



**Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB) Teleconference
Call-in number 1-866-299-3188; conference code 2022330068#
October 14, 2016**

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome and Introductions

Paul Ganster, Chair, GNEB

Mr. Mark Joyce, Associate Director of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Office of Administration and Resources Management's Federal Advisory Committee Management Division, welcomed the participants, thanked them for attending, and conducted the roll call. A list of meeting participants is included as Appendix A. Following the roll call, he thanked the GNEB members for their contributions to the report during the past year.

Mr. Joyce introduced two new Board members, Ms. Hillary Quam, U.S. Department of State, and Mr. Abraham Torres, U.S.-Mexico Border Health Commission, who provided some background information about themselves.

Overview of Agenda

Paul Ganster, Chair, GNEB

Dr. Paul Ganster, GNEB Chair, provided an overview of the agenda, explaining that substantive issues with the report would be discussed first. Following that discussion, the Board would sequentially go through the report and discuss minor issues found in each chapter.

Public Comments

Mr. Joyce called for public comments. No oral or written comments were offered.

Discussion and Approval of Draft Report

Discussion of Substantive Issues

Mr. Stephen Niemeyer, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, presented the substantive comments that he had submitted via email to Dr. Ganster prior to the teleconference.

- Section 1.2 discusses water withdrawal for thermoelectric use. Most of the water is returned to the system and not consumed; therefore, the 45 percent figure for total water withdrawals is somewhat misleading. Dr. Ganster thought that the difference between water withdrawal and consumption could be clarified by adding a sentence with data from the Texas Water Development Board about thermoelectric plants. In response to Mr. Niemeyer's suggestion to add a clarifying footnote, Dr. Ganster explained the goal is to avoid adding too many footnotes to the report. Dr. Bryan Shaw, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, commented that the report needs to describe consumptive use if it is pertinent to the discussion in the report. Dr. Ganster noted the importance of providing the correct information regarding water withdrawal versus consumption. Dr. Cyrus Reed, Sierra Club, and Mr. Niemeyer will write a sentence to clarify and explain this point.

- In Section 1.4, it is incorrect that El Paso, Texas, has received special consideration for meeting air quality standards; this sentence needs to be deleted.
- In Section 1.5, the study that indicated that economically distressed children face disproportionate exposure to peak ozone events is not reliable. The Board agreed to remove this sentence.
- Mr. Niemeyer explained that he had provided updated information about colonias in Section 2.1 because the information in the report was based on old data. Dr. Reed stated that he does not like the entire paragraph about colonias because water and sewer services have been added to many colonias. The information in the report describes past problems but ignores the efforts that have been taken to address these problems. A GNEB member noted the need to make the critical point that the positive actions taken in colonias required collaboration and future efforts also will require collaboration. Mr. Samuel Coleman, EPA Region 6, stated that the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and the state of Texas have collaborated to address problems in colonias. He and Mr. Niemeyer will revise the paragraph.
- Mr. Niemeyer suggested adding a citation to the following sentence in Section 3.5: “Increasing temperatures that have accompanied climate change have exacerbated many of these problems, particularly the health effects of poor air quality in border communities.”
- The last paragraph of Section 3.6 contradicts information that Mr. Niemeyer has been given by a toxicologist regarding increased temperature/drought and asthma. A GNEB member clarified that increased temperature and drought increase dust, which in turn increases the incidence of asthma. Dr. Ganster will reword the paragraph to include this linkage.
- Recommendation 3 of Chapter 3 is vague regarding which communities will see effects. Dr. Ganster explained that the point of this recommendation is to explain the effects of climate change in regard to local communities. For example, tribes speak very specifically about the climate change effects that their communities experience. Dr. Ganster will change the recommendation so that it begins: “Some local communities see the...”
- Mr. Niemeyer explained that he had submitted a footnote to the last paragraph of Section 4.5.2 to address concerns about the referenced study assuming radical increases in energy efficiency. Dr. Ganster will adjust the current language and incorporate some of the footnote material to address Mr. Niemeyer’s concerns.
- Mr. Niemeyer had concerns with the following sentence in Section 6.3: “Increased use of renewable energy not only minimizes these health effects, but certain technologies, like wind and solar photovoltaic power, can actually improve grid resiliency by reducing dependency on fuel supplies and water for operation.” This does not describe the negative aspects associated with solar energy (e.g., hazardous waste, harmful chemicals used to make solar panels). Another Board member agreed that the use of renewable energy may reduce health effects, but it does not minimize them. Dr. Ganster will revise this sentence and then obtain input from Mr. Niemeyer and Ms. Laura Abram, First Solar, Inc., who helped to draft that section.

