, and of institutional structures that might be used to improve service delivery and funding, as well as financing options to support those institutional structures and multi-agency projects. It also summarizes case studies of selected best practices from other border regions.

The focus of Phase 2 will be recommendations for California-specific planning approaches, institutional structures, and funding arrangements for multi-agency project development and delivery where there is no clear jurisdictional lead agency or authority. Another task during Phase 2 is to consider State and federal statutes identified in Phase 1 when evaluating any recommended institutional structural and project delivery options.

Overview of the CA-IBAS

The development of the CA-IBAS is occurring in a rapidly changing and fiscally constrained environment. New planning requirements have been identified in the federal transportation legislation known as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). There are also new requirements to integrate statewide and regional transportation planning processes. MAP-21 originally expired on September 30, 2014, but has been extended through 2015. MAP-21's successor, the Grow America Act, and other competing legislative proposals are being discussed.

The CA-IBAS also must address two distinct mobility markets—goods movement and people movement in and through border communities. Federal and State regulations increasingly require that public and private community enhancements and mobility investments deliver performance-driven policy outcomes beyond mobility enhancement. Ensuring measurable project success from a number of perspectives (e.g., social, economic, mobility, sustainability) will require collaborative efforts involving local, regional, State, and federal partners as well as private stakeholders.

The agencies involved in planning, developing, financing, and implementing regional mobility projects in and around California's border communities have a need for new tools to respond to current and future mobility needs. It has never been easy to develop public plans and funding for the efficient, safe, and environmentally responsible movement of goods and people in and through California's border communities and across international boundaries. However, a changing regulatory environment and ever present fiscal constraints have made the job much more difficult in recent years.

Responding to these new realities significantly changes earlier frameworks used to develop public plans for the efficient, safe, and environmentally responsible movement of goods and people across international boundaries. Do agencies, such as Caltrans, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), and local jurisdictions use existing planning models and project evaluation criteria specific to each mode and project type, or does the new framework warrant a more strategic approach for projects that could fall outside specific jurisdictions or missions?

The primary weaknesses of the current approach to project selection and funding are the lack of a shared, integrated vision, a common strategy, and joint implementing mechanisms among the various federal, State, regional, and local agencies in charge of mobility and security in communities adjacent to the U.S.-Mexico POEs in California. As a result, each agency takes the lead in applying their own approaches in managing mobility and security projects, securing funding for those projects, and mitigating their impacts. However, the potential exists to create

a single institutional mechanism through which all the appropriate agencies can partner in developing regional mobility strategies and projects.

The CA-IBAS builds upon Caltrans work in previous border-related and bottleneck studies including the 2004 Binational Border Transportation Infrastructure Needs Assessment[1] (BINS), and the 2008 California-Baja California Border Master Plan (BMP) and it's 2014 update.[2] Other specific studies have been undertaken since 2008 including the June 2014 San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center Study. The report recommended improvements such as a passenger automobile Pick-up and Drop-off (PPUDO) facility, a bike center, and a pedicab pick-up/drop-off location adjacent to the POE.

As visionary and exciting as these improvements and projects might be, many economic, environmental, security, and mobility needs and priorities have significantly changed the focus of funding in the border communities adjacent to POEs. Some traditional funding sources have been eliminated, greatly reduced, or are less reliable.

The energy and focus of this new planning and project development environment provide a timely opportunity for stakeholders involved in California's border-crossing communities to create a five-year planning framework that can support their common efforts to address:

- Joint funding strategies and reassessment of project delivery priorities
- Integrated multi-agency planning roles
- Collaborative project development models
- Needed regulatory reform to advance this initiative

In addition to a new integrated border institutional framework, significant changes in federal, State, regional, and local funding sources require Caltrans and its partners to go beyond traditional funding and financing sources and investigate other models that may include:

- Developing public-private partnerships
- Collaborating with the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank
- Leveraging funds targeted for federal agencies' off-site improvements for improved service delivery in border communities.

[1] http://borderplanning.fhwa.dot.gov/tocBINS.asp

[2] http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/departments/planning/pdfs/systplan/10-California-BajaCaliforniaBorderMasterPlanSeptember2008.pdf

To evaluate new institutional and funding options, participating agencies need to better understand recent changes in legislative statutes that may either facilitate or hinder multi-agency coordination (as well as public-private partnerships) in the development of an integrated border approach for mobility improvements.

II. CA-IBAS Study Scope of Work

To better define the current set of challenges and begin to explore potential responses, Caltrans developed a two-phase CA-IBAS strategy concept in March 2013 with the following objectives:

1. Identify best practices and approaches to joint planning and multi-agency coordination for project development, financing, and delivery
2. Highlight areas of overlap of agencies involved in border-related mobility and security activities
3. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current models used to facilitate multi-agency coordination at California's border
4. Identify federal and State legislative challenges and opportunities
5. Identify financial strategies, challenges, and opportunities
6. Propose a new framework in which border-related projects can be identified, developed, funded, constructed, operated, and maintained
7. Propose a five-year work plan for the selected institutional framework

The first three of these objectives were the subject of this Phase 1 study. Specific tasks included:

- Briefly describe the "who, what, when, where" of California border-related operations, planning, programming, project development, and funding.
- Establish criteria for selecting best practice models for institutional collaboration and multi-agency funding and financing mechanisms in other border communities.
- Identify and examine best practice models for multi-agency institutional structures, innovative financing strategies, and pooled funding to allow construction of major capital projects. These include several options coming from the U.S.-Mexican border and the U.S.-Canadian border as well as other multi-agency institutional agreements.

One of the expected outcomes of the CA-IBAS is that specific development agreements would need to be executed between partners and stakeholders tailored to each of the programs and projects selected for implementation. Any identified statutory impediments to specific agreements and collaborative structures recommended during Phase 2 will need to be addressed.

III. Agencies Involved in California Border Communities

One of the first Phase 1 tasks involved developing a brief list of the participants and their roles in border community planning, regulation, enforcement, and project development. The identification of border approach agencies relevant to the study was first developed by Caltrans, in part building upon the stakeholder outreach done for the Border Master Plan. An expanded list was prepared to provide an annotated, comprehensive list of the principals and their roles in border community planning, regulation, enforcement, and project development. To reflect the IBAS emphasis on border communities, the focus was narrowed to local agencies within one to two miles of California's ports of entry. The list of State and federal agencies was narrowed to include only those with active, relevant duties in and around border communities or at the border itself. The list of agencies and their roles includes:

State Agencies

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/departments/planning/index.htm - Caltrans develops and updates the State's long-range transportation plan, the California Transportation Plan (CTP), which helps guide the development of a Statewide program of transportation projects, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Caltrans District 11 (which includes San Diego and Imperial Counties) represents Caltrans, the California State Transportation Agency, and the Governor of the State of California on border transportation affairs.
- California Air Resources Board (C A R B) http://www.arb.ca.gov/ - CARB is involved in Statewide air quality management activities including ambient air monitoring, vehicular emissions studies, and heavy-duty diesel vehicle inspections. CARB has funding under Proposition 1A (Highway Safety and Traffic Reduction Bond Act of 2006) to spend $1 billion along trade corridors, including POEs, to reduce air pollution.
- California Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) http://www.calepa.ca.gov/ - The California EPA coordinates with U.S. EPA's Border 2020 and Border XXI programs. These programs are bi-national, interagency programs aimed at protecting and improving the environment and public health. The Border Environmental Program is a collaborative effort involving Cal/EPA, other State agencies, Baja California, and tribal communities located at the border. AB 3021 (2006) created a Border Relations Council. Relevant codes are California Government Code Sections 8710-8713.
- California Department of Public Health (CDPH) http://www.cdph.ca.gov/ - Office of Bi-national Border Health focuses on assessing the health of the border region, educating health professionals, and providing international

leadership to optimize health and quality of life along the U.S. /Mexico border. CDPH partners with government and non-governmental agencies to support border-wide initiatives. Funding comes from the CDPH as well as CDC and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

- California Transportation Commission (CTC) http://www.catc.ca.gov/ - The CTC reviews and approves use of State transportation funding for transportation projects that are included in the State and Federal Transportation Improvement Programs and State transit projects that are in the Federal Transit Improvement Program.
- Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (IEDB) http://www.ibank.ca.gov/ - The IEDB has the authority to act as the State's general purpose financing authority for public infrastructure and public /private partnerships. IEDB operates pursuant to California Government Code Section 63000.

Federal Agencies

- General Services Administration (GSA) http://www.gsa.gov/ - GSA is the landlord of most U. S. POEs (it owns and operates 102 land POEs and leases another 22, with the remaining 43 under the Department of Homeland Security jurisdiction). GSA is responsible for construction, as well as general management and repair. GSA utilizes BorderWizard™ software to assist in planning and designing POEs. Funds for federal infrastructure along the border come from the GSA-administered Federal Buildings Fund. The Federal Buildings Fund included $564 million for land port of entry infrastructure improvement projects in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-2010, with none in 2011 and 2012. More recently, GSA has received $226 million for phase 2 of the San Ysidro POE project. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) allocated $300 million for GSA-owned land POEs to be used to provide design or construction funds to seven new or ongoing capital projects. GSA can accept private donations for developing border infrastructure.
- Customs and Border Protection (CBP) http://www.cbp.gov/ - CBP inspects goods and people seeking entry into the U.S. CBP is the lead agency in collecting and reporting wait time data. Utilizing the Strategic Resources Assessment process to analyze information about each crossing, CBP identifies needs and prioritizes infrastructure improvement projects along the northern and southern border in consultation with GSA.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ - FHWA provides funding for highway and road construction, works to ensure safe movement of people and goods across borders, and works with partners in Canada and Mexico to create joint working groups to address the challenges of

improving mobility and security at overland crossings. The U.S.-Mexico Joint Working Committee is organized through the FHWA.

