

Alex Hinojosa, Deputy Managing Director, North American Development Bank  
Presentation to Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works  
Subcommittee: Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility (Sen. Tom Udall, Chairman)  
April 11, 2012  
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Chairman Udall, members of the committee, I thank you for this opportunity to present to you information regarding The North American Development Bank (NADB) and its work in developing and financing environmental infrastructure in the border region. I will present to you information regarding the Bank's overall accomplishments, as well as information specific to the Bank's administration of funds provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) through its U.S.-Mexico Border Program.

As has been touched on by my colleague Maria Elena Giner of the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC), the NADB is a bilateral financial institution created within the framework of the negotiations of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). The Bank began operations in 1994 with headquarters in San Antonio, Texas. The Bank currently operates with a compact organizational structure, currently totaling 54 employees. It is capitalized in equal parts by the governments of the United States and Mexico. As of December 31, 2011, the U.S. and Mexican governments provided a total net capital contribution of US\$405million. NADB is governed by a bi-national board that includes federal and non-federal members. Representing the United States government on the Board are the Department of Treasury, Department of State, and the EPA. Representing the Mexican government are the Ministry of Finance & Public Credit (Hacienda), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (SRE), and the Ministry of Environment & Natural Resources (SEMARNAT). The Board also includes four non-federal members – two from each country. These are one member from each country representing border state governments and one member from each country representing border communities at large.

Pursuant to its charter, the mandate of the NADB is to support the development of environmental infrastructure in the areas of potable water, wastewater treatment and solid waste, as well as projects aimed at improving air quality, conserving water, reducing energy consumption and developing renewable energy sources, among others. Eligible projects must be located within 100 kilometers (about 62 miles) north of the international boundary in the four U.S. states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California, and within 300 kilometers (about 186 miles) south of the border in the six Mexican states of Tamaulipas, Nuevo León, Coahuila, Chihuahua, Sonora, and Baja California. Each project must pass through a public participation process and a certification process performed by the BECC in order to be considered for financing from NADB.

As of February 29, 2012, NADB has contracted US\$1.34 billion in financing for 153 BECC-certified environmental infrastructure projects throughout the border region. Of this total amount, US\$678.4 million is in the form of loans, and US\$658.4 million is in the form of grants. The vast majority of these grants funds—US\$568.7 million—are funds that have been provided by the U.S. EPA through its U.S.-Mexico Border Program, for high priority water and wastewater projects throughout the border region, both in the United States and in Mexico. Of the total amount of contracted funds, US\$1.25 billion, or approximately 94 percent, of the contracted funds had been disbursed as of February 29, 2012. NADB funding for these 153 BECC-certified projects represents about 40 percent of the total investment in these projects. This is noteworthy, in that it indicates that each dollar of NADB financing for

Alex Hinojosa, Deputy Managing Director, North American Development Bank  
Presentation to Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works  
Subcommittee: Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility (Sen. Tom Udall, Chairman)  
April 11, 2012  
Las Cruces, New Mexico

environmental infrastructure projects leverages on average an additional \$1.50 from other funding sources.

The loans provided and grants being administered by NADB are for projects in a variety of infrastructure sectors. Historically, the Bank's efforts had focused in the basic infrastructure sectors of water, wastewater and solid waste management, sectors in which significant lags had been identified at the time of the Bank's establishment. In more recent years, as a result of the Board of Directors adopting policies to broaden eligible sectors, NADB has played an instrumental role in the development and financing of projects aimed at improving air quality, primarily through the paving of unpaved streets, thus reducing particulate matter in many border communities. Most recently, as a result of federal incentives in the U.S. and Mexico, as well as ambitious state-level renewable energy portfolio standards in the U.S., NADB has been active in the financing of renewable energy projects, such as solar and wind projects.

As of February 29, 2012, 58 percent of NADB financing was for water and wastewater infrastructure; 20 percent was for air quality projects; almost 7 percent was for renewable energy projects; storm water and water conservation projects each accounted for approximately 6 percent of funding; basic urban infrastructure represented just over 2 percent; and solid waste projects represented just over one percent of financing. NADB management anticipates substantial growth in funding for renewable energy projects, followed by water and wastewater projects. With regard to the construction status of NADB financed projects, 108 of these 153 projects have been fully implemented. Thirty-nine (39) projects are in various stages of construction; 5 are in the bidding or design stage; and only one has been cancelled to date.

