

# BORDER INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PLAN CANADA – UNITED STATES APRIL 2013



Transport  
Canada      Transports  
Canada





**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**INTRODUCTION..... 1**

**INITIAL PRIORITY BORDER CROSSINGS..... 4**

**Portal, ND – North Portal, SK ..... 5**

**Pembina, ND – Emerson, MB ..... 8**

**Port Huron, MI – Sarnia, ON (Blue Water Bridge) ..... 12**

**Buffalo, NY – Fort Erie, ON (Peace Bridge)..... 16**

**Lewiston, NY – Queenston, ON (Lewiston-Queenston Bridge) ..... 19**

**Alexandria Bay, NY – Lansdowne, ON (Thousand Islands Bridge) ..... 22**

**Champlain, NY – Lacolle, QC..... 25**

**NEXT STEPS ..... 28**

**ANNEX A – SMALL AND REMOTE PORTS OF ENTRY ..... 30**

**Canada – United States Work Plan for the Development of the Small and Remote Ports  
    Joint Action Plan ..... 31**

**List of Ports of Entry ..... 36**

**ANNEX B – LIST OF BORDER CROSSINGS..... 38**

**ANNEX C – EXCERPT OF PERIMETER SECURITY AND ECONOMIC  
COMPETITIVENESS ACTION PLAN..... 41**

**Beyond the Border: A Shared Vision for Perimeter Security and Economic  
    Competiveness ..... 41**

**Coordinate border infrastructure investment and upgraded physical infrastructure at  
    key border crossings..... 42**

**Coordinate plans for physical infrastructure upgrades at small and remote ports of  
    entry..... 43**

**ANNEX D – WEBSITES AND CONTACTS..... 44**

**ANNEX E – DATA SOURCES ..... 45**

**ANNEX F – ACRONYMS ..... 47**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Our integrated Canada – United States of America (U.S.) transportation system is an essential component of our economic and social wellbeing. It supports our bilateral trade relationship, the largest in the world, and has helped make North America a competitive force globally. Central to this is the longest shared border in the world. Everyday Canada and the U.S. work together on trade facilitation, trusted-traveler programs, and border infrastructure projects that support border security while facilitating legitimate trade and travel.

On February 4, 2011, Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper and U.S. President Barack Obama issued a joint Declaration entitled “Beyond the Border: A Shared Vision for Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness”. The Declaration focused on four areas of cooperation: addressing threats early; facilitating trade, economic growth and jobs; integrating cross-border law enforcement; and improving critical infrastructure and cyber-security. The Declaration included the following statement on border infrastructure:

“We intend to pursue creative and effective solutions to manage the flow of traffic between Canada and the United States. We will focus investment in modern infrastructure and technology at our busiest land ports of entry, which are essential to our economic well-being. We will strive to ensure that our border crossings have the capacity to support the volume of commercial and passenger traffic inherent to economic growth and job creation on both sides of the border.”

On December 7, 2011, the Prime Minister and President released the Action Plan on Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness. The Action Plan includes 32 binational initiatives designed to implement the Vision set out by the Leaders and make the Canada – U.S. border more efficient, safe and secure.

As part of the Action Plan, the two countries are to pursue a major new initiative relating to infrastructure proposed and developed by Transport Canada (TC), U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). This initiative has two key elements. First, Canada and the U.S. “commit to make significant investments in physical infrastructure at key crossings to relieve congestion and speed the movement of traffic across the border.” The Action Plan listed the following as examples of significant infrastructure upgrades: “customs plaza replacement and redevelopment; additional primary inspection lanes and booths; expanded or new secondary inspection facilities; expanded or new connecting roads, highway interchanges and bridges.” These investments depend upon funding appropriations approved by the Canadian Parliament and the U.S. Congress. Nothing in the Action Plan and in this document is intended to give rise to rights or obligations under domestic or international law; neither the Action Plan nor this document are intended to constitute an international treaty under international law. CBP investments are to be delivered in partnership with the General Services Administration (GSA) which functions as CBP’s ports of entry Service Provider.

Both Canada and the U.S. identified Initial Priority border crossings at which significant upgrades are to be made. Based on a preliminary assessment of investment needs, Canada prioritized (east to west):

- Lacolle, Quebec;
- Lansdowne, Ontario (Thousand Islands Bridge);
- Fort Erie, Ontario (Peace Bridge).
- Emerson, Manitoba; and
- North Portal, Saskatchewan.

The United States prioritized (east to west):

- Alexandria Bay, New York (Thousand Islands Bridge);
- Lewiston, New York (Lewiston – Queenston Bridge);
- Buffalo, New York (Peace Bridge); and
- Port Huron, Michigan (Blue Water Bridge)

The second key element of the border infrastructure initiative involves enhancing our capacity to coordinate border infrastructure investments at the binational level. This is to be achieved through the establishment of a binational five-year Border Infrastructure Investment Plan (BIIP) that is to be renewed annually. The BIIP ensures a mutual understanding of available funding for targeted projects and the schedule, scope and responsibilities for those projects in consultation and coordination with all applicable local, state or provincial and federal stakeholders. The BIIP covers significant upgrades that have an impact on transportation and inspection capacity.

This report is the first edition of the BIIP, delivering on the objective outlined in the Action Plan. This first report focuses on the five Canadian and four U.S. Initial Priority border crossings noted above, along with the corresponding ports of entry opposite each of these priority locations. Seven major border crossings are therefore featured in this first edition (east to west):

- Lacolle, Quebec – Champlain, New York;
- Lansdowne, Ontario – Alexandria Bay, New York (Thousand Islands Bridge);
- Queenston, Ontario – Lewiston, New York (Queenston – Lewiston Bridge)
- Fort Erie, Ontario – Buffalo, New York (Peace Bridge);
- Sarnia, Ontario – Port Huron, Michigan (Blue Water Bridge)
- Emerson, Manitoba – Pembina, North Dakota; and
- North Portal, Saskatchewan – Portal, North Dakota.

For each of these border crossings, a binational profile shows existing infrastructure, major federal/provincial/state/border operator projects in the previous five years, opportunities for infrastructure improvements and planned or proposed projects over the coming five years.

The first annual BIIP has been prepared by TC, USDOT, CBSA and CBP. Opportunities for infrastructure improvements identified in the BIIP are indicative only and may not translate into projects in the future. The U.S. and Canada are to seek the resources needed to implement many of the specific planned or proposed projects identified. All projects at these locations, and other border crossings, are to be completed consistent with all necessary environmental assessments, permitting requirements, legislative approvals and approvals of any applicable government funding appropriations.

The BIIP, along with several other initiatives under the Action Plan, is designed to benefit the integrated economies of Canada and the U.S. which depend on the fluid movement of commercial and non-commercial traffic across our borders. Modernization of major border crossings is expected to provide the following long-term economic benefits:

- reduced wait times;
- increased reliability of just-in-time shipments;
- decreased fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, due to reduced engine idling at the border; and
- increased safety and security.

Efficiencies gained through this initiative support and work in tandem with the following other Action Plan initiatives:

- Border Wait Time Technology;
- Pre-Inspection and Preclearance;
- Enhanced Trusted Trader and Trusted Traveler Facilities; and,
- Harmonized Benefits to NEXUS Members.

Stakeholder consultations were undertaken to inform the first BIIP. Consultations with federal, state, provincial and local stakeholders were conducted through meetings of the Canada – U.S. Transportation Border Working Group (TBWG), and separate follow-on discussions to solicit and validate information. While states, provinces and public border operators were consulted in the preparation of these profiles, the BIIP is a federal government to federal government document. This first edition of the BIIP also includes as an Annex a binational approach for preparing plans for 62 small and remote border crossings. This Annex was prepared by the U.S. - Canada Small and Remote Port Working Group made up of representatives of CBP and CBSA. Future editions of the BIIP are to include consensus binational recommendations for the implementation of short-, medium- and long-term objectives regarding operational alignment of small and remote ports of entry.

Improving our cross-border infrastructure is a long-term process. As other projects are identified, they are to be addressed in future editions of the BIIP.