Dr. David Eaton, The University of Texas at Austin, provided his substantive issues with the report.

- The footnote in Section 3.6 includes a statement about EPA’s belief regarding the outcome of Clean Power Plan litigation. The report should not cite a belief by a specific group or agency. Effectively, GNEB is arguing for EPA when it is the court’s decision. Mr. Coleman explained the origin of the statement, which was vetted extensively within EPA, including the Office of General Counsel, and

deemed appropriate for external use. It is intended to be a statement of EPA's position and not of any other entity. Dr. Eaton maintained that no particular party's position is germane to the report and asked that the sentence be deleted. Mr. Coleman explained that the sentence provides necessary clarification; without it, the remainder of the footnote is out of place. The Board agreed to delete the entire footnote.

- Section 6.2 contains the following sentence: "General consensus indicates that these extreme weather events and natural disasters are expected to continue to increase in frequency and intensity in the U.S.-Mexico border region as global temperatures rise." Although studies do indicate this pattern, the phrase "general consensus" is too strong of a statement. Dr. Eaton will develop alternative language.
- Section 6.3 indicates that "13 landfill methane capture projects" are underway, but there are more than 13 such projects. Mr. Joyce noted that the statement indicates that this number is correct for the border region, which is the report's focus. Mr. Coleman will confirm that this is the correct number of projects within the border region.
- He did not think that the capacity of 100 megatons described in Section 6.9 could be correct. Mr. Kevin Shade, EPA Region 6, will follow up with the individual who provided this information.

Ms. Edna Mendoza, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, provided her substantive comments regarding the report, all of which apply to Chapter 7.

- The introduction to Chapter 7 and Section 7.1 describe hantavirus and plague outbreaks in the high elevation of the Four Corners region. This does not apply to the border region and, therefore, is out of place. Additionally, the data are more than 20 years old. Ms. Mariel Nanasi, New Energy Economy, agreed that most of the disease focus in the chapter is on Zika virus, and the information about hantavirus and plague should be removed. Ms. Mendoza added that the vectors present in the border region harbor the Zika and dengue viruses and not hantaviruses. Dr. Ganster will remove references to hantaviruses and plague.
- In Section 7.2, the following sentence needs a reference: "Climate change and rising temperatures contribute to a greater presence of the primary vector for these diseases, *A. aegypti*, in the U.S. border region from Brownsville to San Diego." Mr. Jose Angel, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, will provide a reference.
- Ms. Mendoza was not sure that the following sentence in Section 7.2 is necessary: "High poverty rates in this region also increase susceptibility of human exposure to *A. aegypti* and its viral transmission." This states that if individuals are poor, they will be exposed more. Dr. Ganster explained that the literature indicates substandard housing in poor areas, including a lack of screens and air conditioning, do indeed increase likelihood of residents being bitten. Ms. Mendoza suggested the following change to the sentence: "High poverty rates in *underserved communities* in this region..."
- The second sentence of Section 7.5 regarding water quality issues should be more strongly linked to water usage and food sources. For example, contamination of reduced water sources may contribute to poor water quality in irrigation systems. Without this connection, the sentence seems to focus on untreated sewage and hazardous materials instead of food- and waterborne diseases and, therefore, is out of place. Dr. Ganster will examine and revise the sentence.

A GNEB member wondered whether "introduced" was the correct term to use in Section 7.2 in regard to the Zika virus being present in Brazil in 2015, as the virus was identified in the 1940s. Ms. Beverly

Mather-Marcus, U.S. Department of State, noted that it is her understanding that the virus has been reported in the Asia-Pacific region since the 1940s but was first seen in Brazil and the Americas in 2015. Therefore, “introduced” is the preferred term of the health community.