- U.S. Border Patrol – This agency is the uniformed law enforcement arm of the U. S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS); it detects and prevents unauthorized entry into the country.
- International Boundary and Water Commission (U.S. Section) – This agency administers boundary and water treaties negotiated by the U.S. and Mexico including issues surrounding boundary demarcation, national ownership of waters, sanitation, water quality, and flood control in border regions.

Local Government

- City of San Diego http://www.sandiego.gov/ - City located within 1-2 mile proximity of the border; 372 square miles; 1.338 million population
- City of Calexico http://www.calexico.ca.gov/ - City located within 1-2 mile proximity of the border; 6.2 square miles; 39,310 population
- County of San Diego http://sdpublic.sdcounty.ca.gov/ - Unincorporated area – 3,572 square miles; 486,604 unincorporated population
- County of Imperial http://www.co.imperial.ca.us/ - Unincorporated area – 4,492 square miles; 176,948 population

Regional Organizations

- San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) http://www.sandag.org/ - SANDAG is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)[3] and regional planning and transportation agency that oversees transportation planning and implementation in San Diego County. Its main responsibilities are to produce a Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP). SANDAG also develops the long range plans for San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) transit services. Major initiatives along the border are a study of economic impact of wait times in the San Diego-Baja California Border Region and the Otay Mesa bi-national corridor strategic plan. Funding comes primarily from the FTA and FHWA, Caltrans, a local transportation sales tax (Transnet), and local funds from SANDAG member jurisdictions.

[3] MPOs are transportation policy-making bodies made up of representatives from local government and transportation agencies with authority and responsibility in metropolitan planning areas. Federal legislation passed in the early 1970s required the formation of an MPO for any urbanized area with a population greater than 50,000. MPOs were created in order to ensure that existing and future expenditures for transportation projects and programs were based on a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3-C) planning process. Federal funding for transportation projects and programs is channeled through the MPO. Source: http://www.planning.dot.gov/documents/BriefingBook/BBook.htm#2BBa

- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) http://www.scag.ca.gov/ - SCAG is the MPO for Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura, and Imperial Counties. Its main responsibilities are to produce a Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP). SCAG is also the co-lead agency for the Southeast Desert Air Basin, the air quality management district in Imperial County. The agency completed a study of goods movement across the border in 2013, which analyzed the Calexico East and Andrade crossings.
- Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) http://www.imperialctc.org/ - ICTC is the transportation planning and programming agency for the Imperial County region. ICTC guides the development of the RTP for the Imperial region and its regional, State, and federal TIPs. ICTC provides direct management, administration, and oversight for transit operators in the area, including the Imperial Valley Transit System. ICTC funding comes primarily from the FTA and FHWA, Caltrans, a local transportation sales tax (Measure D). ICTC is also currently evaluating the feasibility of expanding an intermodal facility in the City of Calexico.

Tribal Communities

- Campo Kumeyaay http://www.campo-nsn.gov/
- Quechan
- La Posta

Private Sector

- Trucking industry—California Trucking Association http://caltrux.org/
- Freight rail companies—BNSF Railway http://www.bnsf.com/; Union Pacific Railroad http://www.up.com/; San Diego and Imperial Valley Railroad http://www.gwrr.com/ Pacific Imperial Railroad http://pacificimperialrailroad.com/

Transportation, Transit, Utilities

- San Diego MTS http://www.sdmts.com/ - MTS is a joint powers authority created in 1975 as the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB). SB 1703 transferred MTDB's long range planning, financial programming, project development, and construction functions into SANDAG. MTDB changed its name to Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) in 2005. MTS owns the assets of the San Diego Trolley, Inc., the San Diego Transit Corporation, and the San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railway Company, which owns 108 miles of track and right-of-way. The San Diego Trolley operates on the main line and on the La Mesa branch. MTS contracts with the Pacific Imperial Railroad to provide

freight service to shippers over its right of way. It is funded from the California Transportation Development Act, the Federal Transit Administration (sections 5307, 5337, and 5339), TransNet sale tax revenues, and fares (which comprise 40%).

- RideFACT http://www.factsd.org/ - RideFACT is a dial-a-ride service serving all of San Diego County.

International Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

North American Development Bank (NADB) http://www.nadbank.org/ - Established in San Antonio, Texas, as a jointly-funded non-governmental international organization of which Mexico and the U.S. are equal partners, NADB created the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC), which is tasked with developing solutions to environmental problems in the region of 62 miles on either side of the international border. NADB prepares, develops, coordinates, and oversees environmental infrastructure projects; and provides loans, grants and technical assistance (including studies and training support) for water, waste management, air quality improvement, renewable energy, energy efficiency, and industrial and hazardous waste projects.

The list will be further refined during Phase 2.

IV. Institutional Structures Applicable for Border Projects

The IBAS Phase 1 project included a review of California Statutes to identify collaborative structures and limitations to those structures and what both mean for improved service delivery in and around borders. The relevant California codes are summarized in Appendix 6. During Phase 2, the types of institutional structures will be reviewed with the stakeholders to confirm which structures would be appropriate. Phase 2 will also review applicable federal statutes.

Current State of Project Development Collaboration

In order to program public funding for new transportation and mobility projects, federal and State laws require states and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to develop and adopt various funding and policy plans including State and Regional Transportation Plans (RTP)[4] and, in California, Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS).

[4] Regional Transportation Plans look out over a 20 plus-year period providing a vision for future demand and transportation investment within the region. Source: California Transportation Commission, 2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines.

Mobility projects outside federal POE property boundaries are allocated funding through the regional, State, and federal transportation improvement program processes. Each regional transportation planning authority prepares a RTIP[5]. The RTIPs are consolidated with other regional programs and interregional statewide and federal programs, the STIP[6] and the FTIP[7], for federally funded highway projects and transit projects. The California STIP is administered by the CTC. The FTIP is administered jointly by the U.S. Department of Transportation's FHWA and FTA. Transit projects are sent directly from the Regional TIP authors to the Federal Transit Administration for consolidation in the FTIP Transit Element. Although highway and transit projects beyond the boundaries of POE property are included in the RTIP, STIP and FTIP, as appropriate, improvements within the POE property line that do not receive regional, State, or federal transportation funding are not.

Beyond the funding-related FTIP/STIP/RTIP processes, the State and regional agencies prepare detailed future-focused transportation plans. The CTP is a long-range transportation policy plan that explores social, economic, and technological trends and demographic changes anticipated over the next 20 years and their potential influence on travel behavior. The CTP is developed in consultation with the MPOs to provide policy guidance for developing future regional transportation plans consistent with State and federal policies and requirements.

In the California-Mexico border region, SANDAG prepares the RTP/SCS and RTIP for San Diego County. In Imperial County, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), in consultation with the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC), prepares the RTP/SCS and the RTIP. Caltrans funding commitments in the region are documented in the STIP. The RTIP project lists include all regionally significant highway and transit projects in cities and city projects that receive regional, State, or federal funds.

Projects within federal ports of entry (POE) are not included in the RTIP since they are funded through the Federal Buildings Fund or in the General Services Administration or the Customs and Border Patrol annual budgets. Within the formal zones of ports of entry, Customs and Border Protection initiates a process to assess land port of entry inspection facilities' condition and

[5] The RTIP is a five year program of projects prepared by the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and County Transportation Commissions. Each RTIP should be based on the regional transportation plan and a region wide assessment of transportation needs and deficiencies. Source: California Transportation Commission, 2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines.

[6] The STIP is a biennial program adopted by the California Transportation Commission. Each STIP covers a five year period and includes projects proposed by regional agencies in their regional transportation improvement programs (RTIP) and by Caltrans in its interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP). Source: California Transportation Commission, 2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines.

[7] The FTIP is a financially constrained four-year program listing all federally funded and regionally significant projects in the region. Source: California Transportation Commission, 2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines.

operations as well as relevant regional planning data and studies (GAO 2013). The federal General Services Administration then follows up on requests from CBP to contract for and administer Port of Entry feasibility studies to identify and evaluate alternative POE designs and cost estimates. The respective GSA and CBP studies may differ with respect to the timeline. GSA plans for 30 years, while CBP plans for 3 years. GSA also uses transportation data from MPOs and correlates this data with a software program known as "BorderWizard™," which simulates projected traffic flow through the proposed facility to help identify potential deficiencies. The BorderWizard™ analyzes such factors as "projected traffic volume, workload processing time, and the proposed infrastructure improvements" (GAO 2013).