## **INITIAL PRIORITY BORDER CROSSINGS**

## Portal, ND – North Portal, SK

### I. Crossing Overview

Trade and Traffic				
	United States		Canada	
<b>2011 Imports (in Millions CDN \$)</b>	\$1,998		\$7,587	
<b>2011 Traffic (Inbound)</b>	<b>Commercial</b>	<b>Non-Commercial</b>	<b>Commercial</b>	<b>Non-Commercial</b>
	82,466	87,936	96,190	82,837
Port-Specific Information				
	United States		Canada	
<b>Port of Entry Name</b>	Portal		North Portal	
<b>Hours of Operation</b>	24/7		24/7	
<b>Connecting Municipalities</b>	Portal, North Dakota		North Portal, Saskatchewan	
<b>Port Ownership</b>	GSA		CBSA	
<b>Connecting Infrastructure</b>	U.S. Route 52		Saskatchewan Route 39	

### II. U.S. Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
<b>Primary Commercial Lanes</b>	3
<b>Primary Non-Commercial Lanes</b>	1
<b>Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays</b>	2
<b>Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces</b>	1 enclosed inspection garage space
<b>NEXUS</b>	No
<b>FAST</b>	No

#### B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)

##### 1. Inspection

- a. No significant infrastructure improvements completed within the last five years.

##### 2. Transportation

- a. No significant infrastructure improvements completed within the last five years.



**C. Infrastructure Opportunities**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Construction of new facility planned for completion in 2012.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

**D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)**

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a replacement inspection facility to include a main port building, border patrol building, non-commercial secondary building, non-intrusive inspection building (NII), garage / training building including a firing range, 4 commercial inspection lanes, 2 non-commercial inspection lanes, and officer and public parking space.</li> </ul>	Fall 2012	Funded
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li> </ul>		

**III. Canadian Infrastructure**

**A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics**

<b>Inspection Component</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Primary Commercial Lanes</b>	1
<b>Primary Non-Commercial Lanes</b>	1
<b>Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays</b>	1 Bay
<b>Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces</b>	6
<b>NEXUS</b>	No
<b>FAST</b>	Yes

**B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)**

**1. Inspection**

- a. No significant infrastructure improvement projects completed within the last five years.

**2. Transportation**

- a. In 2008, sections of Highway 39 leading to the Port of Entry (POE) were upgraded.

### C. Infrastructure Opportunities

#### 1. Inspection

- a. Expansion of secondary inspection facilities.
- b. Expansion and realignment of in-bound traffic lanes.

#### 2. Transportation

- a. Northbound traffic growing exponentially due to expanding oil and gas industries in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

### D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposed expansion of CBSA commercial facility.</li><li>• Possible expansion and realignment of commercial staging area, commercial traffic lanes, and border crossing roadways.</li></ul>	Project expected to start in 2013, and be completed in 2015.	Project details and funding under consideration.
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li></ul>		

## Pembina, ND – Emerson, MB

### I. Crossing Overview

Trade and Traffic				
	United States		Canada	
2011 Imports (in Millions CDN \$)	\$5,518		\$11,776	
2011 Traffic (Inbound)	<b>Commercial</b>	<b>Non-Commercial</b>	<b>Commercial</b>	<b>Non-Commercial</b>
	209,603	312,782	178,405	324,401
Port-Specific Information				
	United States		Canada	
Port of Entry Name	Pembina		Emerson	
Hours of Operation	24/7		24/7	
Connecting Municipalities	Pembina, North Dakota		Emerson, Manitoba	
Port Ownership	GSA		CBSA	
Connecting Infrastructure	Interstate 29, U.S. Route 81		Manitoba Highway 75	

### II. U.S. Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
Primary Commercial Lanes	3
Primary Non-Commercial Lanes	6
Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays	6
Secondary Non-Commercial Lanes	4 enclosed inspection garage spaces
NEXUS	No
FAST	No

#### B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)

##### 1. Inspection

- a. No significant infrastructure improvement projects completed within the last five years.

##### 2. Transportation

- a. No significant infrastructure improvement projects completed within the last five years.

### C. Infrastructure Opportunities

#### 1. Inspection

- a. Renovate and/or expand main building to accommodate import specialists, mission support specialists, port director, and administrative staff.
- b. Improve primary commercial inspection capacity.
- c. Improve primary non-commercial inspection capacity.
- d. Reconfigure port to better facilitate commercial vehicle turning radii.
- e. Remove parking lot and commercial inspection queuing area grass and gravel islands to facilitate traffic flow and enable additional parking.

#### 2. Transportation

- a. Southbound: realign approach to commercial Primary Inspection Lanes (PILS).
- b. Northbound: add dedicated / new commercial lane.

### D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li> </ul>		
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li> </ul>		

## III. Canadian Infrastructure

### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

<b>Inspection Component</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Primary Commercial Lanes</b>	1
<b>Primary Non-Commercial Lanes</b>	5
<b>Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays</b>	2 Bays
<b>Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces</b>	30
<b>NEXUS</b>	Yes
<b>FAST</b>	Yes

### B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)

#### 1. Inspection

- a. No significant infrastructure improvement projects completed within the last five years.

**2. Transportation**

- a. No significant infrastructure improvement projects completed within the last five years.

**C. Infrastructure Opportunities**

**1. Inspection**

- a. With funding support from the Government of Canada, the Province of Manitoba and the State of North Dakota are performing a joint study of existing and future commercial and private traffic, and border infrastructure needs at the Pembina – Emerson port of entry.
- b. Southbound - new outbound inspection pad/canopy area - Preliminary Pembina - Emerson Port of Entry Study (Preliminary Study).
- c. Northbound - new commercial PILS, Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System (VACIS), secondary inspection (Preliminary Study)
- d. A relocation of the PILS.
- e. Construction of a bus processing center.

**2. Transportation.**

- a. Southbound – Improvements at the border to Manitoba Highway 75 to facilitate full vehicle segregation (new commercial lane) on approach to U.S. plaza (Preliminary Study).
- b. Northbound: infrastructure to facilitate fully segregated auto / commercial CBSA inspection (Preliminary Study).
- c. Inadequate access to Duty Free Shop during lengthy southbound queues.

**D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)**

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li> </ul>		
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manitoba Highway 75 south-bound:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Improved advance notification, channelization &amp; lane assignment strategies, improved duty free intersection management.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Project to start in July 2012 and be completed in October 2012.	Funding of \$1.2 million to be provided by Province of Manitoba.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential improvements to CBSA traffic lanes.</li> </ul>	TBD	Review of needs being undertaken via Pembina – Emerson POE Study. Phase 1 is a conceptual study

	<p>outlining two alternatives for future development. Pending approval of provincial funding.</p> <p>Phase 2 of the study is to provide a functional design of the selected alternative and be completed by December 2013. Phase 2 funding partners are to be the Province of MB and the Government of Canada.</p>
--	--

## Port Huron, MI – Sarnia, ON (Blue Water Bridge)

### I. Crossing Overview

Shared Infrastructure				
<b>Bridge Description</b>	Two 3-lane spans			
<b>Year Built</b>	Span 1: 1938; Span 2: 1997			
<b>Bridge Ownership</b>	Canadian portion of bridges owned, operated and maintained by Blue Water Bridge Canada (BWBC). U.S. portion of bridges owned by Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT)			
Trade and Traffic				
	United States		Canada	
<b>2011 Imports Trade Value (in Millions CDN \$)</b>	\$20,243		\$30,394	
<b>2011 Traffic (Inbound)</b>	Commercial	Non-Commercial	Commercial	Non-Commercial
	677,360	1,781,705	780,261	1,523,647
Port-Specific Information				
	United States		Canada	
<b>Port of Entry Name</b>	Port Huron		Sarnia	
<b>Hours of Operation</b>	24/7		24/7	
<b>Connecting Municipalities</b>	Port Huron, Michigan		Point Edward and Sarnia, Ontario	
<b>Port Ownership</b>	Owned by MDOT and leased to GSA		BWBC	
<b>Connecting Infrastructure</b>	Interstates 94 and 69		Ontario Highway 402	

### II. U.S. Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
<b>Primary Commercial Lanes</b>	7
<b>Primary Non-Commercial Lanes</b>	7
<b>Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays</b>	23 spaces
<b>Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces</b>	12
<b>NEXUS</b>	Yes
<b>FAST</b>	Yes

**B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Installation of 3 stacked and 3 staggered booths funded by BWBC completed in summer 2012.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Corridor approaching BWB on the U.S. side has seen significant work. A 2-year construction project on the Black River Bridge and surrounding area is expected to be completed in fall 2012. Project cost is \$150 M, \$30 M received through USDOT TIGER grant. The project is to increase capacity in the area near the international crossing from 4 lanes to 9 lanes.

