Overview for CBP:
Alternative Site Framework (ASF)
The Structure of the FTZ Board

- FTZ Board (FTZB) is comprised of Commerce and Treasury departments.
- FTZB has long delegated to Executive Secretary (staff director) authority to approve “minor boundary modifications” (MBMs).
- CBP has advisory role to FTZB, including local CBP providing comments on all requests for new FTZ sites.
The “What” and “Why” of the ASF:

What?

- FTZB adopted an optional alternative “framework” to manage FTZ sites – codified in 15 CFR 400.2(c).

- ASF gives participating zones great flexibility to use a much simpler, faster MBM procedure to designate locations where companies are ready to use FTZ.

- A grantee can seek to participate in ASF by applying to FTZB to “reorganize” its zone under ASF.
Why?

• The traditional site framework (TSF) had become outmoded. The designation of new FTZ locations for users under the TSF imposed a major burden on applicants, took a long time, and consumed too many government resources.

• TSF’s limitations for MBMs often led to only temporary MBM site approvals and required “swapping” of acreage (which could revert later). A record-keeping nightmare!
Why? (cont.)

• Too many unused FTZ sites (often designated for speculative reasons). Too little relationship between sites’ FTZ designations and actual use. Number of speculative sites – not tied to specific users – made it hard for CBP to project resources needed for oversight.

• The ASF looked to address all of these shortcomings through a ground-up rethink: Grantee reframes FTZ to focus on serving broad area, can get simple MBMs for actual needs, and essentially all sites get “sunset” limits that remove designation if unused in 3 to 5 years.
Key Points:

• Purpose of ASF: Enable a zone to use simple MBM process for future site designations after detailed, public process – including input from CBP – to approve ASF “service area” for the zone.

• Under ASF – as under TSF – FTZ space can only be designated or modified through FTZB or FTZ Staff action (with concurrence of local CBP).

• FTZ Staff consulted with grantees and others to develop ASF to be flexible (for users), focused (for govt. oversight), and predictable (benefits everyone).
Key Points (cont.):

- CBP HQ concurred on the ASF concept as part of FTZB considering whether to adopt the ASF.
- There is no change to CBP operator/site activation procedures under the ASF.
- ASF does not change grantee/operator structure. Activation of site still requires that specific site first be approved by FTZB or Staff (with local CBP concurrence) and that grantee concur on activation.
Terms and Concepts:

• “Service Area” is the geographic area where grantee wants to be able to propose sites for specific users.

  – Most commonly will be named counties, with grantee writing to each county in proposed Service Area at application stage.

  – Entire proposed Service Area must meet the ordinary FTZ adjacency requirement (within 60 miles/90 minutes’ driving time of the CBP port of entry limits).

  – Defining Service Area up front eliminates need for full FTZ Board processes (versus MBM action by FTZB staff) when new potential zone users appear and need FTZ designation quickly.
• A “Magnet” site is one selected by grantee based on ability to attract multiple potential FTZ operators/users.
  – Designated only via FTZ Board action.
  – Akin to traditional FTZ site (industrial park, port facility, etc.) designated in advance – essentially speculatively – to attempt to draw FTZ operators/users.
  – Magnet sites are not the true focus of the ASF, and the ASF sets a general goal of six or fewer Magnet sites per grantee.
Example of Magnet Site (outlined in red)
A “Usage-Driven” site (can also be termed a “subzone”) is designated for a company to conduct FTZ activity.

- Can be designated by FTZB staff via simplified MBM (with no swapping of acreage required) – with local CBP concurrence.

- Designation tied to a named company and limited to the space needed for that company’s use.

- If the company vacates its designated Usage-Driven site, the FTZ designation automatically terminates. (A new Usage-Driven MBM would need to be done if a subsequent occupant of the space wanted to use FTZ procedures.)
Example of Usage-Driven Site (outlined in red)
• “Activation Limit” is cap on amount of space that can simultaneously be in CBP “activated” status.
  – ASF includes standard 2,000-acre activation limit for each zone – which had long been standard FTZB practice for large zones.

• Ongoing “Sunset” tests remove unused sites.
  – Standard five-year sunset period for Magnet sites (applicant can request longer sunset on case-specific basis but request must be justified; possible waiver of sunset for one site).
  – Three-year sunset period for all Usage-Driven sites.
• “Sunset” tests (cont.).
  – Sunset deadline for each Magnet site extended for add’l. five years based on activation during the sunset period.
  – Sunset deadline for each Usage-Driven site extended for add’l. three years based on admission of foreign-status mdse. for bona fide customs purpose during sunset period.
  – FTZB web site lists all sites of each FTZ, including each site’s sunset date.

• Grantee may bring any number of existing FTZ sites into the ASF as Magnet sites. Sunset tests (with five-year default period) automatically remove sites not used during that initial “transitional” phase.
Application Process:

• To participate in ASF, a grantee must apply to FTZB to “reorganize” its zone under ASF.

• Simple application format with four possible application sections to complete:
  – Part One: Standard Info. Required
  – Part Two: Info. on Subzone/Usage-Driven Site (if applicable)
  – Parts Three and Four: General and Site-Specific Info. on New/Modified Magnet Site (if applicable)

• As with other types of applications, FTZB decisions take into account the comments from local CBP.
Application Process (cont.)

- It is essential for local CBP to address in their comments to the FTZB whether:
  - the entirety of the proposed Service Area meets the adjacency requirement; AND,
  - CBP could actually serve Usage-Driven FTZ sites across the zone’s proposed Service Area.

- In a few parts of the country, closely clustered CBP Ports of Entry may lead to grantees proposing partially overlapping Service Areas. A major consideration for FTZB is whether the overlap would cause problems for CBP’s oversight of the zones.
The Bottom Line: A FTZ program that’s both more flexible and more focused.

- By enabling Usage-Driven site process – with CBP’s concurrence on proposed Service Area and again for each proposed new site – across each approved Service Area, the ASF dramatically simplifies and accelerates designation of sites for companies with real FTZ needs.

- At same time, the ASF is resulting in far fewer unused, speculative FTZ sites through the “use-it-or-lose-it” sunset limits that will apply to virtually all sites.
Other questions? Do not hesitate to contact the FTZ Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Staff Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Eastern  | Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia | Kathleen Boyce  
            (202) 482-1346  
            Kathleen.Boyce@trade.gov |
| Southeastern | Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina          | Qahira El-Amin  
            (202) 482-5928  
            Qahira.El-Amin@trade.gov |
| Great Lakes | Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin | Liz Whiteman  
            (202) 482-0473  
            Elizabeth.Whiteman@trade.gov |
| Central  | Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, Texas                | Camille Evans  
            (202) 482-2350  
            Camille.Evans@trade.gov |
| Western  | Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming | Christopher Kemp  
            (202) 482-0862  
            Christopher.Kemp@trade.gov |