Over the years, the growth of the Bank's loan portfolio has strengthened its financial position through fuller utilization of its capital, resulting in growth of its retained earnings. After fully lending its paid-in capital, the Bank issued debt on the international capital markets for the first time in February 2010. NADB raised US\$250 million through the sale of bonds at a very competitive rate that was the reflection of its high credit rating – Aaa by Moody's and Aa+ by Standard & Poor's. While as a bank it is customary to report on the financial strength and performance of the institution, as a development bank with a specific mandate focused on environmental infrastructure, it is important to recognize the social and environmental benefits being rendered by the certified projects. These benefits include the construction, expansion or rehabilitation of 20 drinking water plants and 32 water distribution systems; 54 wastewater treatment plants and 73 wastewater collection systems; 16 landfills constructed or expanded and 16 open-air dumpsites closed; over 371,000 acre-feet of water conserved annually; and almost 7 million square meters of street paving. BECC and NADB projects are benefiting over 13.5 million people throughout the border region, providing a cleaner and healthier environment and ultimately improving the quality of life in the border region.

Looking forward, infrastructure needs in a rapidly growing and dynamic border region will continue to foster demand for NADB loans and grants from both public and private sector project sponsors. In

Alex Hinojosa, Deputy Managing Director, North American Development Bank  
Presentation to Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works  
Subcommittee: Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility (Sen. Tom Udall, Chairman)  
April 11, 2012  
Las Cruces, New Mexico

particular, the emergence of clean and renewable energy projects in the United States and Mexico is consistent with and attributable to the policies pursued by both federal governments, as well as those pursued by U.S. state governments, including the border states. At the U.S. federal level, investment and production tax credits, a cash grant program, a loan guaranty program, along with the Bonus Depreciation schedule, have served to catalyze the development of clean and renewable energy projects. While some of these incentives have expired or are scheduled to expire in the next few years, President Obama's support for extension of these tax credits, along with state Renewable Portfolio Standards in California (33 percent renewable energy by 2030) and Arizona (15 percent renewable energy by 2025) in particular, will continue to foster development of clean and renewable energy projects seeking NADB financing.

In Mexico, federal rules that allow for renewable energy generation for commercial self-supply, along with rules for energy "banking" and accelerated depreciation are factors fostering the development of such projects. Furthermore, federal policies in Mexico with regard to climate change, as evidenced by the recent signing of agreements on climate change between the United States and Mexico, are indicative of the continued push for policies that confront climate change, including those that will foster the development of clean energy in order to reduce emissions.

Under the policy direction of the Board of Directors, NADB and BECC are moving to serve a broader array of infrastructure needs in the border region, while continuing to place priority focus on basic water, wastewater and solid waste infrastructure. In December last year, the Board agreed to support the development of energy transmission or distribution infrastructure; public transportation infrastructure, including international border crossings; production of goods and services designed to enhance or protect the environment if the project also provides a net environmental benefit to the border region; and other infrastructure designed to minimize future negative environmental impacts in the border. Such a broadening of eligible sectors provides the dual benefit of enhancing the affordability of a broader array of needed border projects, while also facilitating fuller use of NADB's capital, in turn generating higher earnings for NADB. A portion of these earnings on capital can in turn be used to fund programs to provide technical assistance for project development, as well as in construction assistance for basic infrastructure projects for underserved communities in the border region that have little or no capacity to incur debt in order to meet their needs. NADB's recently instituted Community Assistance Program (CAP) is the principal vehicle by which NADB seeks to accomplish this. This program will provide grants of up to US\$500,000 for border communities with little or no debt capacity, with a priority given to water, wastewater and solid waste projects. NADB and BECC are currently evaluating submissions under their first Call for Proposals under the CAP, and anticipate awarding grants for selected projects by September 2012.