**C. Infrastructure Opportunities**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Improve commercial and non-commercial inspection capacity.
- b. Include inspection exit control capacity.
- c. Renovate and/or expand main building to facilitate CBP operations.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

**D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments**

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commercial cargo expansion project to include improved primary and secondary commercial and non-commercial inspection capacity and renovations to existing CBP office space.</li></ul>		Project being assessed for feasibility within fiscal and regulatory environment.
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li></ul>		



### III. Canadian Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
Primary Commercial Lanes	7
Primary Non-Commercial Lanes	12
Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays	8 Bays
Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces	40
NEXUS	Yes
FAST	Yes

#### B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)

##### 1. Inspection

- a. 7 new Primary Commercial Inspection lanes were completed in 2011.
- b. New CBSA Commercial facility, inspection area, loading docks/bays.

##### 2. Transportation

- a. Approaching roadway at inspection plaza widened in conjunction with Highway 402 widening project.
- b. Reconstruction, widening and other operational improvements to Highway 402 were completed in May 2009.

#### C. Infrastructure Opportunities

##### 1. Inspection

- a. 14 additional Primary Inspection booth installation (7 Private Occupancy Vehicle (POV) and 7 Dual use).
- b. Additional NEXUS lane.

##### 2. Transportation

- a. Completion of truck exit roadway from Commercial PILs to Highway 402.
- b. Improved facilities for travelers.

#### D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)

Inspection Infrastructure		
Project Description	Estimated Completion Date	Additional Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BWBC Master Plan: Installation of 14 new PIL booths (7 POV and 7 Dual use). Demolition and construction of new CBSA Traffic facilities, including secondary inspection.</li> </ul>		BWBC indicates that it is updating its Master plan.

<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BWBC Master Plan: Completion of truck exit roadway from commercial primary inspection lanes to Highway 402.</li> </ul>		BWBC indicates that it is updating its Master plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BWBC Master Plan: Construction of multi-purpose “service center” for travel information, currency exchange, restaurant facilities.</li> </ul>		BWBC indicates that it is updating its Master plan.

## Buffalo, NY – Fort Erie, ON (Peace Bridge)

### I. Crossing Overview

Shared Infrastructure				
<b>Bridge Description</b>	3,580 foot/1,091 meter steel structure with three lanes and a reversible center lane.			
<b>Year Built</b>	Officially dedicated on August 7, 1927.			
<b>Bridge Ownership</b>	Owned, operated and maintained by the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority (PBA).			
Trade and Traffic				
	United States		Canada	
<b>2011 Imports (in millions CDN \$)</b>	\$28,112 <sup>1</sup>		\$20,815	
<b>2011 Traffic (Inbound)</b>	Commercial	Non-Commercial	Commercial	Non-Commercial
	621,202	2,384,157	603,056	2,030,216
Port-Specific Information				
	United States		Canada	
<b>Port of Entry Name</b>	Buffalo (Peace Bridge)		Fort Erie	
<b>Hours of Operation</b>	24/7		24/7	
<b>Connecting Municipalities</b>	City of Buffalo, New York		Town of Fort Erie, Ontario	
<b>Port Ownership</b>	Owned by PBA and leased to GSA		PBA	
<b>Connecting Infrastructure</b>	Interstate 190, Baird Drive		Queen Elizabeth Way (Ontario)	

### II. U.S. Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
<b>Primary Commercial Lanes</b>	7
<b>Primary Non-Commercial Lanes</b>	11
<b>Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays</b>	11 bays
<b>Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces</b>	25, plus 1 enclosed inspection garage
<b>NEXUS</b>	Yes
<b>FAST</b>	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Some exports from the Queenston port of entry are reported as exports from the Fort Erie port of entry based on combined data that Statistics Canada receives from the U.S. Government.

**B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Secondary non-commercial and Administration Building renovations were completed in 2009.
- b. Toll booths and PBA Administration relocated to Canada in 2007.

**2. Transportation**

- a. No significant infrastructure improvements completed within the last five years.

**C. Infrastructure Opportunities**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Plaza expansion or reconfiguration to facilitate better on-site traffic circulation.
- b. Commercial warehouse expansion.
- c. Inclusion of exit control systems and outbound capabilities.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Improved access to the Interstate.
- b. Existing bridge deck replacement.
- c. Second bridge span to support additional capacity and redundancy in infrastructure.
- d. Improved access from bridge to plaza.

**D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)**

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial warehouse expansion and renovation to increase useable square footage, reconfigure existing spaces, and additional bay build-out.</li> </ul>	In design - completion TBD.	CBP in negotiations with PBA regarding financing strategy.
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit consolidation and addition of a flyover ramp.</li> </ul>	In design - completion TBD.	Design and construction costs to be funded by the PBA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach widening.</li> </ul>	In design - completion TBD.	Design and construction costs to be funded by the PBA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge re-decking.</li> </ul>	In design - completion TBD.	Design and construction costs to be funded by the PBA.

### III. Canadian Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
Primary Commercial Lanes	5
Primary Non-Commercial Lanes	15
Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays	8 Bays
Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces	32
NEXUS	Yes
FAST	Yes

#### B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)

##### 1. Inspection

- a. Redesign of Canadian plaza, including security and technology enhancements, additional commercial capacity and upgrades to support trusted shipper programs.

##### 2. Transportation

- a. No significant infrastructure improvements completed within the last five years

#### C. Infrastructure Opportunities

##### 1. Inspection

- a. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

##### 2. Transportation

- a. Bridge re-decking.
- b. Bridge twinning in future as warranted by traffic demand and port of entry capacity.

#### D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)

Inspection Infrastructure		
Project Description	Estimated Completion Date	Additional Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li> </ul>		
Transportation Infrastructure		
Project Description	Estimated Completion Date	Additional Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge re-decking.</li> </ul>	In design - completion TBD.	Design and construction costs to be funded by the PBA.

## Lewiston, NY – Queenston, ON (Lewiston-Queenston Bridge)

### I. Crossing Overview

<b>Shared Infrastructure</b>				
<b>Bridge Description</b>	Steel arch bridge with 5 reversible lanes. Bridge is 1,600 feet/488 meters long. Bridge deck is 370 feet/113 meters above the Niagara River.			
<b>Year Built</b>	Officially dedicated November 1, 1962.			
<b>Bridge Ownership</b>	Owned, operated and maintained by the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission (NFBC)			
<b>Trade and Traffic</b>				
	United States		Canada	
<b>2011 Imports (in Millions CDN \$)</b>	\$229 <sup>2</sup>		\$11,210	
<b>2011 Traffic (Inbound)</b>	Commercial	Non-Commercial	Commercial	Non-Commercial
	310,972	1,407,047	349,487	1,618,323
<b>Port-Specific Information</b>				
	United States		Canada	
<b>Port of Entry Name</b>	Lewiston		Queenston (Niagara Falls)	
<b>Hours of Operation</b>	24/7		24/7	
<b>Connecting Municipalities</b>	Lewiston, NY		Niagara Falls, Ontario	
<b>Port Ownership</b>	Owned NFBC and leased to GSA		NFBC	
<b>Connecting Infrastructure</b>	Interstate 190		Ontario Highway 405	

### II. U.S. Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

<b>Inspection Component</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Primary Commercial Lanes</b>	4
<b>Primary Non-Commercial Lanes</b>	6
<b>Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays</b>	4
<b>Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces</b>	10; plus 1 enclosed inspection garage space
<b>NEXUS</b>	No
<b>FAST</b>	Yes

<sup>2</sup> Some exports from the Queenston port of entry are reported as exports from the Fort Erie port of entry based on combined data that Statistics Canada receives from the U.S. Government.