Once GSA works out the plan with CBP, GSA submits two funding requests: first, for a site design, and second for construction funding, which normally are approved within a two year period. Funding for POE projects comes primarily from Congressional appropriation, but State transportation departments and local port authorities frequently contribute through inter-agency agreements. The regional GSA office must have its prospectus for a preferred design approved not only by the central GSA office, but also by the federal Office of Management and Budget.

GSA and CBP collaborate closely, and CBP works with numerous other agencies, including the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), State Department, state departments of transportation, regional planning organizations, and local governments. The GSA has historically limited its authority and responsibility to federal property and facilities. However, while there is some communication between federal, State, regional, and local agencies, there are opportunities for a more systematic process to align implementation activities, including funding as well as schedules for POEs and connecting transportation facilities.

There are two innovatively financed mobility projects on the San Diego border, the South Bay Expressway[8] extension of SR-125 and a new border crossing, Otay Mesa East, which will connect to the future SR-11[9]. The South Bay Expressway (SBX) toll road was developed under California's AB 680 legislation passed in 1989. SBX was constructed in 2007 in two sections: a publicly-funded $138 million, 3.2-mile northern section that included a new SR-125/SR-54 interchange; and a $635 million, 9.3-mile former public-private partnership toll road southern extension of SR-125 that connects eastern Chula Vista to Otay Mesa, the largest area of industrial-zoned land remaining in San Diego County. In 2012, SANDAG acquired the lease to operate the toll road. SANDAG has different goals from the previous toll road operator, a private, for-profit entity.

[8] AASHTO Center for Excellence in Project Finance & U.S. Department of Transportation, 2014. http://www.transportation-finance.org/projects/south_bay_expressway.aspx.
[9] SR11/Otay Mesa East Port of Entry: Gateway to Opportunity. http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_56_16106.pdf

SANDAG, as a public agency, seeks to improve mobility in the San Diego region. As a result of public ownership of the highway, the SBX has reduced its prices for using the facility up to 40 percent.

Caltrans, SANDAG, GSA, CBP, USDOT and their counterpart agencies in Mexico are working together to construct a new Otay Mesa East POE and future SR 11.[4] The project, on the U.S. side of the border alone, is expected to cost approximately $750 million and is to be funded through tolls, fees, and other public revenues. More than 1.4 million trucks carrying an estimated $31 billion in goods crossed at the Otay Mesa POE in 2010. The number of trucks is expected to double by 2025. The new POE and future four-lane State highway will connect the U.S.-Mexico border to key regional, State, and international highways, including SR 125, SR 905, and the Tijuana-Tecate and Tijuana-Ensenada free and toll roads.

An important change to the SR 11/Otay Mesa East POE phasing was made in early 2012 in order to expedite project delivery. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) approved a plan to divide the project corridor into three distinct segments. The CTC also approved $80 million in Proposition 1B Trade Corridors Improvement Funds (TCIF) for Segment 1 of the project.

Current Opportunities for Collaboration

The federal government has principal jurisdictional authority within its property boundaries north of the international border. Although mostly focused on international security, POE facilities have significant mobility components that cast a long shadow on surrounding mobility improvement options.

Prior to 2012, the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Customs and Border Protection (CBP) focused its strategic planning on resource allocation. The agency used a process known as "Strategic Resources Assessment" (SRA), previously mentioned above. SRAs were performed for 160 land POEs. The resulting data were used as the first comprehensive inventory of CBP's POEs. The SRA results were compiled into a Capital Investment Plan that prioritized facilities based upon urgency of need and used to communicate those needs to DHS, GSA, and Congress. GSA follows up on requests from CBP to contract for and administer Port of Entry feasibility studies to identify and evaluate alternative POE designs and cost estimates. The SRA included architectural and analytical assessments of the condition of land POE inspection facilities, their operations, as well as relevant regional planning data and studies.

This modified sign marks the dates when the new pedestrian path to Mexico opens. Planning activities on one side of the border have implications for the other side.

In 2012, the CBP changed its approach from resource allocation to risk assessment and response. One of the key objectives of CA-IBAS Phase 2 is to address a renewed and expanded role of the federal Homeland Security and Transportation funding resources in mobility improvement projects adjacent to the POEs.

Land Ports of Entry

After the passage of NAFTA, Caltrans District 11 established an International Border Studies program. The program's primary objective is to coordinate transportation planning efforts between Caltrans and Baja California and to work toward the efficient and secure movement of goods and people along the U.S.-Mexico border region. Caltrans District 11 works with community stakeholders and federal, State, and local government agencies from both the United States and Mexico.

In 2008, with participation of all levels of government from the U.S. and Mexico involved in transportation and land POE issues, Caltrans and the Secretaría de Infraestructura y Desarrollo Urbano del Estado de Baja California (SIDUE) led the development of the first California-Baja California Border Master Plan (BMP). Its primary objectives were:

- Increase the understanding of POE and transportation planning on both sides of the border and create a plan for prioritizing and advancing POE and related transportation projects
- Develop criteria for prioritizing projects related to existing and new POEs, as well as, transportation facilities leading to the California-Baja California POEs; rank mid- and long-term projects and services (e.g., roads, public transit, and railways)

- Establish a process to institutionalize dialogue among federal, State, regional, and local stakeholders in the United States and Mexico to identify future POE and connecting transportation infrastructure needs and coordinate projects

The BMP coordinates the U.S. and Mexico's national land POE planning and connecting transportation infrastructure in a systematic approach. A BMP Update was released in summer 2014.[10]

The CBP Resource Optimization Strategy[11] was first authorized in the Federal Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriation Act of 2013 and may provide an additional opportunity to expand border collaboration efforts. Recognizing that the federal budget was not able to fund all high priority CBP projects, the provision permits CBP to accept outside donations and enter into reimbursable alternative financing agreements for modernization, and new or expanded POE projects and services on non-federally owned property.

CBP currently has authority to enter into agreements related to: Dallas-Ft Worth Airport; El Paso, Texas; South Texas Assets Consortium (a group of Ports of Entry in Laredo, Rio Grande City, Pharr, McAllen, and Cameron County); Houston Airport System;[12] Miami-Dade County; Peace Bridge in New York; a new international crossing in Michigan; and Lewiston Bridge in New York. CBP has also completed negotiations to provide services and staffing at a private cross-border pedestrian facility that will connect the Tijuana International Airport to the Otay Mesa area of San Diego. This may enable the CBP to participate within the CA-IBAS institutional structure to develop additional projects in communities adjacent to its CBP facilities.

CBP recently began an innovative partnership with several border cities across the nation to address staffing needs and to pay for facility construction. The CBP responds to requests for increased staffing or facilities at Ports of Entry and the local governments then reimburse the CBP. In one example, in January 2014, CBP announced an agreement with El Paso, Texas for a five-year project to allow private entities and local governments to pay for extra staffing at border crossings to cut wait times. CBP will add inspection agents to passenger and commercial vehicle and pedestrian lanes at two border bridges during peak hours. The city will contribute approximately $1.5 million a year to CBP to pay for the overtime. The goal is to keep wait times under 15 minutes.

The agreement was one of several collaborative initiatives funded by a 2013 federal pilot program that will create public-private partnerships with Customs and Border Protection to

[10] http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/departments/planning/index.htm
[11] "CBP Resource Optimization Strategy," April 2013. http://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/documents/resource_op_poe_3.PDF
[12] Houston Airports Partner With CBP, January 8, 2014. http://www.fly2houston.com/0/3921570/0/83280D83283/

increase staff at the nation's ports and help alleviate backups. Four of the five sites chosen for the program are in Texas: the South Texas Assets Consortium, which includes international bridges in Laredo, Cameron County, Pharr, McAllen, and Rio Grande City; international bridges in El Paso; the George Bush Intercontinental Airport in Houston; and the Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport. The program was initially proposed as part of HR 1108, the Cross-Border Trade Enhancement Act of 2013 and was included in the subsequent federal appropriations bill. Local governments have the freedom to craft their own port staffing proposals, which must get final approval from Customs and Border Protection.

One local option would be similar to a city increasing security or support staff during a seasonal event where international traffic fluctuates. The city could make a determination to use sales tax revenue generated by the event to purchase CBP services that would allow an additional three open lanes based on an overtime rate. A similar agreement could be negotiated for bus lines or commercial vehicles that wish to cross during off-peak hours. The concept is already working at several airports around the country, and would only finance overtime during the pilot program.

Other Methods for Institutional Collaboration

One of the key goals for the institutional structure created to implement CA-IBAS projects could be consideration of other kinds of partnerships that use non-traditional funding and financing approaches to accelerate high-priority CA-IBAS projects. Traditionally, public sector agencies developing projects use their staff or private sector contractors to perform the environmental review processes for compliance with State and federal regulations. The subsequent design and construction of public sector projects has historically used public funding on a "pay-as-you-go" basis in which the construction contract is executed only after construction funds are secured by the public agency. Funding comes from government grants or financing provided by loans and tax-exempt revenue bonds. Repayment is provided through a public revenue stream like taxes, tolls, or fares.

Public-Private Partnerships (P3s)

Public-private partnerships (P3s) are a fairly recent variation on the traditional method of public project delivery. P3Ss are contractual agreements formed between a public agency and a private sector entity that allow for greater private sector participation in the delivery and financing of transportation projects.