Dr. Keith Pezzoli, University of California, San Diego, thought that the report is outstanding and articulates well that, from cradle to grave, no single alternative energy source will be a panacea for the region.

Discussion by Report Chapter

Executive Summary

A GNEB member thought that the mention of the North American Development Bank (NADB) and Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) needed to be more clear regarding NADB-BECC’s role in performing outreach in the border region. Dr. Ganster will add this.

Introduction

No comments were offered.

Chapter 1

Mr. Niemeyer suggested that the term “projected” be used rather than “expected” when discussing the potential effects of climate change. The Board agreed to a global replacement throughout the document.

Mr. Niemeyer pointed to the following sentence in Section 1.1: “Precipitation in Texas in the past century has increased 7 to 10 percent, and the frequency of 2-day heavy rainfall spells has nearly doubled.” This is historically accurate but conflicts with the models mentioned on page 14. Dr. Ganster acknowledged that the predictions for Texas are different than for other border areas. He will amend this sentence.

Ms. Nanasi commented that hurricanes affect people and refineries, but the \$100 billion of devastating damage to the area that has been projected following a major hurricane is not discussed in Chapter 1 or Section 7.8. Dr. Ganster replied that the report mentions the potential infrastructure damage on the Pacific and Gulf Coasts in regard to chronic and episodic sea level rise and flooding. Ms. Nanasi suggested enhancing the language regarding potential infrastructure damage and volunteered to submit a short description for consideration. Dr. Jeff Payne noted that Section 1.9 addresses infrastructure damage resulting from episodic flooding, such as the flooding following a hurricane. A strong causal link between a changing climate and tropical storms and hurricanes should not be drawn. He volunteered to review Ms. Nanasi’s description.

Mr. Niemeyer pointed out that the statistic regarding the deaths of undocumented migrants in the penultimate paragraph of Section 1.5 is not related to climate change. Dr. Ganster will remove the sentence.

Mr. Niemeyer commented that affordable energy plants are needed during the transition to renewable energy, and fossil fuel plants provide affordable energy in the interim. Expanding renewable energy that currently is more expensive will raise costs for low-income populations. Dr. Reed noted that Texas has increased the percentage of wind energy used from 0 to 15 percent, and retail prices have decreased. Mr. Niemeyer thought that part of this resulted from natural gas prices decreasing. Dr. Reed agreed that it is a complicated formula.

Chapter 2

In response to a suggestion from Ms. Mather-Marcus, Dr. Ganster will add a description of colonias to the term's first use in Section 2.1. Ms. Mendoza added that she had sent a report about colonias from which language could be drawn.

Ms. Jennifer Hass, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, noted that she will be submitting editorial comments regarding Section 2.2.

Chapter 3

Ms. Mather-Marcus commented that the Border Liaison Mechanism, which is mentioned in the introduction to Chapter 3, no longer exists as a formal mechanism as a result of increased border violence. Dr. Ganster suggested that GNEB add a recommendation that the mechanism be reactivated and revitalized to facilitate cross-border cooperation. He will draft such a recommendation and send it to Ms. Mather-Marcus for review.

Mr. Niemeyer thought that if the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) Minute 320 described in the text box in Section 3.8 is the first IBWC minute specifically highlighting climate change, that fact should be mentioned. Mr. Edward Drusina, IBWC, explained that it is not the first minute highlighting climate change.

Mr. Niemeyer questioned the accuracy of the last sentence of Recommendation 4, which states that city staff in the sister cities of Brownsville, Texas, and Matamoros, Tamaulipas, met for the first time in person only recently. Mr. Coleman explained that this information had been provided by Ms. Laura Gomez, the Strong Communities, Strong Cities Initiative Team Lead in Brownsville, Texas. At the time of the meeting, the mayor of Brownsville stated that the cities had not met before on an official basis. Mr. Niemeyer commented that these sister cities were the first two cities to sign an emergency response agreement in the 1990s. Mr. Coleman explained that the mayors may not have met at that time. Dr. Ganster suggested removing the phrase "the first time" from the sentence.

Ms. Manheimer noted that she had submitted changes regarding Section 3.5 to reflect that there have been three children's health meetings in the border region instead of two.