**B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Main building security holding area completed in 2010.

**2. Transportation**

- a. No significant infrastructure improvements completed within the last five years.

**C. Infrastructure Opportunities**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Reconfigure and/or expand main building to include additional space for adequate interview rooms and holding cells.
- b. Reconfigure and/or expand non-commercial inspection garage and commercial dock.
- c. Include additional inspection booths to facilitate commercial and non-commercial processing.
- d. Improve bus processing capacity.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

**D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)**

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Plaza reconfiguration and renovations to include the construction of a new main building, secondary processing facilities, and installation of additional primary inspection booths.</li></ul>	Spring 2016	CBP in negotiations with NFBC regarding financing strategy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Main building reconfiguration and renovations</li></ul>	Summer 2013	Main building project being reevaluated in consideration of progress on the aforementioned plaza reconfiguration and renovation project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Installation of an exit control booth.</li></ul>	Fall 2012	None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Addition of LED signage.</li></ul>	Summer 2012	None
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li></ul>		

### III. Canadian Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
Primary Commercial Lanes	5
Primary Non-Commercial Lanes	10
Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays	8 Bays
Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces	32
NEXUS	Yes
FAST	Yes

#### B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)

##### 1. Inspection

- a. Substantial completion of Phase II of the Queenston Plaza was completed in 2011. This included new Canada Food Inspection Agency and CBSA facilities and 10 new non-commercial PILs.
- b. Phase I of the reconstruction of the Queenston Plaza was completed in 2009. This consisted of an expanded footprint of the entire plaza, the addition of five new commercial inspection lanes, and the construction of a new toll house and maintenance facility.

##### 2. Transportation

- a. Reconstruction and bridge rehabilitations, from the Queenston-Lewiston Bridge toll plaza to the QEW in Niagara Falls were completed in 2009.
- b. Highway 405 was expanded to include two dedicated commercial truck lanes leading to bridge.

#### C. Infrastructure Opportunities

##### 1. Inspection

- a. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

##### 2. Transportation

- a. Realignment of road, relocation of duty free store and traveler facilities.

#### D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments

Inspection Infrastructure		
Project Description	Estimated Completion Date	Additional Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li> </ul>		
Transportation Infrastructure		
Project Description	Estimated Completion Date	Additional Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase III of reconstruction of Canadian Plaza includes east bound road realignment, relocation of the duty free store and currency exchange and construction of public washrooms.</li> </ul>	2013	Project funded. Cost \$14 million.



## Alexandria Bay, NY – Lansdowne, ON (Thousand Islands Bridge)

### I. Crossing Overview

Shared Infrastructure				
<b>Facility Description</b>	Series of two lane bridges			
<b>Year Built</b>	Constructed in 1937. East Rift Bridge constructed in 1958.			
<b>Bridge Ownership</b>	The Federal Bridge Corporation Limited (FBCL) and Thousand Island Bridge Authority			
Trade and Traffic				
	United States		Canada	
<b>2011 Imports (in Millions CDNS)</b>	\$7,221		\$6,285	
2011 Traffic (Inbound)	Commercial	Non-Commercial	Commercial	Non-Commercial
	176,914	649,711	163,107	763,050
Port-Specific Information				
	United States		Canada	
<b>Port of Entry Name</b>	Alexandria Bay		Lansdowne	
<b>Hours of Operation</b>	24/7		24/7	
<b>Connecting Municipalities</b>	Alexandria Bay, NY		Gananoque, Ontario	
<b>Port Ownership</b>	GSA		FBCL	
<b>Connecting Infrastructure</b>	Interstate 81		Ontario Highway 137	

### II. U.S. Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
<b>Primary Commercial Lanes</b>	2
<b>Primary Non-Commercial Lanes</b>	7
<b>Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays</b>	4
<b>Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces</b>	6; plus 3 enclosed inspection garage spaces
<b>NEXUS</b>	Yes
<b>FAST</b>	Yes

**B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)**

**1. Inspection**

- a. No significant infrastructure improvements completed within the last five years.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Widening of roadway between West Rift Bridge and U.S. inspection facility.

**C. Infrastructure Opportunities**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Major expansion and replacement of inspection facilities.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

**D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)**

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Major replacement and expansion project.</li></ul>		Fully designed; awaiting construction appropriations
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li></ul>		

**III. Canadian Infrastructure**

**A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics**

<b>Inspection Component</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Primary Commercial Lanes</b>	2
<b>Primary Non-Commercial Lanes</b>	6
<b>Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays</b>	3 Bays
<b>Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces</b>	9 long spaces (each can accommodate 2 cars back to back if cars have no trailers) plus 1 enclosed inspection garage
<b>NEXUS</b>	Yes
<b>FAST</b>	No

**B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Expansion of VACIS inspection area.
- b. Construction of enclosed inspection garage.
- c. Roofing replacement of secondary inspection canopy.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Improvements to Highway 137 approach to Thousand Islands Bridge at Ivy Lea.
- b. Rehabilitation of the Thousand Island Parkway Bridge in Gananoque was completed in 2007.

**C. Infrastructure Opportunities**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Replacement and expansion of port of entry facilities: The current port of entry is at the end of its effective economic life, and there is a possibility of mechanical and/or electrical failure. Traffic flow for commercial secondary is congested.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

**D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)**

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Complete replacement and expansion of port of entry facilities.</li><li>• Could include road configuration and traffic routing improvements, maintenance/storage garage, and brokerage facilities.</li></ul>	This project could start in 2012-13. Estimated project duration: 5 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project details and funding under consideration.</li></ul>
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li></ul>		

## Champlain, NY – Lacolle, QC

### I. Crossing Overview

Trade and Traffic				
	United States		Canada	
2011 Imports (in Millions CDN\$)	\$14,929		\$9,097	
2011 Traffic (Inbound)	Commercial	Non-Commercial	Commercial	Non-Commercial
	282,424	759,507	293,179	673,059
Port-Specific Information				
	United States		Canada	
Port of Entry Name	Champlain		St. Bernard de Lacolle	
Hours of Operation	24/7		24/7	
Connecting Municipalities	Champlain, New York		Blackpool, Quebec	
Port Ownership	GSA		CBSA	
Connecting Infrastructure	Interstate 87		Quebec Route 15	

### II. U.S. Infrastructure

#### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
Primary Commercial Lanes	9
Primary Non-Commercial Lanes	10
Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays	8
Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces	10; plus 5 enclosed inspection garage spaces
NEXUS	Yes
FAST	Yes

#### B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)

##### 1. Inspection

- a. Construction of the new Champlain Inspection Facility was completed in 2009.

##### 2. Transportation

- a. No significant infrastructure improvements completed within the last five years

### C. Infrastructure Opportunities

#### 1. Inspection

- a. Need for new NII and Import Specialist facilities.

#### 2. Transportation

- a. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

### D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)

Inspection Infrastructure		
Project Description	Estimated Completion Date	Additional Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Construction of a new NII building.</li></ul>	Winter 2013	Funded.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Construction of an Import Specialist area.</li></ul>	Fall 2013	Funded.
Transportation Infrastructure		
Project Description	Estimated Completion Date	Additional Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li></ul>		

## III. Canadian Infrastructure

### A. Inspection Infrastructure Characteristics

Inspection Component	Description
Primary Commercial Lanes	2
Primary Non-Commercial Lanes	8
Secondary Commercial Docks/Bays	6
Secondary Non-Commercial Spaces	13
NEXUS	Yes
FAST	Yes

### B. Recent Infrastructure Improvements (previous 5 years)

#### 1. Inspection

- a. No significant infrastructure improvements completed within the last five years.