Looking specifically at the Bank's partnership with EPA, the North American Development Bank has served as the principal administrator of funds from EPA's U.S-Mexico Border Program since fiscal year 1998. The Bank does so through its Border Environment Infrastructure Fund (BEIF), providing

Alex Hinojosa, Deputy Managing Director, North American Development Bank  
Presentation to Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works  
Subcommittee: Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility (Sen. Tom Udall, Chairman)  
April 11, 2012  
Las Cruces, New Mexico

construction assistance grants to enhance the affordability of high-priority water and wastewater projects in the border region. As of February 2012, EPA had provided US\$664.9 million to NADB for administration of projects since federal fiscal year 1998. Of this amount, US\$638.1 million has been made available for projects, with the balance, less than four percent, being allocated for NADB administration of the program. A total of \$568.7 million has been contracted for 91 projects. Ninety-five (95) percent of these contracted funds or US\$541 million has been disbursed to project sponsors for construction.

The success of NADB in effectively and efficiently administering EPA funds is attributable to numerous factors, not the least of which are well-established working relationships with federal, state and local partners in both the U.S. and Mexico, as well as NADB internal efforts at continual improvement in the management of the program. With an established institutional structure and an operating presence throughout the border region, NADB has been uniquely situated to administer the BEIF program while incurring limited administrative expenses of less than four percent throughout the program's history. Furthermore, in 2005, EPA, in conjunction with NADB and BECC, restructured the program guidelines for the selection and implementation of projects, which resulted in an expedited development and implementation schedule, and a greater ability to maintain sufficient disbursement rates. Having previously carried a large un-liquidated balance of funds for approved projects of close to US\$300 million, this balance today is approximately US\$106 million, well within the targets set forth in 2005 by EPA's Office of Chief Financial Officer (OCFO).

With regard to the program's accomplishments, it is the opinion of the Bank's management that these U.S. federal funds provided by EPA have had a significant impact on the state of water and wastewater infrastructure in the border region. To begin with, the leveraging impact of almost \$2.00 from other sources for every \$1.00 BEIF funds must be recognized. This leveraging impact is most notable in Mexico, where the availability of these EPA funds, with a dollar-to-dollar match requirement for their use in Mexico, has spurred a significant increase of investment by Mexico in the border region with the *Comisión Nacional del Agua* (National Water Commission) tripling its investment in the border over the past four years for drinking water and wastewater infrastructure. While there has undoubtedly been a substantial direct impact and benefit to U.S. border communities from EPA investments made for infrastructure in U.S. communities, it is the investment of these funds in Mexican border communities that has had a truly transformational effect, and a direct impact on our shared waterways. In 1995, when BECC and NADB began operations, virtually every major Mexican border community was lacking secondary wastewater treatment capacity, resulting in the flow of hundreds of millions of gallons of untreated sewage into rivers and streams along the border. Today, in large part due to EPA's funding efforts, wastewater treatment plants and collection systems exist or are under construction in every major Mexican border community. Service coverage for drinking water, sewer and wastewater treatment have increased dramatically in Mexico's border region with the most significant being an increase in wastewater treatment coverage from 21% to over 80%, whereas Mexico's national average in coverage of wastewater treatment services remains less than 35%. As a result of EPA's U.S.-Mexico

**Alex Hinojosa, Deputy Managing Director, North American Development Bank  
Presentation to Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works  
Subcommittee: Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility (Sen. Tom Udall, Chairman)  
April 11, 2012  
Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**Border Program, we eliminate nearly 300 million gallons per day of untreated or inadequately treated wastewater, equivalent to the wastewater discharge of 6.8 million persons or 1.64 million households.**

**Thank you again for your time and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.**



Border Environment Cooperation Commission and  
North American Development Bank



## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

### BOARD RESOLUTION 2011-21

#### ELIGIBILITY OF PROJECT SECTORS UNDER BECC-NADB MANDATE

*Whereas*, the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States Concerning the Establishment of a Border Environment Cooperation Commission and a North American Development Bank (hereinafter the "Charter") permits the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) to certify, and the North American Development Bank (NADB) to finance all types of environmental infrastructure projects, but maintains a strong preference for environmental infrastructure projects relating to water pollution, wastewater treatment, water conservation, municipal solid waste and related matters (such as industrial and hazardous waste projects, water and wastewater hookups for housing, recycling, and waste reduction projects); and

*Whereas*, the purpose of BECC shall be to help "preserve, protect and enhance the environment of the border region in order to advance the well-being of the people of the United States and Mexico" and the purpose of NADB shall be to provide financing to those projects certified by the Board in accordance with the Charter and to otherwise assist BECC in fulfilling its purposes; and