Chapter 4

Mr. Salvador Salinas, U.S. Department of Agriculture, indicated that his office had provided Figure 4 and Table 4, so he will provide the appropriate references.

Mr. Niemeyer noted that he added clarifying language to the following sentence in Section 4.5.1: "Renewable energy sources such as solar photovoltaic systems and wind do not require fuel processing and associated water inputs to generate electricity and are consequently more resilient to extreme weather events and severe droughts than hydro and thermoelectric." It now reads: "Renewable energy sources such as solar photovoltaic systems and wind have this advantage over hydroelectric and thermodynamic energy: they do not require fuel processing and associated water inputs to generate electricity and are consequently more resilient to extreme weather events and severe droughts than hydro and thermoelectric."

Chapter 5

Mr. Niemeyer commented that, in Section 5.1, nitrous oxides are included as a component of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards when the correct component is nitrogen dioxide. The standards themselves are referred to as safeguards; they are standards. He submitted these changes prior to the teleconference.

Ms. Sylvia Grijalva, U.S. Department of Transportation, noted that the following sentence in Section 5.3 is gratuitous and should be removed: “The FHWA’s Office of Freight Management and Operations continues its review of border crossing activities at the seven ports of entry that handle more than 60 percent of U.S. truck trade among the three North American Free Trade Agreement nations.” Dr. Ganster will delete the sentence.

Ms. Grijalva pointed out that the phrase “border crossing delay” should be replaced with “border crossing wait times” in Section 5.3. Dr. Ganster will make the change.

Ms. Mather-Marcus commented that Section 5.3 references a pilot program at the Mariposa Port of Entry. A pilot program also has been initiated at the Mesa de Otay Port of Entry in Mexico. Dr. Ganster will add a mention of the second pilot project.

Ms. Grijalva noted that the three instances in Chapter 5 in which the San Ysidro Port of Entry is classified as the busiest port of entry need to be qualified as a result of how the data are combined. Dr. Ganster will address these instances in Sections 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6.

Ms. Grijalva explained that she had submitted comments in writing that update the information about the U.S.-Mexico Joint Working Committee for Transportation Planning in Section 5.6.

Ms. Grijalva commented that the last sentence of the first paragraph in Section 5.7 could include references to initiatives mentioned earlier in the report (e.g., joint inspections). Dr. Ganster will add this information.

Ms. Grijalva wondered whether hiring incentives should be added to Recommendation 2 of Chapter 5. Dr. Ganster will revise the recommendation accordingly.

Chapter 6

Ms. Mather-Marcus explained that North American leaders had established the “North American Climate, Energy and Environment Partnership” at the June 2016 North American Leaders Summit. The fifth paragraph in Section 6.3, which describes current activities, does not mention this partnership; it is likely the White House will notice this omission. Ms. Mather-Marcus will develop a short description of the partnership and its goals that is parallel with other descriptions in this chapter.

Mr. Niemeyer commented that the phrase “such as El Paso” in the third paragraph of Section 6.7 needed to be deleted because it is not accurate. Dr. Ganster will delete this mention.

Ms. Mendoza explained that BECC has been working with communities on climate change so Recommendation 2 should be reworded to include this binational aspect. Dr. Ganster had not been aware that BECC was engaged in activities below the state level. The recommendation is to encourage federal leadership to get the cities to collaborate on regional climate action plans.

Chapter 7

All issues with Chapter 7 were substantive and discussed earlier in the teleconference.

Chapter 8

Dr. Ganster thought that it made sense to include the full list of all recommendations found in Appendix A with the summary of recommendations in Chapter 8.

Approval of Report

Mr. Angel moved to approve the report with the discussed amendments. Ms. Nanasi seconded the motion, which the Board unanimously approved.

All GNEB members responsible for providing additional information must send their edits to Dr. Ganster no later than close of business on Monday, October 17, 2016.

Mr. Joyce thanked the Board for their efforts in developing and approving the report.

Discussion of Potential Topics for the Board's 18th Report

Mr. Joyce explained that the Board has committed to provide potential topics for the next report to CEQ by the end of November. Although CEQ provides the final mandate to the Board, GNEB in previous years has prioritized two to three consensus, high-priority topics for the Council's consideration. For some reports, however, CEQ dictates the topic of the report, as was the case for the current report on climate change. A meeting will be scheduled with CEQ so that the Board can transmit the 17th report. The meeting will occur in Washington, D.C., and call-in information will be provided to GNEB members who cannot attend in person.