#### 2. Transportation

- a. Between 2002 and 2008, the Ministère des Transports du Québec made major improvements to Highway 15 between Montreal and the border. Near the border, the main improvements included:
  - i. Construction of a truck lane to separate commercial vehicle traffic from passenger vehicle traffic at approach to Canadian and U.S. customs facilities and behind duty free shop. The design, construction and operations of this project were fully coordinated with the reconstruction of U.S. facilities at Champlain. The new lane was opened in January 2007.

**C. Infrastructure Opportunities**

**1. Inspection**

- a. Expansion of secondary commercial examination facility: Current port of entry configuration and capacity is insufficient for commercial and passenger traffic volumes. This leads to excessively long border wait times, occasionally over two hours.
- b. New bus processing centre.

**2. Transportation**

- a. Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.

**D. Planned/Proposed Infrastructure Investments (next 5 years)**

<b>Inspection Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion of secondary commercial examination facility.</li> <li>• Proposed additional improvements: Modernization and expansion of CBSA facilities by demolishing the current PILs and bus processing centre, and renovating and expanding the CBSA travelers' facility.</li> <li>• Expansion of enforcement area and secondary travelers' examination facilities may also be necessary, plus building additional PILs, improving the road configuration, and upgrading the officer arming facilities.</li> <li>• New office space and bus processing centre to be built.</li> </ul>	<p>Work has not yet begun.</p> <p>Project could start in 2012-13, and take three years to complete.</p>	<p>\$10 million in federal funding was approved in 2011.</p> <p>Project details and funding under consideration.</p>
<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of infrastructure needs ongoing.</li> </ul>		

## **NEXT STEPS**

Following the release of the Perimeter Security Action Plan, Canada and the U.S. are implementing the BIIP in stages, with the first report focusing on the Initial Priority border crossings identified in the Action Plan. It is the intention of Canada and the U.S. to expand the BIIP to cover all major border crossings. This is to include the top 20 crossings by two-way trade and the top 15 crossings based on non-commercial traffic volume. Given the overlap between these two categories, a total of 25 major border crossings are to be covered. As with this first edition of the BIIP, for each major border crossing a binational profile is to show existing infrastructure, major projects in the previous five years, opportunities for infrastructure improvements and planned or proposed projects over the coming five years. A new Annex is to list planned federal investments over the coming five years at the mid-sized border crossings not covered by a binational profile or by the Annex on Small and Remote Ports of Entry. In addition, the Annex on Small and Remote Ports of Entry will be updated. As a result, future editions of the BIIP are to cover all land border crossings between Canada and the U.S.

Projects to establish new border crossings may also be added to subsequent updates of the BIIP. For example, at the time that the work plan for the BIIP was formulated in late 2011, the New International Trade Crossing (NITC), also known as the Detroit River International Crossing (DRIC), was a very high Canadian priority but had not progressed sufficiently in the United States to be included in the list of initial priority projects.

On June 15, 2012, Canada and Michigan signed a Crossing Agreement for the NITC/DRIC project which establishes the framework for their respective roles and responsibilities for the construction, financing, operation and maintenance of the new international crossing. This is a significant step forward for a prospective new project located on the largest commercial corridor between the United States and Canada, carrying approximately one quarter of the annual trade carried by land between the countries in 2011. In this regard, the NITC/DRIC warrants close monitoring, and consideration for inclusion in future BIIP updates.

With regard to NITC/DRIC approvals, Michigan concluded its U.S. National Environmental Policy Act requirements with USDOT endorsement of a Record of Decision in January 2009. Similarly, the Governments of Ontario and Canada granted their environmental approvals in August and December 2009, respectively. Looking forward, the project will also require a Presidential Permit from the U.S. State Department (application submitted by Michigan in June 2012) and a Bridge Permit from the U.S. Coast Guard. Consideration of these permits will follow normal procedures and take into account public comments and the views of relevant agencies. The Government of Canada will follow the required processes with respect to approval of the construction of the new crossing in Canada.

USDOT, TC, CBP and CBSA will also monitor prospective projects and crossing enhancements which are identified as “opportunities” in the current and future BIIP reports, and will update and expand entries for these as necessary and appropriate.

Under the Perimeter Security Action Plan, Canada and the U.S. are to update the BIIP annually, reporting on progress on current and planned or proposed projects. The first full update is to take place in the second half of 2013 in time to inform the second annual Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness Action Plan Progress Report to Leaders in December 2013. Canada and the U.S. are to consult with state and provincial departments of transportation, public border operators and other stakeholders in the preparation of this and subsequent annual updates of the BIIP. Any new funding appropriations are to be noted in the updated BIIP. Consideration may also be given to expanding the project information for major crossings to include Intelligent Transportation Systems (e.g. border wait time measurement technology, traffic management centers and advance traveler information systems).

Each Perimeter Security Action Plan initiative includes specific performance measures that are to be used to measure success and report on progress. Under the BIIP, TC, CBSA, USDOT and CBP are to report on increased capacity resulting from infrastructure projects at major crossings as measured by the number and percentage increase in inspection lanes and primary inspection booths and the number and percentage increase in secondary inspection space. Reductions in border wait times will be measured using wait time technology installed at key ports of entry, while resulting environmental impacts are to be measured by reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

While primary and secondary inspection booth, lane, and space enhancements may be measured immediately in terms of number and percentage increase, their effects on border wait times and greenhouse gas emissions may be less immediate and therefore warrant an extended timeline for performance measurement and reporting. In the interim, the U.S. and Canada are to document the capacity of existing infrastructure as described above to establish baselines for future performance measures. The proposed installation of border wait time measurement technology at key crossings over the next three years as part of the Perimeter Security Action Plan initiative on Border Wait Time Technology is expected to significantly increase the accuracy of border wait time measurement where applicable and provide excellent baseline information.

As next steps on the Initial Priority border crossings identified in the BIIP, the U.S. and Canada are to continue to advance border infrastructure projects through their normal approvals and applicable budgetary appropriations processes, working with all applicable stakeholders.

As next steps for small and remote border crossings, the U.S. and Canada are to develop plans for each of these crossings in consultation with relevant jurisdictions and stakeholders and obtain the necessary approvals and funding appropriations for implementation.



**ANNEX A – SMALL AND REMOTE PORTS OF ENTRY**

# **Canada – United States Work Plan for the Development of the Small and Remote Ports Joint Action Plan**

## **Introduction**

Under the Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness Action Plan, the Small and Remote Ports of Entry initiative directs Canada and the United States (U.S.) to jointly plan investments and enhance client service at small and remote ports of entry along the Canada–U.S. Border. To this end, Canada and the U.S. have developed the approach outlined below to arrive at consensus recommendations for each of the small and remote ports of entry. This approach includes deliverables over the short-, medium- and long-term, as well as a detailed work plan that describes how these deliverables are to be achieved.

A Small Ports Working Group (SPWG) has been established, consisting of representatives from the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). To date, the SPWG has identified: 62 ports of entry which should be considered as small and remote; the principles for coordination of joint investments; and the service-oriented and cost-effective options to be considered for each location. The SPWG is currently analyzing port of entry data such as hours of service, traffic volumes, traffic profiles, infrastructure conditions, and proximity to adjacent ports of entry. The objective of this analysis is to develop consensus recommendations for rationalization of hours of operation, deployment of remote inspection technology, co-located facilities, and potential closures of ports of entry. These recommendations are to form the basis of the Canada-United States Joint Action Plan for small and remote ports of entry.

The CBSA and CBP recognize the complexity of such an undertaking and intend to engage all stakeholders including government, industry, and the impacted communities in the development of the plan.

## **Plan Conceptual Structure**

The framework for the plan consists of the rationalization of port of entry service hours, co-location of facilities, and the use of remote inspection technology. Although mentioned in the December 2011 Action Plan, the SPWG does not intend to recommend the closure of any ports beyond those previously announced. The framework plan components are defined below:

**Rationalization of Hours of Service:** The SPWG is to perform an analysis of port of entry data to ensure the border services offered have been optimized based on the demographics of the northbound and southbound traffic flow.