Under P3s, rather than the public sector undertaking the entire process, a private entity is an investor and provides part of the project planning, design, and/or operation. As a partner, the private entity is entitled to repayment of their investment with a negotiated opportunity to earn

a profit from their work and their investment. Under different partnership structures, such as design-build, design-bid-build, and asset operation or management, a private entity is involved in different stages of the project delivery process. The advantages of P3s are the potential ability to accelerate development, improve efficiency through incentives and innovation, gain access to private capital, and allow public agencies to focus on their strengths. One key attraction of public-private partnerships is the opportunity to secure private financing or investment to match limited public funds or to provide a funding bridge until public funding is available from future public grants or revenue generated by the project.

Because the public sector and private sector share in the risks and rewards, California legislative authorization is usually needed for each specific project in which private sector employees are allowed to perform the work and to enable sharing of public and private investments, potential profit and risks. Some public-private partnerships have non-compete or compensation clauses in concession contracts which limit the public sector's ability to improve or expand nearby competing services or to allow revenue-enhancing improvements to competing transportation projects only if the private entity is compensated for revenue lost as a result of diversion to the competing facility.

At the federal level, the FHWA actively encourages the development of P3 approaches to financing infrastructure. Active FHWA involvement began in 1990 with the adoption of Special Experimental Program 14 (SEP-14) which encouraged innovative contracting approaches. In October 2004, FHWA issued SEP-15 which broadened the eligible approaches in order to identify impediments in current laws, regulations, and practices to the greater use of public-private partnerships, to expand private investment in transportation improvements, and to develop procedures and approaches that address these impediments. Twelve SEP-15 projects have been approved since the FHWA program was initiated.

SEP-15 addresses four major components of project delivery: contracting, compliance with FHWA's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and other environmental requirements, right-of-way acquisition, and project finance. Elements of the transportation planning process may be also involved. SEP-15 applications may include suggested changes to the FHWA's traditional project approval procedures and may require some modifications in the implementation of FHWA policy. Deviations from current federal requirements and generally applicable FHWA regulations also may be involved.

SEP-15 procedures and approaches must continue to protect the public interest and any public investment in the project. FHWA expects that SEP-15 will allow for innovations in project delivery while maintaining FHWA's stewardship responsibilities to protect taxpayers and the environment.

On the State level, California has the legal authority to implement P3s. In 1989, Assembly Bill (AB) 680 allowed the State's first P3 project, State Route 125, to commence. This legislation was updated in 2009 by Senate Bill 24, which modified California Street and Highway Code Section 143 to allow the California Department of Transportation and regional transportation agencies to enter into comprehensive development lease agreements for transportation projects, including those that charge tolls or fees. This legislation also established the Public Infrastructure Advisory Commission (PIAC) as a public P3 advisory body. Lease agreements do not need to be approved by the legislature; but the lease agreements must first be submitted to the California Transportation Commission for approval, then to the legislature and PIAC for review. This leasing provision is temporary and set to sunset on January 1, 2017. P3s in California cannot include non-compete clauses. The first P3 under the 2009 legislation is the Presidio Parkway which includes a 30-year concession on tolls to Golden Link Concessionaire. Other projects include the High Desert Corridor and the Interstate 710 freight corridor.[13]

According to California regulations, the following types of public agencies can enter into public-private partnerships: cities, counties, cities and counties jointly (including chartered cities or counties), school districts, community college districts, public districts, county boards of education, joint powers authorities, California and countywide transportation commissions or authorities, or any other public or municipal corporation. The code allows for a wide variety of P3 projects including highways or bridges, commuter or light rail, energy or power production, municipal improvements, harbors, and flood control. If the infrastructure is leased to a public entity, this public entity must have the authority to collect tolls. Private entities can propose projects; the projects do not have to be proposed by the State.

Given encouragement at the federal level, Governor Brown approved AB 401[14] in October 2013 which permits Caltrans and other authorized public entities to use design-build procurement until January 1, 2024, for up to 10 projects on the State highway system, based on either best value or lowest responsible bid. The bill also authorizes regional transportation agencies to utilize design-build procurement for projects on or adjacent to the State highway system. The law requires that Caltrans perform construction inspection services for projects on or interfacing

[13] On February 20, 2009, Governor Schwarzenegger approved Senate Bill Second Extraordinary Session 4 (SBX2 4) Chapter 2, Statutes of 2009 (Cogdill) which established the legislative authority until January 1, 2017. It allows regional transportation agencies and Caltrans to enter into an unlimited number of public-private partnerships and deleted the restrictions on the number and type of projects that may be undertaken. SBX2 4 also established legislative authority until January 1, 2014, for a design-build demonstration program for the state by allowing a total of up to 15 demonstration projects, up to five projects (local street or road, bridge, tunnel, or public transit projects) for the local transportation agencies and up to ten projects (state highway, bridge, or tunnel projects) for Caltrans.

[14] The provisions of AB 401 are incorporated into California statutes in Chapter 6.5 (commencing with Section 6820) of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Public Contract Code, and in Section 91.2 of the Streets and Highways Code.

with the State highway system. Awarding a contract for a public works project pursuant to these provisions requires reimbursement to the Department of Industrial Relations for the costs of performing prevailing wage monitoring and enforcement of the public works project.

More analysis needs to be completed in the CA-IBAS Phase 2 study to determine the applicability of P3 approaches to recommended projects.

Conclusion

The review of potential funding and financial options noted above is intended to be broad-based. Many of the funding sources identified during Phase 1 are one-time programs which may have been exhausted and the authorizing programs may have expired or been succeeded by more recent federal, State, or regional allocation approaches. Additional analysis will be required during CA-IBAS Phase 2 to match the funding sources and financing strategies with candidate, high-priority projects and programs. The updating of funding and financing options will need to be a continuous customization and prioritization task over the expected five year Phase 2 work program.

Joint Powers Agency/Agreement/Authority (JPA)

A JPA is executed when public officials of two or more agencies agree to create an autonomous and separate legal entity for a specific purpose. There is a significant distinction between a Joint Powers Agreement, Joint Powers Agency, and Joint Powers Authority. A Joint Powers Agreement is a formal agreement between two or more public agencies that agree to share power and responsibilities for a common commitment. It requires that each agency formally approve the cooperative agreement. A Joint Powers Agency or Joint Powers Authority is a separate government organization, such as a rapid transit district, that has members from each participating agency on its board.

The main authority for JPAs in California comes from the Joint Exercise of Powers Act and California Code Section 6500. If authorized by legislative or governing bodies, two or more agencies can jointly exercise common powers that each agency individually possesses, even if one of those agencies is located in another state. The list of public agencies defined by the Code 6500 includes the following: federal agencies or departments, State departments or agencies, counties, county boards of education, county superintendents of schools, cities, public corporations, public districts, regional transportation commissions (which can be out of state), federally recognized Native American tribes, or another joint powers authority. JPAs have broad authority under Senate Bill (SB) 1350 to issue bonds, incur debt, and exercise powers given to the member agencies.

In terms of restrictions, JPAs cannot levy taxes, though their member agencies can levy taxes then grant or allocate the revenue to the JPA. Additionally, the JPA can generate revenues through project tolls or fares and subsidies from member agencies. Although additional detail on the powers and limitations can be obtained by reviewing the agreements related to the Southern California Regional Rail Authority, a JPA, in general, has broad authority and provides a flexible arrangement that does not need prior State legislative approval. In addition to benefitting from efficiencies of scale, JPA agreements allow the participating agencies to share liability and specifically limit risk and other fiduciary exposure of their individual agencies resulting from actions taken by the JPA.

Special Districts

Special districts share some similarities with JPAs, though Special Districts are usually more restricted. Special districts are formed by a local agency formation commission (LAFCo)[15] in the county of their formation. The Los Angeles Local Area Formation Commission describes a special district as "any agency of the State for the local performance of governmental or proprietary functions within limited boundaries."[16] This emphasis on limited boundaries is a crucial distinction, although the defined boundary does not have to be contiguous with an existing city or county boundary. Special districts are governed by a board, either dependent on a governing authority such as a city or county, or independent. Special Districts are created to provide specifically, designated services and facilities.

Statutory authority for special districts comes from California Government Code Section 16271. There are two kinds of acts which govern special districts: principal and special. A principal act is a statute that applies to all special districts of that type. There are 60 principal State statutes that can be used to create a special district. A special act is tailored to the unique needs of a specific area. There are approximately 120 special area law statutes.[17]

Special districts obtain funding either as a sub-allocation of the 1% property tax or through new parcel taxes, benefit assessments, or service charges (e.g., rate increases for water). A two-thirds vote is typically required to increase special district revenues beyond the State constitutional limit of the 1% property tax.

[15] There is a LAFCo in each of California's 58 counties. LAFCos review proposals for the formation of new local governmental agencies and for changes in the organization and boundaries of existing agencies. Each LAFCO may adopt local policies to appropriately administer relevant State statutes in its county. For more information, see: http://lalafco.org/index.php?option=com_moofaq&view=category&id=7&Itemid=106

[16] http://lalafco.org/index.php?option=com_moofaq&view=category&id=7&Itemid=106

[17] http://www.calafco.org/docs/Special_Districts/Whats_So_Special.pdf

Other Multi-Agency Collaborative Models: Border Relations Council

The Border Relations Council[18] is mandated to coordinate cross-border programs, initiatives, and partnerships within California's State agencies; facilitate State agency policies for the sharing of cross-border data; identify and recommend changes in the law needed to achieve the goals of the council; and provide an annual council activities report to the legislature. State agencies included in this council are: Cal EPA, Department of Public Health, Department of Food and Agriculture, Natural Resources Agency, California Transportation Agency, Health and Human Services, Emergency Management, and U.S. EPA.