*Whereas*, pursuant to an initial interpretation of project sector eligibility under the Charter, in a 2000 Board Resolution, BECC and NADB were authorized to address environmental infrastructure projects in additional sectors including, but not limited to, projects that improve air quality, public transportation projects, projects related to clean and efficient energy, and projects that improve municipal planning, development and water management; and

*Whereas*, BECC and NADB participation in those additional sectors has contributed to improving the environmental conditions and general quality of life in many communities along the U.S.-Mexico border, and at the same time has allowed for a substantial increase in the use of NADB's lending capacity; and

*Whereas*, BECC and NADB have formally recommended to the Board a further expansion of project sectors that can be considered eligible pursuant to the definition of environmental infrastructure project contained in the Charter, so as to maximize the role of the BECC and NADB in contributing to sustainable development in the border region and improving the quality of life of its residents.

**NOW, THEREFORE,** the Board of Directors hereby **RESOLVES** as follows:

**Certification and Financing of Projects Related to Water Pollution, Wastewater Treatment, Water Conservation, Municipal Solid Waste and Related Matters as a Preference.**

1. Consistent with the sector preference established by Chapter I, Article II, Section 3(d) of the Charter, BECC and NADB will continue and, as appropriate, strengthen their efforts to help border communities address their needs in the areas of water pollution, wastewater treatment, water conservation, municipal solid waste and related matters.
2. Such efforts shall include an ongoing assessment of needs by sector, identifying the mix of instruments required to address those needs, and working with other potential sources of funding to leverage concessional or grant funding.

**Certification and Financing of Environmental Infrastructure Projects in Additional Sectors**

3. As defined in the Charter, projects that qualify as environmental infrastructure projects are those that will:
  - a) prevent, control or reduce environmental pollutants, or
  - b) improve the drinking water supply, or
  - c) protect flora and fauna

provided that such projects also:

- i) improve human health, or
  - ii) promote sustainable development, or
  - iii) contribute to a higher quality of life.
4. Consistent with the Board resolution 2000-10 "Expansion of NADB Sectors of Activity," which allowed for an expansion to "projects that improve air quality, public transportation projects, projects related to clean and efficient energy, and projects that improve municipal planning, development and water management," additional types of projects that may qualify as environmental infrastructure projects under the Charter include: energy transmission or distribution infrastructure; renewable energy generation; public transportation infrastructure, including international border crossings; production of goods and services designed to enhance or protect the environment if the project also provides a net environmental benefit to the border region; and other infrastructure designed to minimize future negative environmental impacts in the border; and provided that such projects are fully consistent with the Guidance for Documenting Human Health and/or Environmental Benefits provided to NADB and BECC on December 6, 2009, and subsequent revisions.
5. Consistent with the original Charter, NADB and BECC should prioritize those projects that provide maximum environmental benefits to the border community.

**NORTH AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK  
FUNDING BY STATE  
March 1, 2012**

	Population to Benefit <sup>1</sup>	BECC Certification Date	Total Project Cost	Total Participation <sup>2</sup>	Total Contracted	Total Disbursed
--	------------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-----------------

**UNITED STATES**

**ARIZONA**

1	1	Astrol Solar Park	ENE	980,263	1/13/12	N/A	13.15	13.15	
2	2	Bisbee	WW	6,096	9/25/03	30.07	11.30	11.30	11.25
3	3	Douglas	W / WW	18,000	6/20/01	8.47	3.71	3.71	3.67
4	4	FRV Solar	ENE	980,263	11/28/11	N/A	88.50		
5	5	Gadsden	WW	888	12/17/02	5.47	1.33	1.33	1.33
6	6	Gila Gravity Canal	WC		3/19/04	1.76	0.83	0.83	0.37
7	7	Nogales	WW	220,974	6/22/00	74.10	59.51	59.51	59.46
8	8	Patagonia	WW	881	1/27/00	2.39	1.31	1.31	1.31
9	9	Patagonia	SW	-	10/11/07	0.67	0.33	0.33	0.23
10	10	Somerton	W	3,200	9/14/00	3.44	0.78	0.78	0.78
11	11	Somerton	WW	7,905	6/18/03	7.88	3.94	3.94	3.94
12	12	Yuma County (Colonia B&C)	WW	6,149	12/10/09	22.01	2.25	2.25	2.25
13	13	Yuma County WUA	WC		9/25/03	6.16	3.01	3.01	3.01
		<b>TOTAL ARIZONA</b>		<b>1,241,156</b>		<b>162.41</b>	<b>189.95</b>	<b>101.45</b>	<b>87.60</b>