Co-location of Facilities: The SPWG is to determine what facilities CBSA and CBP could jointly occupy to reduce operations and maintenance cost. In the future, if a legislative framework for cross-designation of officer authorities is agreed upon and approved, co-location could also allow the CBSA and CBP to reduce staffing levels and Human Resources costs. Co-located facilities can straddle the border or be entirely in the U.S. or entirely in Canada. Both agencies would contribute to the infrastructure upgrades and ongoing maintenance of a shared facility.

1) At ports of entry where both CBSA and CBP port infrastructure are in need of replacement, the SPWG may recommend investment in a new facility that straddles the border or a new facility located on only one side of the border. CBSA and CBP currently operate six facilities that straddle the border: Alburg Station, VT/Noyan, QC; Turner, MT/Climax, SK; Sweetgrass, MT/Coutts, AB; Danville, WA/Carson, BC; Oroville, WA/Osoyoos, BC; and Poker Creek, AK/Little Gold Creek, YT.

2) At ports of entry where the facility infrastructure on one side of the border can support both CBSA and CBP operational requirements with minimal infrastructure investment while the sister port requires a significant investment for improvements, the port of entry with the minimal infrastructure investment would be selected as the CBSA-CBP facility.

Co-location on only one side of the border is contingent on the legal framework in the Preclearance initiative. The development of additional legislation following the finalization of a Preclearance agreement in the land mode to achieve cross-designation of officer authorities could provide additional opportunities to leverage resources.

Remote Inspection Technology: The development of a remote inspection technology solution would allow CBP officers to process vehicle travellers through the CBP Combined Area Security Center (CASC) in the U.S., and CBSA officers to do the same at a remote monitoring center in Canada. Pending funding approval, the CBP intends to develop a remote inspection technology system that would be based on the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI) with Radiation Portal Monitors. The CBSA would develop a similar remote inspection technology solution and will consider the implementation of associated infrastructure investments based on a standard Canadian footprint for small and remote ports.

In order to mitigate potential security risks, the CBSA and CBP are considering the use of remote inspection technology on only one side of the border at each location, which would allow for “eyes on the ground”, i.e. officers present on the other side, should an incident occur.

## **Development of the Plan**

The following defines the approach to the development of the Plan for all small and remote ports of entry along the Canada-U.S. border. The CBSA and CBP are to use consistent methodology to:

- Determine the level of service required by communities in and around the small and report ports of entry;
- Consider the organizational, financial and personnel impacts and the potential security risks associated with the implementation of remote inspection technology;
- Develop recommendations for all small and remote ports of entry following an analysis of hours of operations, technology-only processing solutions, joint or co-located facilities and aligned plans for expansion.

In considering changes to small and remote ports of entry along the Canada –U.S. border, the SPWG is to be guided by the following principles:

- Assessment of levels of service is to occur at mutually-specified intervals unless a government direction or other unforeseen occurrence necessitates an ad hoc review;
- Should an ad hoc review by one partner be necessary, it is to be done in full consultation with the other;
- Neither partner is to make a decision to open, close or change hours of service without prior consultation with the other;
- Neither partner is to undertake a substantial infrastructure renovation or enhancement without prior discussion with the other;
- External communication of information about current or planned changes to levels of service is to be coordinated between partners;
- Both partners are to consider the following criteria to determine whether the levels of service at a small port of entry remain appropriate:
  - Traffic volumes over the year;
  - Traffic profiles (commercial and non-commercial);
  - Facility/infrastructure assessment;
  - Proximity to an adjacent 24/7 port of entry (both in Canada and the U.S.);
  - Plans that are underway to enhance local infrastructure and economic prosperity;
  - Other factors in the region where access to a port of entry factors heavily;
  - Impact of potential closure or altered service on:
    - Adjacent ports of entry;
    - Local business;
    - Tourism to the area;
    - Emergency or first responder services.

Further, the CBSA and CBP are to meet at least semi-annually to review the ports of entry, progress and performance of the recommendations made under this initiative and to report on the results and recommendations on an annual basis.

## **Deliverables:**

Deliverables are to be achieved in three phases. Phase I is to occur within the next two years, Phase II is to occur in three to six years, and Phase III would occur in seven to ten years or more.

### Phase I: Within the Next Two Years

Phase I of this Plan would enable the SPWG to perform detailed research on the small and remote ports of entry that have been identified by the SPWG and to evaluate which of the options outlined above would be best suited to that location.

In the short-term, the SPWG is to research and evaluate the options for each port of entry, including a cost/benefit analysis of its recommendations. The SPWG is to analyze port of entry data such as hours of service, traffic volumes, traffic profiles, infrastructure conditions, and proximity to adjacent ports of entry. Although traffic volume at these border crossings is low, in many cases, these ports of entry are the lifelines of their communities. Often the nearest basic social and essential services such as schools or work are located on only one side of the border. Hospitals and emergency services are also often located on only one side, making access to the border critical, especially for first responders.

The SPWG will update the Plan for small and remote ports of entry annually in the Border Infrastructure Investment Plan. The Plan is to identify the specific options for co-location pending the resolution of the legislative impediments, options for the rationalization of hours of operation, and locations where it is envisioned that remote inspection technology is to be deployed.

Recognizing the significance of these ports of entry to local communities, the SPWG would consider service-oriented and cost effective options for the joint management of these crossings. CBSA and CBP will conduct stakeholder engagement on the options being considered for each port of entry, including on the implementation of remote inspection technology at one or two ports of entry. Pending the required funding approval, the CBSA and CBP are to jointly develop a pilot of the remote port inspection technology solution, to be implemented in 2015 at mutually agreed sites.

### Phase II: Within Three to Six Years

The SPWG is to begin to evaluate the remote inspection technology pilot shortly after its implementation to determine the future procurement and deployment strategy for remote inspection technology at additional small and remote ports of entry. Should the remote technology pilot prove successful, Canada and the U.S. intend to seek authorization to implement remote technology as a design standard.

During this period, Canada and the U.S. intend to implement joint facilities at selected ports of entry based on the analysis from Phase I and the approval of the agreement for land Preclearance. Joint facilities for the selected ports are to be executed incrementally and are to extend into Phase III. Based on previous analysis both countries would opt for co-location at agreed upon locations and a bi-national agreement to design, construct, operate, and maintain joint facilities.

A pilot feasibility study is to be undertaken at a location where the determination has been made that a new facility is required to replace ageing infrastructure on both sides of the border.

#### Phase III: Within Seven to Ten (plus) Years

The implementation of joint facilities at existing locations is to continue through the long-term. Feasibility studies are to determine where new joint facilities should replace existing CBSA and CBP facilities in Phase III. The CBSA and CBP are to jointly determine the program requirements. A bi-national agreement is to be negotiated for the sharing of new facilities. Where feasible, remote inspection technology is to be incorporated into these new joint facilities.

## **Small and Remote Ports of Entry Initiative:**

### **List of Ports of Entry**

The CBSA and CBP will develop recommendations for the rationalization of hours of operation, co-location of facilities or remote inspection technology at each of the following small and remote ports of entry. Stakeholders including government, industry, and local communities will be engaged.