The Border Environmental Program (BEP) sponsored by Cal EPA includes representatives from Mexican states and cities, tribal nations, the North American Development Bank, and the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission. This broad mechanism for collaboration on a singular focused area is somewhat unique. As an example, the BEP Council has collaborated on producing a strategy for preserving and restoring the Tijuana River that straddles the border between San Diego and Tijuana (California Environmental Protection Agency 2007). While the BEP Council includes State agencies and collaborates across the border, the Council does not include any private partners or significant local government entities. It is likely that this prevents the BEP from utilizing private funding for infrastructure projects.

The North American Development Bank (NADBANK)[19], through the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission finances environmental infrastructure projects. NADBANK lists $3 billion in available capitalization. NADBANK is not focused only on California; projects are funded in all U.S. and Mexican states that are adjacent to the border. As set forth in its charter, 90 percent of NADBANK's authorized capital is used to finance environmental infrastructure projects in the border region, and 10 percent of the capital subscribed by each country finances community adjustment and investment throughout the United States and Mexico in support of the goals of NAFTA**.**

A summary of the four major collaborative CA-IBAS methods can be found in Table 1 on the following page.

[18] http://www.calepa.ca.gov/Border/CMBRC/

[19] For information on NADBank capitalization: http://www.nadbank.org/about/capitalization.asp

TABLE 1: MULTI-AGENCY COLLABORATION METHODS

Collaboration Method	Purpose	Statutory Requirements	Strengths	Weaknesses
Public-Private Partnerships (P3)	Contractual agreements formed between a public agency and a private sector entity that allow for greater private sector participation in the delivery and financing of transportation projects.	Sec. 5956 of the CA code states that pub. agencies that can enter into P3s are the following: city, county, school district, community college district, pub. district, county board of ed., joint powers authority, trans commission or authority, or any other pub. or muni corp.	The advantages of P3s are the ability to develop rapidly, improve efficiency through incentives and innovation, gain access to private capital, and allow public agencies to focus on their strengths.	The limited timeframe established by the California State legislature could present difficulty in creating new projects before its sunset in 2017.
Joint Powers Agency/Agreement/Authority (JPA)	Broad agreements with numerous powers. A JPA is executed when public officials of two or more agencies agree to create an autonomous and separate legal entity for a variety of purposes (regardless of political boundaries and different missions).	The main authority for JPAs in California comes from the Joint Exercise of Powers Act and California code section 6500. If authorized by their legislative or governing bodies, two or more agencies can jointly exercise power, even if one of those agencies is located in another state.	JPAs are a flexible arrangement that do not need prior legislative approval and have broad authority. In addition to efficiencies of scale, the JPA agreements allow the participating agencies to share liability and specifically limit risk and other fiduciary exposure of the member	JPAs cannot levy taxes, although their member agencies can levy such a tax and contribute the revenue to the JPA.
Special Districts	Any agency of the State for the local performance of governmental or proprietary functions within limited boundaries. This emphasis on limited boundaries is a crucial distinction. Special districts are governed by a board and provide services or facilities.	Statutory authority for special districts comes from California code section 16271. A principal act is a generic statute which applies to all special districts of that type, and there are 60 principal law statutes which can be used any time in the State to create a special district. A special act is tailored to the unique needs of a specific area, and there are around 120 special law statutes.	Targeting services to meet local needs and tying costs to benefits so that only users pay for the services they receive.	Unlike JPAs, which can be formed without putting it to a vote, special districts are formed by a local agency formation commission in the county of their formation, which then must be put to a vote.
Other Multi-Agency Collaborative Models: Border Relations Council	Cal EPA's Border Relations Council is mandated to coordinate cross-border programs, initiatives, and partnerships within California State agencies; facilitate State agency policies for sharing of cross-border data; identify and recommend changes in the law needed to achieve the goals of the council; and provide an annual council activities report to the legislature.	California EPA can enter into a joint powers authority. Cal EPA's Border Relations Council functions as a sort of multi-agency partnership, though it cannot enter into agreements with the private sector. Instead, it was created under AB 3021 to fill a need for statewide oversight and coordination of multi-agency involvement with Mexico.	This broad mechanism for collaboration on a singular focused area is somewhat unique. Since many of the environmental issues do not stop conveniently at national borders, multi-national collaborations are instrumental in protecting and improving shared resources.	It does not include any private partners or other local government entities. It is likely that this prevents this mechanism from utilizing private funding for infrastructure projects.

V. Strengths and Weaknesses of Current Institutional Structures

California communities on the United States-Mexico international border are in need of more flexible approaches to planning and programming. The primary weakness in the current approach to project selection and funding is a lack of a single integrated vision among the various federal, State, and local agencies in charge of mobility and security in communities adjacent to U.S.-Mexico POEs in California. These government agencies could increase the effectiveness of their investments by jointly addressing current issues, deficiencies, and impacts created by cross-border employment, housing, goods movement, and tourism.

Each government agency that works at the border has its own objectives, project development, delivery processes, and performance measures to serve its defined constituents and mission. These objectives and processes often do not align precisely with other agencies.

Seaports, airports, and land POEs have distinct service and business models. One principal difference between seaports, airports, and land POE is that land POE priorities are driven principally by regulatory goals and by risk assessments, such as border protection, security, and regulatory enforcement, rather than by broader economic development goals, such as global trade, international commerce, and revenue enhancement. Although airports and seaports have sophisticated border security and customs functions, both have a long history of working with private sector tenants on and adjacent to their facilities to generate revenue and jobs and to attract growth as an "economic engine" for their local jurisdiction.

To mitigate the desired economic growth, airports and seaports are constantly pressed by the adjacent communities to improve the quality of life in the area. In contrast land POEs, as regulators and enforcers with constrained missions, typically operate as closed systems on federal property with incidental retail and service tenants clustered just outside the crossing boundary and with little formal shared interest in the economic development of their adjacent communities.

Absent a major seaport or airport model to anchor interagency implementation strategies to generate economic vitality, the California-Mexico border region lacks an obvious candidate institutional structure or mechanism to address common border objectives and to promote interagency "across the board" solutions. Siloed funding streams and perceived or actual legislative and regulatory restrictions on project eligibility have historically limited the incentive of federal, State, and local agencies to be innovative in their funding and financing options.

There are, however, opportunities. By their very nature, land POEs are nationally significant facilities that are required by the U. S. Department of State to provide certain core services.

The national interest in expediting, expanding, and facilitating international trade and people flow provides a powerful incentive for California's participation in increasing global trade, jobs growth, economic vitality, and improved quality of life in border communities. Yet, the key portals of commerce in California are not located within the federal border facilities but are extensions of the formal federal boundaries sited within the neighboring communities where goods are prepared for national distribution, workers travel daily between their homes and jobs, and tourists first experience the excitement and challenges of foreign travel, and the promise of California. There is an unrealized opportunity to bring these border communities and the agencies that serve the border together using an institutional framework whose purpose is economic growth and improved quality of life for travelers and the communities they traverse.

Private vehicle border crossing at Otay Mesa. Left: cones divide vehicle queues. *Right*: cement blockades divide vehicle queues. The focus is on security, not mobility or economic development.

California is one of the first states in the nation to develop revenue generating sources related to air quality and sustainability goals. A formal Cap and Trade Program is emerging that may be able to provide funding for eligible CA-IBAS projects. There is also a potential new source of revenue for border communities in the State-mandated Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). Although there is no direct funding attached to the new State planning requirements, regions are reconsidering the relative balance between mobility and sustainability investments with initiatives such as Active Transportation, Complete Streets, and Livable Communities. Because the concept of SCS is relatively new, its scope and funding sources are yet to be well defined.

There may be a significant opportunity to innovate pilot SCS-related strategies and institutional structures in border communities that could be replicated in other communities adjacent to major traffic generators. The strength of this proposal lies in the fact that the border communities in California provide an ideal laboratory in which major issues, such as congestion and delay, resource scarcity and reliability, air quality improvement mandates, traveler

amenities, and community quality of life challenges, can be collaboratively and simultaneously addressed in a reasonably-scaled, controlled environment.

The question is whether some new combination of funding mechanism and collaborative agreement like those mentioned above can work in a border setting or some other multi-agency setting. In order to answer the question, it is worth considering best practices in multi-agency project and service delivery.

VI. Multi-agency Institutional Coordination Best Practice Models

Due to the unique nature of planning for and implementing transportation projects in border communities, there are vital lessons to be learned by analyzing what is in place in comparable border regions with high traffic volumes and sustained projected future growth. Additionally, there are benefits to investigating transportation projects that have relied on innovative financing and collaborative mechanisms, especially those that established new organizations or institutions to function as lead agencies for their respective projects.