**CALIFORNIA**

14	1	Bard Water District	WC		12/5/03	8.06	4.00	4.00	4.00
15	2	Brawley (1)	W	26,770	9/28/95	25.71	0.97	0.97	0.97
16	3	Brawley (2)	W / WW	-	9/30/99	13.76	5.65	5.65	5.65
17	4	Calexico	W	26,400	6/24/98	11.33	6.48	6.48	6.48
18	5	Desert Shores	WW	1,208	6/26/02	1.20	0.69	0.69	0.69
19	6	Heber (1)	WW	3,400	3/26/99	3.38	1.08	1.08	1.08
20	7	Heber (2)	W / WW	-	9/30/99	6.87	4.13	4.13	4.13
21	8	Imperial ID	WC		9/25/03	5.00	2.50	2.50	2.50
22	9	Imperial ID (2)	WC		7/16/08	2.52	1.26	1.26	0.32
23	10	San Diego	WW	1,200,000	6/18/97	99.59	17.20	17.20	17.20
24	11	SunPeak (Imperial ID)	ENE	174,528	6/6/11		86.30	86.30	76.30
25	12	Westmorland	WW	2,300	8/11/99	4.41	1.78	1.78	1.78
		<b>TOTAL CALIFORNIA</b>		<b>1,434,606</b>		<b>181.84</b>	<b>132.05</b>	<b>132.05</b>	<b>121.11</b>

**NEW MEXICO**

26	1	Anthony	WW	8,388	5/20/11	8.82	2.80	2.80	
27	2	Doña Ana	WW	9,140	6/20/01	29.80	13.08	13.08	13.08
28	3	Doña Ana	SW	174,682	6/18/03	3.14	2.51	2.51	2.51
29	4	Elephant Butte ID	WC		6/18/03	8.495	4.00	4.00	4.00
30	5	La Union	WW	1,003	12/6/01	7.60	4.24	4.24	4.24
31	6	Lordsburg	W	3,379	3/27/07	2.00	0.70	0.70	0.70
32	7	Salem/Ogaz	WW	788	6/20/01	3.00	0.99	0.99	0.99
		<b>TOTAL NEW MEXICO</b>		<b>178,061</b>		<b>62.85</b>	<b>28.32</b>	<b>28.32</b>	<b>25.52</b>

**TEXAS**

33	1	Alton	WW	6,000	6/18/97	14.47	0.23	0.23	0.23
34	2	Brownsville ID	WC		6/18/03	2.356	1.18	1.18	1.18
35	3	Cameron No. 2 (canal)	WC		9/25/03	4.322	1.80	1.80	1.80
36	4	Cameron No. 2 (pump)	WC		9/25/03	11.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
37	5	Cameron No. 6	WC		12/16/08	1.98	0.99	0.99	
38	6	Clint	WW	1,099	12/10/09	11.56	2.30	2.30	1.26
39	7	Del Rio	W	42,000	3/31/98	44.63	15.18	15.18	15.18
40	8	Del Rio	SW	47,276	6/18/03	1.16	0.27	0.27	0.27
41	9	Delta Lake ID	WC		9/25/03	7.12	3.56	3.56	2.85
42	10	Donna	W / WW	20,000	6/24/98	21.62	2.61	2.61	2.61
43	11	Eagle Pass	W / WW	45,878	3/20/02	105.34	13.70	13.70	13.70
44	12	El Paso JWTP	W	47,000	12/5/97	37.82	14.91	14.91	14.91
45	13	El Paso LVWD	W / WW	40,000	6/24/98	100.35	11.02	11.02	11.02
46	14	El Paso (GAF)	ENE		3/4/08	26.65	3.69	3.69	3.69
47	15	El Paso	SD	742,062	9/4/09	67.50	53.00	53.00	53.00
48	16	El Paso (Paisano)	W	117,407	7/1/10	18.00	15.00	15.00	15.00
49	17	Engelman ID No. 6	WC		10/30/07	1.21	0.48	0.48	0.27
50	18	Fabens	W / WW	7,066	3/20/02	12.00	6.10	6.10	6.09
51	19	Harlingen ID	WC		6/18/03	3.56	1.78	1.78	1.78
52	20	Hidalgo/Cameron ID No. 9	WC		3/19/05	2.50	1.25	1.25	
53	21	Hidalgo ID No. 1	WC		6/18/03	5.78	2.80	2.80	2.80
54	22	Hidalgo ID No. 2 ("A")	WC		6/18/03	3.37	0.59	0.59	0.59
55	23	Hidalgo ID No. 2 (Wis)	WC		6/18/03	1.67	0.60	0.60	0.60
56	24	Hidalgo ID No. 2 (I-18)	WC		10/30/07	1.88	0.91	0.91	0.91