<b>Canada</b>	<b>United States</b>
Milltown, NB	Milltown, ME
St. Croix, NB	Vanceboro, ME
Forest City, NB	Forest City, ME
Fosterville, NB	Orient, ME
Bloomfield, NB	Monticello, ME
Centreville, NB	Bridgewater, ME
River de Chute, NB	Easton, ME
Four Falls, NB	No U.S. port of entry
Gillespie-Portage, NB	Limestone, ME
Grand Falls, NB	Hamelin, ME
St. Leonard, NB	Van Buren, ME
Pohénégamook, QC	St. Francis/Estcourt, ME
St-Pamphile, QC	St. Pamphile, ME
No Canadian port of entry	St. Zacharie, ME
St-Juste de Bretenières, QC	St. Juste, ME
Ste-Aurélie, QC	Ste. Aurelie, ME
Woburn, QC	Coburn Gore, ME
Chartierville, QC	Pittsburgh, NH
Hereford Road, QC	Canaan, VT
Stanstead (Beebe), QC	Beebe Plain, VT
Highwater, QC	North Troy, VT
Glen Sutton, QC	East Richford, VT
East Pinnacle, QC	Pinnacle Road, VT
Frelighsburg, QC	West Berkshire, VT
Morses Line, QC	Morses Line, VT
Clarenceville, QC	Alburg Springs, VT
Covey Hill, QC	Cannon Corners, NY
No Canadian port of entry	Churubusco, NY
No Canadian port of entry	Jamieson Line, NY

South Junction, MB	Roseau, MN
Piney, MB	Pinecreek, MN
Gretna, MB	Neche, ND
Winkler, MB	Walhalla, ND
Windygates, MB	Maida, ND
Snowflake, MB	Hannah, ND
Crystal City, MB	Sarles, ND
Cartwright, MB	Hansboro, ND
Lena, MB	St. John, ND
Goodlands, MB	Carbury, ND
Coulter, MB	Westhope, ND
Lyleton, MB	Antler, ND
Carievale, SK	Sherwood, ND
Northgate, SK	Northgate, ND
Estevan Highway, SK	Noonan, ND
Torquay, SK	Ambrose, ND
Oungre, SK	Fortuna, ND
No Canadian port of entry	Whitetail, MT
Coronach, SK	Scobey, MT
West Poplar River, SK	Opheim, MT
Monchy, SK	Morgan, MT
Climax, SK	Turner, MT
Willow Creek, SK	Willow Creek, MT
Wildhorse, AB	Wildhorse, MT
Aden, AB	Whitlash, MT
Del Bonita, AB	Del Bonita, MT
Carway, AB	Piegan, MT
Chief Mountain, AB	Chief Mountain, MT
Nelway, BC	Metaline Falls, WA
Waneta, BC	Boundary, WA
Cascade, BC	Laurier, WA
Midway, BC	Ferry, WA
Chopaka, BC	Nighthawk, WA



**ANNEX B – LIST OF BORDER CROSSINGS**  
**(WEST TO EAST)**

UNITED STATES	CANADA
Poker Creek AK (joint facility)	Little Gold Creek YT (joint facility)
Alcan AK	Beaver Creek YT
Dalton Cache AK	Pleasant Camp BC
Skagway AK	Fraser BC
No Corresponding U.S. Port	Stewart BC
Point Roberts WA	Boundary Bay BC
Peace Arch WA	Douglas BC
Blaine WA	Pacific Highway BC
Lynden WA	Aldergrove BC
Sumas WA	Abbotsford-Huntingdon BC
Nighthawk WA	Chopaka BC
Oroville WA (joint facility)	Osoyoos BC (joint facility)
Ferry WA	Midway BC
Danville WA (joint facility)	Carson BC (joint facility)
Laurier WA	Cascade BC
Frontier WA	Paterson BC
Boundary WA	Waneta BC
Metaline Falls WA	Nelway BC
Porthill ID	Rykerts BC
Eastport ID	Kingsgate BC
Roosville MT	Roosville BC
Chief Mountain MT	Chief Mountain AB
Piegan MT	Carway AB
Del Bonita MT	Del Bonita AB
Sweetgrass MT (joint facility)	Coutts AB (joint facility)
Whitlash MT	Aden AB
Wild Horse MT	Wild Horse AB
Willow Creek MT	Willow Creek SK
Turner MT (joint facility)	Climax SK (joint facility)
Morgan MT	Monchy SK
Ophiem MT	West Poplar River SK
Scobey MT	Coronach SK
Whitetail MT	No corresponding Canadian Port
Raymond MT	Regway SK
Fortuna ND	Oungre SK
Ambrose ND	Torquay SK
Noonan ND	Estevan Highway SK
Portal ND	North Portal SK
Northgate ND	Northgate SK
Sherwood ND	Carievale SK
Antler ND	Lyleton MB

Westhope ND	Coulter MB
Carbury ND	Goodlands MB
Dunseith ND	Boissevain MB
St. John ND	Lena MB
Hansboro ND	Cartwright MB
Sarles ND	Crystal City MB
Hannah ND	Snowflake MB
Maida ND	Windygates MB
Walhalla ND	Winkler MB
Neché ND	Gretna MB
Pembina ND	Emerson MB
Lancaster MN	Tolstoi MB
Pinecreek MN	Piney MB
Roseau MN	South Junction MB
Warroad MN	Sprague MB
Baudette MN	Rainy River ON
Grand Portage MN	Pigeon River ON
International Falls MN	Fort Francis Bridge ON
Sault Ste. Marie MI	Sault Ste. Marie Bridge ON
Port Huron MI	Sarnia (Blue Water Bridge) ON
Detroit MI	Windsor-Detroit Tunnel ON
Detroit MI	Ambassador Bridge ON
Buffalo NY	Fort Erie (Peace Bridge) ON
Niagara Falls NY	Niagara Falls (Rainbow Bridge) ON
Niagara Falls NY	Niagara Falls (Whirlpool Bridge) ON
Lewiston NY	Queenston Lewiston Bridge ON
Alexandria Bay NY	Lansdowne (Thousand Islands Bridge) ON
Ogdensburg Bridge, NY	Prescott (Prescott – Ogdensburg Bridge) ON
Massena NY	Cornwall (Seaway International Bridge) ON
Fort Covington NY	Dundee QC
Trout River NY	Trout River QC
Jamieson Line NY	No corresponding Canadian Port
Chateaugay NY	Herdman QC
Churubusco NY	No corresponding Canadian Port
Cannon Corners NY	Covey Hill QC
Mooers NY	Hemmingford QC
Champlain NY	St-Bernard-De-Lacolle: Highway 15 QC
Overton Corners	Lacolle (Route 221) QC
Rouses Point NY	Lacolle (Route 223) QC
Alburg VT (joint facility)	Noyan QC (joint facility)
Alburg Springs VT	Clarenceville QC
Highgate Springs VT	St-Armand/Philipsburg QC
Morses Line VT	Morses Line QC
West Berkshire VT	Frelightsburg QC
Pinnacle Road, VT	East Pinnacle QC

Richford VT	Abercorn QC
East Richford VT	Glen Sutton QC
North Troy VT	Highwater QC
Beebe Plain VT	Stanstead (Beebe) QC
Derby Line VT	Stanstead (Route 143) QC
Derby Line VT	Stanstead (Route 55) QC
Norton VT	Stanhope QC
Canaan VT	Hereford Road QC
Beecher Falls VT	East Hereford QC
Pittsburg NH	Chartierville QC
Coburn Gore ME	Woburn QC
Jackman ME	Armstrong QC
St. Zacharie, ME	No corresponding Canadian Port
Ste. Aurelie ME	Ste-Aur�lie QC
St. Juste ME	St-Just-De Breteni�res QC
St. Pamphile ME	St-Pamphile QC
Estcourt Station ME	Poh�n�gamook QC
Fort Kent ME	Clair NB
Madawaska ME	Edmunston NB
Van Buren ME	St. Leonard NB
Hamlin ME	Grand Falls NB
Limestone ME	Gillespie Portage NB
No Corresponding U.S. Port	Four Falls NB
Fort Fairfield ME	Andover NB
Easton ME	River De Chute NB
Bridgewater ME	Centreville NB
Monticello ME	Bloomfield NB
Houlton ME	Woodstock Road NB
Orient ME	Fosterville NB
Forest City ME	Forest City NB
Vanceboro ME	St. Croix NB
Calais – International Avenue ME	St. Stephen (3rd Bridge) NB
Milltown ME	Milltown NB
Calais – Ferry Point ME	St. Stephen (Ferry Point Bridge) NB
Lubec ME	Campobello NB

## **ANNEX C – EXCERPT OF PERIMETER SECURITY AND ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS ACTION PLAN**

### **Beyond the Border: A Shared Vision for Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness**

On February 4, 2011, the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States issued Beyond the Border: A Shared Vision for Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness. The Declaration established a new long-term partnership built upon a perimeter approach to security and economic competitiveness. This means working together, not just at the border, but “beyond the border” to enhance our security and accelerate the legitimate flow of people, goods, and services. Leaders called for the development of a joint Action Plan to realize this goal, which is embodied in this document.