One of the Phase 1 CA-IBAS tasks was to identify multi-agency collaborative institutional best practices in areas that have a comparable multi-jurisdictional catchment area with a diversity of agencies involved in capital projects at the federal, State, regional, and local level. A principal challenge for the California border is siloed planning and funding of infrastructure development and project delivery due to the restricted missions of many of the border-serving agencies. Moreover, there are lessons to be learned from other border districts that are addressing the increased importance of multi-modal transportation at POEs and extreme delays caused by congestion and bottlenecking in the POE area. For example, some districts with comparable vehicle and pedestrian flows are providing multi-modal access and innovative amenities. The best practice models also tend to have active formal collaborative structures that include federal, State, regional and local agencies and implement capital improvement programs that use innovative funding and financing approaches including public-private partnerships.

Based on the interest in exploring initiatives in other POE-adjacent communities in the country, Phase 1 of the IBAS Study examined six case studies. These included border communities at El Paso, Texas/Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua; Whatcom County, Washington/Vancouver, British Columbia; Detroit, Michigan/Windsor, Ontario; Yuma, Arizona/Nogales, Sonora; Laredo, Texas/Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas and two examples of U.S.-based multiagency coordination: the Alameda Corridor East (ACE) project in Southern California and the Illiana Corridor in Illinois and Indiana. Nogales and Laredo also have nearby border areas and novel regional agencies

(the Arizona International Development Authority and South Texas Asset Consortium, respectively) incorporated into their case studies.

While all the organizations involved in the selected case studies are faced with decreased resources and bureaucratic obstacles, examples exist, particularly in Texas, that demonstrate the potential benefit of a shift away from traditional siloed planning and funding in favor of establishing new single-purpose agencies geared towards financing, developing, and/or managing a package of multi-agency transportation projects in high-priority areas. These examples have been most successful in improving local mobility, planning for future growth, and leveraging existing capital. Table 2 on the following page summarizes the key findings from each case study.

Among the five border community case studies, the institutional differences between the U.S.-Mexico and U.S.-Canada borders were most evident with regard to the relative lack of capital funds available. For example, the establishment of Transportation Reinvestment Zones (TRZ) in El Paso resulted in tens of millions of dollars of new revenue to cover bond repayment obligations and provide startup funding for new projects. Establishment of these TRZs was only possible because Texas law allowed their creation in a specified area around a transportation improvement to capture the property tax increment produced by an increase in property values resulting from the improvement. Estimated incremental property tax revenues are pledged to repay loans or bonds over a proscribed period.[20]

California communities that have suffered with the demise of Community Redevelopment Funds could establish a program based on the TRZ model targeted at high-growth or high-density areas (such as Otay Mesa and San Ysidro) to ensure that property appreciation and development provide new revenue to finance mobility projects.

[20] Transportation Reinvestment Zones in El Paso & Camino Real Regional Mobility Authority http://www.acectx.org/research_&_policy_issues/documents/4-CRRMA-Telles.pdf

Table 2 Institutional Best Practices

Region Studied	Regional Challenges	Solutions	Limitations of Approach	Applicability to CA-IBAS
El Paso TX	Border Crossing bridges are located close to downtown and cause significant traffic and congestion spill over onto the communities adjacent to the crossings. Threat of spillover violence from Ciudad Juarez has increased within the last decade.	A Regional Mobility Authority (RMA) to fund, develop, and operate the trans. projects needed to keep up with growth on both sides of the border. Transportation Reinvestment Zones (TRZs) exist to focus on corridors contiguous to the border.	State funding can be difficult to obtain. The nuances of TRZs are still being fleshed out and the original had to be repealed due to issues of non-contiguousness.	El Paso and San Diego share similar demographics. The RMA is an applicable model to CA. TRZs are viable fundraising mechanisms, particularly in growing areas like Otay Mesa where a greater demand for traffic improvements can bring a rise in land value.
Laredo TX	Transportation infrastructure will be at near capacity soon and local revenues can barely match maintenance costs. Significant commercial traffic spillover off the interstate and onto local streets.	Laredo MPO has established a Congestion Management Process. The local agencies have explored establishing an RMA to oversee future trans. developments.	Laredo MPO has been unable to secure sufficient funding to develop new infrastructure that can match projected growth. Laredo lacks a regional trans. authority related to international mobility.	The financing forecasts for the region are not counting on federal dollars, as they continue to dry up. The local situation is causing agencies to investigate innovative funding options.
Yuma AZ	Local infrastructure experiences traffic volumes that it lacks the resources to handle. Lack of local public trans. creates significant accessibility issues for low-income and elderly residents.	The Arizona/Sonora Border Master Plan recommends establishing an Implementation Monitoring Committee to oversee trans. growth and development along the border.	There have been no funds secured to start the IMC. The amount requested is not prohibitive ($350,000) but no agency can or wishes to be made responsible for securing the amount.	The local and state agencies are increasingly realizing that proper planning for any of the border communities requires a coordinated effort. The prime concern is the need for reduced wait times, especially for commercial vehicles.

Table continued on the following page

Region Studied	Regional Challenges	Solutions	Limitations of Approach	Applicability to CA-IBAS
Whatcom County WA	Air quality from diesel trucks is a problem. The POEs in the County are so far apart that if one area is congested, it is not realistic to use another POE. Signage near the border is confusing.	The International Mobility and Trade Corridor program (IMTC) facilitates a forum for ongoing communication between agencies that affect regional, cross-border trans. Whatcom Council of Government's transportation plan is designed to determine which are the important trans. projects for the county and prioritize them accordingly.	Much of the funding for the IMTC's projects is coming from Canada. There is a need for the NEXUS program to expand but it is not happening in a timely manner.	The IMTC serves as a model agency for a bi-national coalition. It has organized the trans. planning in the region with great success and continues to secure funding for future projects.
Detroit MI	The city has filed for bankruptcy. The operator of the Detroit-Windsor Tunnel has filed for bankruptcy. The Ambassador Bridge is outdated and in need of major repairs.	The New International Trade Crossing will be constructed to help alleviate the stress that the other POEs are enduring. It also positions Detroit to better handle future growth.	Most of the funding is coming from Canada which will have the exclusive right to toll. Detroit will not directly receive any revenue from the NITC but it will benefit from increased mobility.	The NITC will be using a P3 to help with the funding and how that agreement is made will be of interest. It also provides another model for bi-national cooperation on transportation projects.
Alameda Corridor East CA	The Alameda Corridor expedites the movement of goods from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to LA but a route out of LA east to San Bernardino was necessary.	The ACE Construction Authority will mitigate the impacts of increases in rail traffic through the region. ACE offers freight rail mainline routes from LA to San Bernardino County.	19 rail-roadway grade separations will create disruptions to businesses and residents along the corridor during construction.	The collaboration and cooperation between the newly created entity and the local governments to create a new route for commercial activity can serve as a good model in CA.
Illiana Corridor IL-IN	The I-90 and I-94 corridor has become increasingly congested.	The Illiana Corridor will run approximately 10 miles south of the I-90/94 corridor and would alleviate congestion.	The construction of the corridor and any land acquisition that is necessary will cause disruption to businesses and residents.	The project is still in its infancy but it looks very promising to produce some innovative funding strategies for a project that crosses state borders.

Another factor that influences institutional choice is asymmetrical population distribution. Communities along the Canadian border have significantly lower populations, fewer cross border events, and shorter wait times compared to highly congested communities located at the U.S.-Mexican border. Compounding the issue along the Mexican border is the singular public agency emphasis on the POEs themselves and not on the border community arterials and connecting roadways that lead in and out of the POEs. Whatcom County, WA provides a useful example of how a bi-national coalition can better address the issue. Having both sides of the border and a host of stakeholders involved in the International Mobility & Trade Corridor Program (IMTC), Whatcom County effectively analyzes the impacts its projects have on the region as a whole rather than just within the immediate project site. This is because the IMTC views the border region as a single transportation and inspection system rather than a series of individual POEs. The IMTC's success is measured in reasonable wait times at the border and customers' trust in the data available to them to make informed decisions on where to cross. While partnerships of this scale are challenging to form, they certainly provide a model worth considering.

Dramatic population growth and increased congestion in border communities pose another problem that should be of concern to CA-IBAS. Population growth rates at El Paso, Laredo, and Nogales are among the highest in the nation, overshadowed only by the tremendous build-out occurring along the Mexican side of the border. The situation is very similar along the Mexican side of the California border, especially in Tijuana. As a result of the population growth, there is a greater urgency to plan for future traffic demands throughout the southern border communities, especially as traditional local and state resources become increasingly unable to handle maintenance projects, let alone roadway capacity expansion. Higher traffic demands will result in congestion spilling over onto local infrastructure that is ill-equipped for the current high traffic volumes and maintenance impacts of commercial vehicles.

El Paso has used Regional Mobility Authorities (RMAs) as a solution to this problem through a legislative paradigm that is unique to Texas. With RMAs, the right to primacy functions as a useful collaborative mechanism that guarantees a specified agency first option on certain projects and establishes a set timeline for completion. This can be modified and used to ensure that proposed projects that do not explicitly fall under a single jurisdiction will move forward under a designated lead agency, instead of being fought over by multiple organizations or tabled indefinitely.