			Population to Benefit <sup>1</sup>	BECC Certification Date	Total Project Cost	Total Participation <sup>2</sup>	Total Contracted	Total Disbursed
57	25	Hidalgo ID No. 6	WC		9/25/03	3.00	1.50	1.50
58	26	Hidalgo ID No. 16	WC		3/19/04	3.52	1.38	1.38
59	27	Jim Hogg County	SW	5,281	7/30/04	1.00	0.45	0.45
60	28	La Feria	W / WW	6,115	4/3/03	18.64	13.08	13.01
61	29	Laredo	W / WW	3,725	9/14/00	21.58	7.89	6.34
62	30	Marathon	W / WW	660	6/18/03	1.95	1.36	1.36
63	31	Maverick County	WC		3/19/04	1.05	0.41	0.41
64	32	Mercedes	W / WW	15,500	11/9/96	11.16	2.77	2.77
65	33	Pharr	WW	54,619	3/27/07	44.00	29.00	28.42
66	34	Raymondville	W	10,774	10/16/01	7.71	4.75	4.75
67	35	Rio Grande City	WW	111	6/30/11	0.45	0.45	0.45
68	36	Roma	W / WW	21,000	9/30/99	34.18	4.98	4.98
69	37	San Benito	W / WW	28,168	9/25/02	32.44	25.91	25.86
70	38	Sanderson	WW	1,128	3/24/00	3.64	0.35	0.28
71	39	Santa Rosa	W / WW	4,400	9/25/02	9.72	1.96	1.96
72	40	Texas Plan	W / WW	23,155	12/2/99	6.37	6.37	6.37
		Combes	W / WW	2,692	12/2/99	0.82	0.82	0.82
		Del Rio	W / WW	2,025	12/2/99	0.94	0.94	0.94
		Donna	W / WW	4,344	12/2/99	1.47	1.47	1.47
		Mercedes	W / WW	3,885	12/2/99	0.76	0.76	0.76
		Primera	WW	4,051	12/2/99	0.87	0.87	0.87
		San Benito	W / WW	636	12/2/99	0.24	0.24	0.24
		San Juan	WW	5,522	12/2/99	1.28	1.28	1.28
73	41	Tornillo	WW	3,176	9/25/02	21.77	7.59	7.59
74	42	Uvalde	SW	26,000	6/20/01	3.415	0.50	0.50
75	43	Valley Municipal UD	WC		12/5/03	2.481	1.10	1.10
		<b>TOTAL TEXAS</b>		<b>1,062,303</b>		<b>735.92</b>	<b>269.72</b>	<b>261.36</b>