Dr. Ganster thought that the next report could systematically examine the set of issues and opportunities surrounding better cross-border coordination for addressing cross-border environmental issues. Federal leadership is needed to accomplish this. The report could explore how this cooperation can be facilitated by the federal government. The Board could provide recommendations that would help federal agencies to overcome the barriers that impede effective cross-border coordination on a variety of issues (e.g., air quality, flow of used tires).

Ms. Mather-Marcus commented that a recent GNEB report concentrated on water, and her agency recently has been focused on cross-border stormwater and the associated infrastructure challenges. The last report on water did not center on this specifically. Dr. Ganster noted that this is related to IBWC Minute 320 and international watershed management. Mr. Niemeyer added that NADB-BECC has efforts underway regarding green infrastructure and positive stormwater management. When a new port of entry is created, National Environmental Policy Act assessments, which include a stormwater component, are performed in the United States, but not in Mexico. It is incongruous to worry about only one-half of the border. Dr. Ganster noted that the topic of stormwater touches on a number of issues, such as building codes, zoning, retaining runoff on site, and so forth. Approaches such as IBWC Minute 320 encourage the development of promising approaches for stormwater management, and GNEB could make recommendations in this area. Mr. Drusina agreed that this topic would be appropriate for GNEB to address. Mr. Joyce commented that cross-border stormwater issues could be the focus of one chapter in a report on cross-border collaboration. Dr. Ganster agreed, adding that other chapters of such a report could focus on Transboundary Environmental Impact Reports and energy sharing.

Mr. Drusina suggested focusing a chapter on how the drought along the U.S.-Mexico border has been addressed as it relates to water management. With science and technology increasing rapidly, the basins can be analyzed in a much more finite way that allows the determination of the amount of runoff that truly is being generated through natural means and conveyances. Managers then can examine the interruptions of these conveyances as a result of manmade dams and structures. Analysis of the natural flow of watersheds allows the identification of the deliveries that should be made on both sides of the border. An emerging area focuses on finding new methods to scientifically analyze basins using naturalized flows while also considering climate change effects on the border.

GNEB members with ideas for potential topics will send a short summary of the topic to Dr. Ganster and Mr. Joyce.

Next Steps

When it is available, Mr. Joyce will send to the Board members information about the December meeting to transmit the report to CEQ. The February face-to-face meeting will be held in Imperial Beach, California, and Mr. Joyce will provide information about this meeting to the GNEB members when it is available. Dr. Ganster added that the meeting location is ideal because of the available local support and opportunities for several interesting field trips. Mr. Joyce explained that the EPA Region 9 Border Liaison Office is helping to plan the meeting. Mr. Jack Monger, Industrial Environmental Association, commented that his organization has moved to a new facility with conference space.

In response to a question from Mr. Niemeyer, Mr. Joyce explained that the deadline for recusals is Friday, October 21. The recusals may be sent via email; a more formal recusal is not needed. If several nonfederal agencies recuse themselves, Mr. Joyce can send the recusal statement for approval. Federal agencies automatically are recused.

Adjournment

Dr. Ganster thanked the GNEB members for their input during the teleconference. The meeting was adjourned at 2:43 p.m. EDT.

Action Items

- Dr. Ganster will make the following modifications to the report:
 - Globally replace “expected to” with “projected to.”
 - Add information to the Executive Summary about NADB-BECC’s role in performing outreach in the border region.
 - Address the differences in Texas precipitation projections in Section 1.1.
 - Strike the sentence in Section 1.4 that indicates that El Paso, Texas, has been given special consideration in meeting air quality standards.
 - Remove the sentence in Section 1.5 regarding children in economically disadvantaged families facing a disproportionate exposure to peak ozone events.
 - Remove the sentence in Section 1.5 regarding the deaths of undocumented migrants.
 - Add a description of colonias at the term’s first use in Section 2.1.
 - Reword the last paragraph of Section 3.6 to include the linkage of dust with increased temperature/drought and asthma.
 - Delete the footnote from Section 3.6.
 - Revise Recommendation 3 of Chapter 3 so that it begins: “Some local communities see the...”