The New International Trade Crossing (NITC) between Detroit and Windsor provides another example of a project that addresses public mobility and community concerns created by the current crossing facility and its adjacent communities. The existing, privately-owned

Ambassador Bridge is the busiest international border crossing in North America in terms of trade volume. More than 25 percent of all merchandise trade between the United States and Canada crosses the private toll bridge; and traffic must use Ontario city streets to go from the bridge to Canadian Highway 3 and Highway 401.

The NITC public project will eliminate the use of city streets by creating a new border crossing bridge over the Detroit River connecting Detroit and Windsor by linking Interstate 75 and Interstate 94 in Michigan with a new Windsor–Essex Parkway connection to Highway 401 in Ontario.[21]

NITC is being managed by an international construction committee of Canadian and United States partners. Ontario began construction of the new Windsor–Essex Parkway in 2011 before the bridge project was approved. An agreement that was announced in June 2012 ensured that the bridge project will proceed with the Canadian federal government funding bridge construction, land acquisition in Michigan, and the construction of Interstate 75 on-ramps on the U.S. side of the border. The Canadian contribution will be repaid from bridge tolls collected on the Canadian side. No tolls will be charged on the U.S. side.

On April 12, 2013, the U.S. Department of State and the Obama Administration granted Michigan the permit required to build the bridge and the Canadian government allocated $25 million to begin land acquisition on the Detroit side of the bridge. The owner of the Ambassador Bridge has unsuccessfully opposed the project and also proposed a second span which was rejected, in part, because the proposal did not include the city street bypass parkway.

Best Practice Applicable Lessons

As border communities come to recognize the inherent complexity of planning for their regions, many are mimicking the landmark California-Baja California BMP model and drafting BMPs of their own. Conversely, there has yet to be any similar federal or bi-national undertaking at any community bordering Canada. Instead, both of the observed northern case study regions have prioritized regional agencies that emphasize bilateral planning and project management.

[21] See more at: http://www.hgparkway.ca/

The collaborative nature of the IMTC Program in Whatcom County coupled with a regional approach that views transportation near the International border as a singular system are principal factors in its success. Similarly, the NITC has shifted the financial burden away from state resources via a bi-national public-private partnership that relies on unilateral tolling to recoup costs. However, it should be noted that the Canadian government has invested a significant portion of the upfront expenses (for the POE, but not for mobility projects at national border communities).

Because federal focus along the Mexican border has been on POE facilities rather than mobility in adjacent communities through efforts such as the CA-IBAS, the lessons from Whatcom County and Detroit provide a model for federal agencies on BOTH sides of the border to become key partners in CA-IBAS initiatives. Without such a change in federal policy, the State and regions would need to lead the CA-IBAS which could limit the applicability of the NITC model in California.

While El Paso, Laredo, and Nogales all differ significantly in terms of their size, all three cities are dwarfed to varying degrees by the population of their Mexican counterparts. In addition, cross-border collaboration efforts are hampered by institutional obstacles and a stasis brought on by lack of resources. These regions have shifted their planning focus outside the border boundaries to focus on geographic-based planning, stressing the need to target the urban areas immediately adjacent to border crossings while concurrently developing new POEs at the city outskirts.

While the method used in each of these areas differs, the focus remains on securing local reinvestment via tax-increment financing-type programs. The most successful regions have also established local agencies that not only take advantage of these innovative funding mechanisms but also function as a one-stop, umbrella organization for mobility projects that do not fall under the sole jurisdiction of any single existing entity. This is best highlighted by the Camino Real Regional Mobility Authority (RMA) in El Paso that pioneered TRZs along the El Paso border and seeks to eventually manage all major border infrastructure. El Paso's success has encouraged other counties to establish an RMA to manage future projects. In Arizona, the State's International Development Authority remains unfunded, but its legislative backing and authority is similar to that of RMAs.

There are useful lessons from non-border development authorities as well. In Southern California, the Alameda Corridor East (ACE) Construction Authority is undergoing a similar institutional change as it delivers the ACE Project in the San Gabriel Valley east of downtown Los Angeles. ACE has completed safety improvements at 39 at-grade crossings and is

constructing 14 rail-roadway grade separations. The ACE Construction Authority was originally created in 1998 by the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, a joint powers authority, to mitigate the impacts of significant increases in rail traffic over 70 miles of mainline railroad in the San Gabriel Valley. Concerned with management issues at the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, the ACE Authority recently separated from its founding joint powers authority and created a new joint powers authority with the local jurisdictions in which its projects are located.

California border communities stand to benefit from establishing a single entity tasked with managing transportation projects and mitigating their impacts on border communities. It should be noted that all of the above mentioned agencies required specific enabling legislation and complex inter-agency agreements. In addition, their ability to operate outside national border crossing sites, enter into private agreements, and raise funds independently are instrumental to their success. Also, as federal and State funds dwindle, there is an increased prevalence of toll-based projects being implemented through public-private partnerships.

In conclusion, although the CA-IBAS would benefit greatly by a strong presence of the federal government, the states and regions in other areas of the country have led successful border improvement initiatives with only marginal participation by the federal agencies. Through tolling, benefit assessment, and other innovative financing approaches, single purpose multi-agency programs have delivered meaningful improvements. These models can create a framework for the new CA-IBAS initiative to be defined in Phase 2.

VII. CA-IBAS Funding and Financing Options

Best practices are particularly helpful if they demonstrate useful models for securing funding over the longer term. The current federal, State, and local funding pictures are bleak. Virtually every current funding source is overcommitted and financing requires a revenue stream for repayment. T hat said, funding and financing options for federal transportation funds are changing dramatically and evolving rapidly in response to the enactment of MAP-21. MAP-21 changed the federal approach to allocating funds by replacing numerous niche funding programs with a consolidated set of six core programs,[22] eliminating Congressional earmarks, and allocating most funding by formula rather than to specific projects via States or MPOs. In addition to shifting programming responsibility, MAP-21 imposed performance-based requirements on recipients of federal funds. MAP-21 also required the first Federal Freight Policy, which could be a significant policy consideration for border community project

[22] National Highway Performance, Surface Transportation, Congestion Mitigation and Improvement, Highway Safety Improvement, Railway-Highway Crossings, Metropolitan Planning

competitiveness.

Border communities and mobility and POE-serving agencies have an immediate yet fleeting opportunity to influence the role of the federal government in improving local economic development effectiveness, efficiency, reliability, and user experience in the critical community portals adjacent to the federal facilities.

With little will to increase federal fuel taxes or change the source of revenues used to fund federal transportation needs, states and regions have begun to discuss innovative funding alternatives to fuel and sales taxes. Border communities have an untapped opportunity to participate in the development of new funding sources at the local, regional, State, and federal levels. This is an explicit objective of CA-IBAS Funding Strategies. However, these communities currently have limited access to a unique single regional forum in which their unique needs can be identified and advocated. They also lack a unified sub-regional message that can be considered by various transportation, sustainability, air quality, and security-related funding institutions as they develop new funding and financing strategies and structures.

Beyond the impacts and opportunities of MAP-21, federal border agencies suffer from funding shortfalls to address their current and projected needs As discussed earlier, the ability of CBP to enter into P3s, accept asset donations, and enter into alternate financing agreements for modernized, new, or expanded POE services is an opportunity. Because of this new flexibility, it may be possible to attract the CBP to partner with State and local interests and engage in local communities in order to better leverage federal, State, and local funding that improves POE operations.

Agreements have been negotiated with the CBP and the Dallas Ft Worth Airport, El Paso Texas, South Texas Assets Consortium, Houston Airport System, Miami-Dade Co., Peace Bridge in New York, New Int'l Crossing in Michigan, and the Lewiston Bridge in New York. Final negotiations are underway for the proposed Tijuana International Airport Cross Border Terminal in Otay Mesa.

Despite the streamlined approach sought by MAP-21, funding and financing a project remains a complex task due to the decentralized programming authority for federal, State, regional, and local funding sources and the specific eligibility requirements and restrictions imposed by the agency responsible for determining how "its" funds are used.

With the demise of Community Redevelopment Agencies in California, a significant future financing tool for non-transportation community improvements is in flux. This void in the historical increment-funding approach to community redevelopment provides yet another impetus for border communities to band together to suggest new strategies for capturing public revenues from economic growth and land use intensification that will be needed to support statewide economic expansion and community revitalization in border communities. Several State legislative measures have been proposed to provide a replacement institution and/or funding structure to capture incremental revenues for needed public improvements and public-private ventures that improve the communities. These legislative deliberations provide opportunities for border agencies to collaboratively highlight the unique and compelling needs in border-crossing communities, especially since Governor Brown has expressed interest in replacing general redevelopment agencies with location-specific community and economic development structures.

Examples of funding streams that could be applied to border community projects exist at the federal, State, and local levels (Table 3). The challenge is matching the revenue potential with the appropriate institutional structure and program management approach required for effective project development, delivery and maintenance. The funding and financing sources and uses matrix that appears in Appendix 8 "Mobility-Related Funding and Financing Options Matrix" only addresses funding for mobility improvements. That is a key focus of Phase 2 of the IBAS.