75 **TOTAL U.S.** **3,916,126** **1,143.01** **620.05** **531.55** **495.60**

**MEXICO**

**BAJA CALIFORNIA**

1	1	Baja State	AQ	2,840,000	4/3/03	487.00	25.07	25.07
2	2	Mexicali	WW	658,185	12/5/97	54.97	20.62	20.62
3	3	Mexicali II	WW	-	9/25/03	26.57	10.11	10.11
4	4	Mexicali IV	WW	20,120	10/30/07	46.96	18.95	18.95
5	5	Mexicali	AQ	59,881	12/8/11	46.41	11.02	11.02
6	6	Playas de Rosarito	W / WW	25,522	10/26/06	10.02	3.73	3.73
7	7	Playas de Rosarito	AQ	80,000	10/30/07	40.91	17.11	17.11
8	8	Tecate	W / WW	82,794	6/22/00	9.73	4.98	4.98
9	9	Tecate (2)	W / WW	8,951	10/30/07	2.78	0.97	0.97
10	10	Tijuana (SAB)	WW	1,540,072	6/18/97	27.43	21.95	21.95
11	11	Tijuana (SANA)	WW	-	10/16/01	42.01	22.42	22.42
12	12	Tijuana	SW	-	6/21/06	4.55	2.22	2.22
13 & 14	13 & 14	Tijuana (Coastal/River Basin)	WW	36,620	12/16/08	10.38	5.47	4.01
15	15	Tijuana y Rosarito	W/WW	1,111,891	7/21/09	48.42	22.08	12.64
16	16	Rosario I WWTP	WW	21,802	7/21/09	4.53	2.20	0.48
17 & 18	17 & 18	2 Tijuana WWTP	WW	311,727	2/1/10	16.34	4.68	4.68
19	19	Col. Alcatrazes	WW	14,436	5/20/11	3.75	1.50	
20	20	Ejido Plan Libertador	WW	3,020	5/20/11	1.11	0.43	
21	21	Tijuana (Cemex)	AQ	-	7/24/09	125.46	102.03	102.03
22	22	Valle de las Palmas	BUI	40,000	12/8/11	110.63	36.59	
		<b>TOTAL B.C.</b>		<b>2,840,000</b>		<b>1,094.24</b>	<b>329.44</b>	<b>290.93</b>

**CHIHUAHUA**

23	1	Anapra	WW	28,600	10/26/06	6.24	2.02	2.02
24	2	Ascensión	SW	12,429	1/17/08	0.62	0.31	0.20
25	3	Barreales/Juárez y Reforma	WW	1,969	12/5/08	2.62	0.88	0.85
26	4	Cd. Juárez (1)	WW	1,217,818	9/30/97	31.49	16.80	16.80
27	5	Cd. Juárez (Sur)	WW	360,000	12/10/09	35.67	8.00	8.00
28	6	Cd. Juárez (Sur-Sur)	WW	180,000	12/10/09	39.33	15.35	15.35
29	7	Colonia Esperanza	WW	1,267	9/28/07	2.18	0.43	0.43
30	8	Colonia Esperanza	W	-	7/21/09	0.33	0.17	0.17
31	9	Delicias ID	WC	180,000	10/17/02	143.60	39.99	39.99
32-34	10-12	El Millón, Jesús Carranza & Tres Jacales	WW	1,656	5/4/10	3.66	1.05	0.43
35	13	El Porvenir	WW	2,740	9/28/07	2.27	0.92	0.92
36	14	Guadalupe	WW	4,647	7/31/07	3.40	1.12	1.12
37	15	Ojinaga (1)	SW	24,307	10/16/01	1.77	0.50	0.50
38	16	Ojinaga (2)	WW	-	9/25/02	5.28	3.15	3.15
39	17	Porfirio Parra	WW	1,294	7/31/07	2.00	0.54	0.54
40	18	Praxedis	WW	3,641	9/28/07	4.28	0.78	0.78

W = Water; WC = Water Conservation; WW = Wastewater  
 AQ = Air Quality; BU = Basic Urban Infrastructure; ENE = Clean Energy; ID = Irrigation District; MP = Municipal Planning; MSD = Municipal Service District; SD = Storm Drainage; SW = Solid Waste;  
 Total authorized funding after deobligation of unused grants and with final loan amounts.  
 1 Populations benefiting from more than one project are only counted once.