- Rephrase the last sentence of Recommendation 4 of Chapter 3 so that “the first time” is not included.
 - Add a recommendation to Chapter 3 that the Border Liaison Mechanism be reactivated and revitalized to facilitate cross-border cooperation and send the recommendation to Ms. Mather-Marcus for review.
 - Adjust the current language of the last paragraph of Section 4.5.2 and incorporate some of the provided footnote material.
 - Delete the gratuitous sentence in Section 5.3.
 - Mention the Mesa de Otay Port of Entry pilot project in Mexico in Section 5.3.
 - Change the phrase “border crossing delay” to “border crossing wait times” in Section 5.3.
 - Ensure wording is correct when classifying the San Ysidro Port of Entry in Sections 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6.
 - Add references to initiatives mentioned earlier in the report (e.g., joint inspections) to the last sentence of the first paragraph in Section 5.7.
 - Address hiring incentives in Recommendation 2 of Chapter 5.
 - Revise this sentence in Section 6.3 regarding minimization of health effects from alternative energy and then obtain input from Mr. Niemeyer and Ms. Abram.
 - Delete the phrase “such as El Paso” in the third paragraph of Section 6.7.
 - Remove all references to hantaviruses and plague in Chapter 7.
 - Insert the following addition to the last sentence of the fourth paragraph in Section 7.2: “High poverty rates *in underserved communities* in this region...”
 - Examine and revise the second sentence of Section 7.5.
- The following GNEB members will provide additional information for the report and send it via email to Dr. Ganster no later than Monday, October 17:
- Ms. Nanasi will develop a short description of potential infrastructure damage from major hurricanes to be included in Chapter 1 and submit it to Dr. Payne for review and consideration.
 - Dr. Reed and Mr. Niemeyer will write a sentence to clarify and explain the difference between water consumption and withdrawal for thermoelectric energy for Section 1.2.
 - Mr. Coleman and Mr. Niemeyer will rewrite the paragraph on colonias in Section 2.1 to include collaborative efforts that address problems in colonias.
 - Ms. Hass will submit editorial comments regarding Section 2.2.
 - Mr. Salinas will provide the appropriate references for Figure 4 and Table 4.

- Dr. Eaton will develop alternative language for the following sentence in Section 6.2: “General consensus indicates that these extreme weather events and natural disasters are expected to continue to increase in frequency and intensity in the U.S.-Mexico border region as global temperatures rise.”
 - Mr. Coleman will confirm that 13 landfill methane capture projects are underway within the border region, as noted in Section 6.3.
 - Ms. Mather-Marcus will develop a short description of the “North American Climate, Energy and Environment Partnership” and its goals to include in Section 6.3.
 - Mr. Shade will follow up with the individual who provided information regarding the capacity of 100 megatons in Section 6.9.
 - Mr. Angel will provide an additional reference for the following sentence in Section 7.2: “Climate change and rising temperatures contribute to a greater presence of the primary vector for these diseases, *A. aegypti*, in the U.S. border region from Brownsville to San Diego.”
- GNEB members with ideas for potential topics for the Board’s 18th report will send a short summary of the topic to Dr. Ganster and Mr. Joyce as soon as possible.
 - Mr. Joyce will send the Board members information about the December and February meetings when the information becomes available.
 - Nonfederal entities planning to recuse themselves from the 17th report must do so via email no later than Friday, October 21.

Appendix A: Meeting Participants

Chair

Paul Ganster, Ph.D.

Director
Institute for Regional Studies of the Californias
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA

Nonfederal, State, Local and Tribal Members

Laura Abram

Director, Public Affairs
First Solar, Inc.
San Francisco, CA

Jose Angel

Interim Executive Officer
State Water Resources Control Board
California Regional Water Quality Control
Board
Palm Desert, CA

Lauren Baldwin, LEED-GA

Sustainability Program Specialist
City Manager's Department
Office of Resilience and Sustainability
City of El Paso
El Paso, TX

Tom W. Davis

General Manager
Yuma County Water Users' Association
Yuma, AZ

David J. Eaton, Ph.D.