Although funding sources and strategies are ever-changing and competition is fierce for scarce funding and financing resources, CA-IBAS Phase 2 can consider the other successful project development models provided. All successful models contain the same key attribute of being public sector entrepreneurs. The key challenge during CA-IBAS Phase 2 will be to create an institution, program scope, and funding plan to maximize the visibility, criticality, and cost-effectiveness of CA-IBAS products and programs. With the complexity of the collaboration required and the competition for funding, CA-IBAS Phase 2 also will need to capture the imagination and support of influential champions to be successful. These champions will need to be prepared to commit their resources and support for innovation within the CA-IBAS program for a minimum of five years before projects and strategies can be expected to bear significant results.

Table 3 Examples of Funding and Financing Sources

Program	Source	Programming Source	Statute/ Authority	Uses	Restrictions	Prelim. Allocation Annual $ millions
National Highway Performance Program	Federal Highway Trust Fund	Caltrans - STIP	MAP-21	Rehabilitation, maintenance	National Highway System	1,949 statewide
Surface Trans Program – Safe Routes to Schools	Federal Highway Trust Fund	Caltrans Call for Projects	MAP-21	Pedestrian, bike safety infrastructure improvements	No purely educational programs	896.5 statewide, 3 year limit
Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program	CA Natural Resources Agency, CA Trans Commission, Caltrans	CFP by CA Natural Resources Agency and Caltrans	California Streets and Highways Code Section 164.56	Highway landscaping, roadside rests, trails	Mitigations beyond project requirements that benefit the CA-IBAS program	$10 million annually statewide
Transit Development Act	CA Local Trans Fund, CA State Trans Assistance Fund	State Board of Equalization determines allocation formula data sources, State Controller's Office allocates funds	CA Government Code 29530 et seq., CA Public Utilities Code Section 99200 et seq.	Article 3-bikeways, Article 4-Public Transit, Article 8-Unmet transit needs non-urban areas	Allocated by formulae that considers population, sales taxes generated and transit performance	$1.8 billion in TDA allocations statewide in FY 12/13; LTF in San Diego-114.2 mil; LTF in Imperial-$5,474; STA in San Diego-29.2 mil; STA in Imperial-1.14 mil
San Diego County TransNet Transactions and Use Tax	½ cent Countywide sales tax initially approved in 1989, extended to 2050 in 2010	SANDAG	2008 Proposition	Specified freeway/highway projects, bikeways, environmental mitigation by land purchases, smart growth projects	N/A	Varies depending on tax revenue
Program	**Source**	**Programming Source**	**Statute/ Authority**	**Uses**	**Restrictions**	**Prelim. Allocation Annual $ millions**
Benefit Assessment Districts	Benefit Assessment Act of 1982	Local jurisdictions can authorize under a uniform procedure	CA Government Code, Section 54710 et seq.	Maintenance and operations of flood control, drainage systems, street lighting, public streets	Requires majority vote of affected property owners at time of ballot measure, no bonding authority, fees continue on property tax bill until funds are repaid	N/A

VIII. What's Next: CA-IBAS Phase 2

The IBAS Phase 1 project included a review of obstacles to effective service delivery in and around borders as well as a discussion of possible model solutions. During Phase 2, the potential institutional structures and strategies discussed above will be matched against statutory regulations to determine which models are appropriate in the CA-IBAS at California border communities. This includes the relationship between any changes in successor legislation to MAP-21 and the ability of Caltrans or other State or local agencies to partner with CBP, GSA, or FHWA. Any necessary changes to statutory authority at the federal or State level which would make best practices work in California will also be explored.

The three focal points of Phase 2 will be to recommend planning approaches and multi-jurisdictional institutional structures, to determine the need for State or federal legislation to enable the creation of a new border collaboration mechanism, and to identify funding opportunities specific to candidate project development and delivery where there is no clear jurisdictional lead agency or authority and where there is insufficient available funding.

With the completion of CA-IBAS Phase 1, the remaining Phase 2 CA-IBAS tasks include:

- *Identify Opportunities for an Integrated Border Approach*—Identify challenges, opportunities, and the common and unique issues in California adjacent to international land POEs to determine and implement projects that improve transportation infrastructure connectivity and services that can be addressed as "interconnected systems" in San Diego and Imperial Counties.
- *Develop Improvement Proposals*—Propose specific multi-agency funding mechanisms and strategies to develop motorized and non-motorized projects that address mobility and sustainability/livability strategies in communities near California's border with Mexico.
- *Develop an Institutional Structure*—Develop a model for the establishment of an alternative public sector institutional structure to coordinate California's border mobility, sustainability, and security issues at one or more systems of land POEs in California.
- *Develop Implementation Strategies*—Propose short and long term strategies and "road maps" to establish multiple agency coordination mechanisms between the transportation agencies, land POE agencies, security agencies, and local jurisdictions. This includes areas of legislation and institutional policy, planning, project delivery, traditional and innovative funding, and governance issues.
- *Determine Follow-Up Actions/Schedule*—Determine follow-up actions and a schedule to implement approved strategies with "road map" proposals.

Stakeholder input, of course, plays a key role in determining what is, in fact, appropriate planning for border communities. Stakeholder engagement is another critical component of Phase 2 and participants will be encouraged to determine if there is a common vision among border community-serving jurisdictions and agencies to resolve current and future mobility issues that are beyond the reach or capacity of a single agency.

Caltrans believes that an integrated border institutional mechanism or approach capable of serving as the lead coordinating entity for multi-agency strategic planning, project delivery, and funding methods is needed to solve jointly the regional mobility needs in California's border communities. As a result, all United States federal, state, regional, and local agencies with jurisdictional authority at or adjacent to California's international border will be asked to participate in Phase 2 of the IBAS study at the policy and technical levels via a Policy Advisory Committee.

At a minimum, participants will include representatives from: U.S. General Services Administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the City of San Diego, San Diego County, Imperial County, and the City of Calexico, the San Diego Association of Governments, the Southern California Association of Governments, and the Imperial County Transportation Commission. Local mass transit providers will also be invited to participate in the study. While the focus is on public sector agency coordination, the study will also seek out the input of private sector representatives from the various modes of transport and Chambers of Commerce representing the vast interests of people who live and do business in border communities.

IX. CA-IBAS Phase 1 Strategy Appendices

Appendix 1 – Caltrans / METRANS Communications Strategies

1. Annotated Table of Deliverables
2. Phase 1 schedule as of 9/4/13
3. Phase 1 Caltrans / METRANS meeting minutes
4. 8.2.13 San Diego Site Visit Notes
5. 8.23.13 Memorandum revising Phase 1 Scope of Work

Appendix 2 – CA-IBAS Phase 1 and Phase 2 Study Scopes

Appendix 3 - CA-IBAS Agencies List

Appendix 4 – CA-IBAS Stakeholders Matrix

Appendix 5 – Best Practice Fact Sheet Sources / References

1. El Paso / Santa Teresa Fact Sheet
2. Whatcom County Case Fact Sheet
3. Illiana Expressway Fact Sheet
4. Detroit / Windsor Fact Sheet
5. Nogales / Yuma /AZ Int'l Development Authority Fact Sheet
6. Laredo / Lower Rio Grande Valley / So. Texas Asset Consortium Fact Sheet
7. Alameda Corridor East Fact Sheet

Appendix 6 - Other Sources / References

1. Institutional Structure Options
   AECOM Consult Team (2007). *User Guidebook on Implementing Public-Private Partnerships for Transportation Infrastructure Projects in the United States*. Prepared for Office of Policy and Governmental Affairs, Federal Highway Administration.

   Aguilar, Julian (2013). A Federal Program to Ease Congestion at Border Crossings. *The New York Times*. www.nytimes.com/2013/08/16/us/a-federal-program-to-ease-congestion-at-bordercrossings.html?pagewanted=print

California Environmental Protection Agency (2007). California-Baja California Border Environmental Program. http://www.calepa.ca.gov/border/.

Cypher, T. and C. Grinnell (2007). *Governments Working Together: a Citizen's Guide to Joint Powers Agreements*. California State Legislature, Senate Local Government Committee.

Government Accountability Office (2013). *U.S. Mexico Border: CBP Action Needed to Improve Wait Time Data and Measure Outcomes of Trade Facilitation Efforts*. GAO-13-603.

Los Angeles Local Agency Formation Commission. http://lalafco.org/.

National Conference for State Legislatures (2010). *Public Private Partnerships for Transportation: a Toolkit for Legislators*. http://www.ncsl.org/issues-research/transport/public-private-partnerships-for-transportation.aspx

Mizany and Manatt (2002). *What's so special about Special Districts? A Citizen's Guide to Special Districts in California (3e)*. California Senate Local Government Committee.

METRANS (2010). *Report One: Best Practices*. Submitted to Caltrans. http://www.METRANS.org/Other_Research/BestPractices9-2010.pdf

North American Development Bank (2012). http://www.nadbank.org/.

Federal Highway Administration (no date). Public Private Partnerships. http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/p3/index.htm.

Caltrans (2008). *California-Baja California Border Master Plan*. San Diego, CA. http://bmp.sandag.org/

Appendix 7 – California Code Notes related to Institutional Structures

Appendix 8 - Mobility-Related Funding and Financing Options Matrix