	Population to Benefit	BECC Certification Date	Total Project Cost	Total Participation	Total Contracted	Total Disbursed	
41	19	Praxedis	3,641	1,83	1,86	1,86	
42	20	Puerto Palomas	7,450	127/00	1,86	0,73	
43	21	San Isidro	2,255	7/31/07	0,80	0,73	
<b>TOTAL CHIH.</b>							
1,490,153							
293,97							
95,22							
94,67							
78,48							
<b>COAHUILA</b>							
44	1	Cd Acuña	113,194	3/24/00	78,80	17,29	
45	2	Grupo Solar	28,206	6/22/00	20,98	6,52	
46	3	Piedras Negras	132,561	3/24/00	56,82	10,85	
<b>TOTAL COAH.</b>							
245,755							
156,60							
34,65							
34,65							
34,65							
<b>NEUVO LEON</b>							
47	1	ChinaGral Bravo	17,300	6/20/01	0,95	0,47	
48 & 49	2 & 3	Dr. González & Los Herrera	4,959	12/16/08	0,24	0,12	
50	4	Monterrey	3,592,474	6/21/06	66,34	27,31	
51	5	State of Nuevo Leon	117,049	11/29/10	38,18	18,32	
<b>TOTAL N.L.</b>							
3,614,743							
105,71							
59,92							
59,92							
46,21							
<b>SONORA</b>							
52	1	Agua Prieta	60,236	11/9/96	1,91	0,45	
53	2	Agua Prieta	78,236	12/17/02	17,00	3,63	
54	3	Agua Prieta	2,956	10/30/07	0,65	0,23	
55	5	El Sasabe	1,081	3/27/01	0,94	0,43	
56	6	Hermosillo	785,082	4/11/11	86,15	47,82	
57	7	Hermosillo	154,400	5/3/11	68,25	19,61	
58	8	Naco	6,108	4/30/96	2,07	1,09	
59	9	Naco	-	7/30/04	0,60	0,30	
60	10	Naco	-	10/30/07	0,91	0,42	
61	11	Nogales	213,976	1/18/96	27,01	17,66	
62	12	Nogales	-	7/30/04	11,09	5,55	
63	13	Nogales	-	7/30/04	17,08	15,45	
64	14	Nogales (equip)	-	12/11/07	2,83	2,36	
65	15	Nogales (landfill)	-	12/18/09	2,97	1,00	
66	16	Nogales (Alisos)	70,000	10/11/10	19,31	11,23	
67	17	Puerto Peñasco	33,115	11/9/96	2,18	0,50	
68	18	Puerto Peñasco	-	6/21/06	4,55	3,94	
69	19	San Luis Rio C. (1)	161,795	6/22/00	16,74	13,35	
70	20	San Luis Rio C.	-	10/16/01	4,01	1,58	
71	21	San Luis Rio C. (2)	-	7/31/07	15,19	7,65	
72	22	San Luis Rio C.	180,886	10/29/08	15,39	10,13	
73	23	San Luis Rio C. (3)	-	4/14/10	6,99	2,70	
74	24	Sonoyta	12,439	12/16/08	2,61	0,81	
<b>TOTAL SON.</b>							
1,310,923							
326,41							
167,88							
120,07							
114,08							
<b>TAMAILIPAS</b>							
75	1	Cd. Mier	6,539	11/26/08	3,37	1,38	
76	2	El Porvenir Wind	608,891	2/9/12	N/A	51,00	
77	3	Frontera Ribereña	67,035	12/16/08	3,43	1,55	
78	4	Matamoros	462,157	6/19/03	76,60	43,03	
79	5	Matamoros/ Hermoso	524,350	3/27/07	8,55	2,00	
80	6	Miguel Alemán	24,020	10/30/07	6,47	1,54	
81	7	Nuevo Laredo	310,915	7/30/04	57,70	25,43	
82	8	Nuevo Laredo	-	6/21/06	44,32	22,69	
83	9	Nuevo Laredo	-	12/16/08	47,49	36,35	
84	10	Nuevo Laredo (2)	-	7/10/09	44,91	26,89	
85	11	Reynosa	420,463	3/31/98	83,40	41,50	
86	12	Rio Bravo/Hvo. Progreso	93,603	5/29/08	29,20	15,86	
<b>TOTAL TAMP.</b>							
1,604,794							
405,43							
269,21							
218,21							
214,37							
86	<b>TOTAL MEX.</b>						755,08
161	<b>TOTAL NABD</b>						1,250,67

W = Water; WC = Water Conservation; WW = Wastewater  
 AQ = Air Quality; BU = Basic Urban Infrastructure; ENE = Clean Energy; ID = Irrigation District; MP = Municipal Planning; MSD = Municipal Service District; SD = Storm Drainage; SW = Solid Waste;  
 Total authorized funding after deobligation of unused grants and with final loan amounts.  
 1 Populations benefiting from more than one project are only counted once.