Bess Harris Jones Centennial Professor
LBJ School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX

Lisa LaRocque

Sustainability Officer
Public Works Department
City of Las Cruces
Las Cruces, NM

Edna A. Mendoza

Director
Office of Border Environmental Protection
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Tucson, AZ

Jack Monger

Executive Director
Industrial Environmental Association
Coronado, CA

Mariel Nanasi

Executive Director
New Energy Economy
Santa Fe, NM

Keith Pezzoli, Ph.D.

Teaching Professor, Department of
Communication
Director, Urban Studies and Planning Program
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA

Cyrus B. H. Reed, Ph.D.

Conservation Director
Lone Star Chapter
Sierra Club
Austin, TX

Bryan W. Shaw, Ph.D., P.E.

Chairman of Commissioners
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Austin, TX

Thomas Skibitski

Chief, Emergency Response Operations
Office of the Secretary
New Mexico Environment Department
Albuquerque, NM

Scott D. Storment
Principal
Green Hub Advisors, LLC
San Antonio, TX

Margaret Wilder, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Geography and Development
Center for Latin American Studies
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

Jose Francisco Zamora-Arroyo, Ph.D.
Director
Colorado River Delta Legacy Program
Sonoran Institute
Tucson, AZ

Federal Members

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Salvador Salinas
Texas State Conservationist
Natural Resources Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Temple, TX

*U.S. Department of Commerce—National
Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration*
Jeff Payne, Ph.D.
Acting Director
Office for Coastal Management
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce
Mount Pleasant, SC

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Samuel Coleman, P.E.
Deputy Regional Administrator
Region 6
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Dallas, TX

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Teresa R. Pohlman, Ph.D., LEED, AP
Executive Director
Sustainability and Environmental Programs
Undersecretary for Management
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior
Jonathan Andrew
Interagency Borderlands Coordinator
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C.

*International Boundary and Water
Commission*
Edward Drusina
Commissioner
United States Section
International Boundary and Water Commission
El Paso, TX

U.S. Department of State
Hillary Quam
Border Affairs Coordinator
Office of Mexican Affairs
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Transportation
Sylvia Grijalva
U.S.-Mexico Border Planning Coordinator
Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Phoenix, AZ

Nonfederal Alternate

Stephen M. Niemeyer, P.E.

Border Affairs Manager and Colonias Coordinator
Intergovernmental Relations Division
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Austin, TX

Federal Alternates

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Abraham Torres

Management Analyst
U.S.-México Border Health Commission
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
El Paso, TX

U.S. Department of State

Beverly Mather-Marcus

Energy and Environment Officer
Office of Mexican Affairs
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Jennifer Hass, J.D.

Environmental Planning and Historic
Preservation Program Manager
Office of the Chief Readiness Support Officer
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regional Office Participants

Region 6

Jenna Manheimer

Environmental Scientist
Region 6
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Dallas, TX

Region 9

Jeremy Bauer

Regional Coordinator
San Diego Border Liaison Office
Region 9
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
San Diego, CA

Kevin Shade

Superfund Enforcement Officer
Region 6
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Dallas, TX

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Headquarters Participant

Mark Joyce

Associate Director
Federal Advisory Committee Management Division
Office of Administration and Resources Management
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.

Contractor Support

Kristen LeBaron

Senior Science Writer/Editor

The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.

Gaithersburg, MD

Appendix B: Meeting Agenda



Good Neighbor Environmental Board Teleconference

Agenda

Friday, October 14, 2016

12:00 – 4:00 p.m. EDT

Call-in: 866-299-3188, conference code: 2022330068#

12:00 – 12:15 p.m.	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paul Ganster, Chair Good Neighbor Environmental Board• Board Introductions
12:15 – 12:25 p.m.	Overview of Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paul Ganster, Chair Good Neighbor Environmental Board
12:25 – 12:35 p.m.	Public Comments
12:35 – 3:15 p.m.	Discussion and Approval of Draft Report
3:15 – 3:45 p.m.	Discussion of Potential Topics for the Board’s 18th Report
3:45 – 4:00 p.m.	Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Formal Transmittal of the Board’s 17th Report to the Council on Environmental Quality• Planning for the Board’s February Meeting
4:00 p.m.	Adjournment