This Action Plan sets out joint priorities for achieving that vision within the four areas of cooperation identified in the Beyond the Border Declaration: addressing threats early; trade facilitation, economic growth, and jobs; cross-border law enforcement; and critical infrastructure and cyber security. Nothing in this Action Plan is intended to give rise to rights or obligations under domestic or international law; this action plan is not intended to constitute an international treaty under international law. Work to implement this Action Plan will be subject to normal budget, legal, and regulatory mechanisms in each country and will be carried out in close consultation with interested stakeholders in both countries. In particular, progress on many of the elements of this Action Plan will depend on the availability of funding. In those cases, appropriations to support implementation will be sought through the normal budgetary processes of each country.

In addition to calling for this Action Plan, the Declaration of Leaders on February 4, 2011, also created a Canada–United States Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC). Whereas this Action Plan aims to enhance security and economic competitiveness through measures taken at our shared perimeter and border, the RCC aims to better align our regulatory approaches to protect health, safety, and the environment while supporting growth, investment, innovation, and market openness. Some initiatives under this Action Plan will complement the work of the RCC, and indeed, could provide beneficial interim measures pending more fundamental regulatory solutions which may flow from the RCC.

## **Invest in Improving Shared Border Infrastructure and Technology**

### **Coordinate border infrastructure investment and upgraded physical infrastructure at key border crossings.**

**Next Steps:** We will develop a joint Border Infrastructure Investment Plan to ensure a mutual understanding of available funding for targeted projects and the schedule, scope and responsibilities for those projects in consultation and coordination with all applicable local, state or provincial and federal stakeholders.

We commit to make significant investments in physical infrastructure at key crossings to relieve congestion and speed the movement of traffic across the border. Examples of the significant infrastructure upgrades may include customs plaza replacement and redevelopment, additional primary inspection lanes and booths, expanded or new secondary inspection facilities, and expanded or new connecting roads, highway interchanges and bridges.

As initial respective priorities, Canada will put forward Emerson, Man.; Lacolle, Que.; Lansdowne, Ont.; North Portal, Sask.; and Peace Bridge, Ont., and the United States will put forward for approval Alexandria Bay, N.Y.; Blue Water Bridge, Mich.; Lewiston Bridge, N.Y.; and Peace Bridge, N.Y., for such investments.

By June 30, 2012, we will develop coordinated project investment and implementation plans that will, together with infrastructure-specific actions at small/remote crossings, constitute the first bilateral five-year Border Infrastructure Investment Plan, to be renewed annually.

**Measuring Progress:** Transport Canada, the Canada Border Services Agency, the U.S. Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security will report progress in a Border Infrastructure Investment Plan—Progress Report that outlines specific projects that are planned for future years and investments to date. The report also will describe increased capacity (measured by the number and percentage increase in inspection lanes and primary inspection booths), the number and percentage increase in secondary inspection bays, increased space for secondary inspections, and the percentage increase in space for secondary inspections and changes in border wait times. Reductions in the environmental impact due to reduced border wait times will be measured in decreases and percentage decreases in tons of greenhouse gas emissions. Transport Canada, the Canada Border Services Agency, U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the U.S. Department of Transportation also will report on reductions in wait times at the border.

## **Coordinate plans for physical infrastructure upgrades at small and remote ports of entry.**

**Next Steps:** We will better coordinate joint port of entry investment and enhance client service by:

- Establishing a small- and remote-port working group to evaluate a binational approach to operational alignment (for example, mirroring hours), infrastructure investment and improved service;
- Arriving at consensus recommendations for all small and remote ports to include analyses of hours of operation, technology-only processing solutions, joint or co-managed facilities and aligned plans for expansions and closures;
- Based upon consensus recommendations, developing joint action plans for implementation, covering the short-, medium-, and long-term objectives; and
- Incorporating binational infrastructure recommendations into the bilateral five year Border Infrastructure Investment Plan.

**Measuring Progress:** Transport Canada, the Canada Border Services Agency, the U.S. Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security will develop joint action plans for all small ports by June 30, 2012, and incorporate recommendations into the bilateral five-year Border Infrastructure Investment Plan on an annual basis, beginning June 30, 2012.

## **ANNEX D – WEBSITES AND CONTACTS**

### **Canadian and United States Beyond the Border Websites:**

#### **Canada:**

[www.borderactionplan.gc.ca](http://www.borderactionplan.gc.ca)

#### **United States:**

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/02/04/declaration-president-obama-and-prime-minister-harper-canada-beyond-bord>

[http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/us-canada\\_btb\\_action\\_plan3.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/us-canada_btb_action_plan3.pdf)

[www.dhs.gov/beyond-the-border](http://www.dhs.gov/beyond-the-border)

### **Contact Information for Four Partner Agencies:**

Customs and Border Protection (CBP): <http://www.cbp.gov>

Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA): <http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/>

Transport Canada (TC): [www.tc.gc.ca](http://www.tc.gc.ca)

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>

#### **Other:**

The Canada-United States Transportation Border Working Group: [www.thetbwg.org](http://www.thetbwg.org)

## **ANNEX E – DATA SOURCES**

### **A. Crossing Overviews**

- Canada Border Services Agency
- Customs and Border Protection
- Transport Canada
- U.S. Department of Transportation
- Individual public border operators

### **B. Merchandise Trade Data**

Transport Canada, adapted from Statistics Canada, International Trade database, June, 2012

Exports from Canada – The mode of transport represents the mode of transport by which the international boundary is crossed. This may be different from the mode of transport within Canada. Some exports from the Queenston port of entry are reported as exports from the Fort Erie port of entry based on combined data that Statistics Canada receives from the U.S. Government.

Imports to Canada – The mode of transport represents the last mode of transport by which the cargo was transported to the port of clearance in Canada and is derived from the cargo control documents of customs. This may not be the mode of transport by which the cargo arrived at the Canadian port of entry in the case of inland clearance. Import trade values may not reflect actual trade activity at certain ports due to the importer's options of clearing goods at destination customs offices, rather than at the port of entry.

In 2011, \$41.7 million worth of merchandise trade was cleared at inland CBSA facilities.

### **C. Vehicle Traffic Data**

Northbound: Transport Canada, 2011 data adapted from Statistics Canada, International Travel section, and other unpublished statistics, June 2012.

Southbound: U.S. Fiscal Year 2011 traffic volumes from Customs and Border Protection. Commercial volumes from Automated Commercial Environment data. Non-commercial volumes from Border Stat program.



#### **D. Border Crossing Infrastructure and Project Information**

- Canada Border Services Agency
- Customs and Border Protection
- Transport Canada
- U.S. Department of Transportation
- Individual public border operators
- Provinces of Québec, Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan
- States of New York, Michigan and North Dakota

## ANNEX F – ACRONYMS

<b>BIIP</b>	Border Infrastructure Investment Plan
<b>BWBC</b>	Blue Water Bridge Canada
<b>CASC</b>	Combined Area Security Center
<b>CBP</b>	United States Customs and Border Protection
<b>CBSA</b>	Canada Border Services Agency
<b>CFIA</b>	Canadian Food Inspection Agency
<b>DHS</b>	Department of Homeland Security
<b>FAST</b>	Free and Secure Trade
<b>FBCL</b>	Federal Bridge Corporation Limited
<b>GSA</b>	General Services Administration
<b>MDOT</b>	Michigan Department of Transportation
<b>NII</b>	Non-Intrusive Inspection
<b>NFBC</b>	Niagara Falls Bridge Commission
<b>PBA</b>	Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority
<b>PIL</b>	Primary Inspection Lane
<b>POE</b>	Port of Entry
<b>POV</b>	Private Occupancy Vehicle
<b>RFID</b>	Radio Frequency Identification Device
<b>SPWG</b>	Small Ports Working Group
<b>TC</b>	Transport Canada
<b>USDOT</b>	United States Department of Transportation
<b>VACIS</b>	Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System