



## Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB) Meeting

October 30, 2014  
11:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. EST

**Call-In: 1-866-299-3188; Conference Code: 202-233-0068**

### FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

#### Welcome and Introductions

*Ann-Marie Gantner, Acting GNEB Designated Federal Officer (DFO); Diane Austin, Chair, GNEB; Toni Rousey, Acting Associate Director, Office of Diversity, Advisory Committee Management and Outreach (ODACMO), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); Mark Joyce, Associate Director, ODACMO*

Ms. Ann-Marie Gantner, Acting GNEB DFO, conducted the roll call and thanked the Board members and alternates for their participation.

Dr. Diane Austin, Chair of the GNEB, welcomed the Board members and expressed her gratitude for their efforts as part of the Board while supporting the environmental and border work of their respective organizations and agencies. Dr. Austin said that she will retire from the Board following this meeting as she has been on the Board for the past 7 years. Members expressed appreciation for her leadership, competence and service; they also lauded her for having a fair and open-minded approach. Ms. Gantner expressed her own and ODACMO's appreciation to Dr. Austin for her time and efforts in working with and leading the Board through GNEB issues and reports, and the time spent on many conference calls, teleconferences and in face-to-face meetings.

Ms. Gantner introduced Ms. Toni Rousey, Acting Staff Office Director for Committee Management, ODACMO. Ms. Rousey recognized the outstanding work that Dr. Austin has performed, and thanked her on behalf of ODACMO. Mr. Mark Joyce, Associate Director, ODACMO, and Ms. Gantner welcomed Ms. Diana Jiménez Trejo, Consulado General de México of the Embassy of Mexico.

Ms. Gantner indicated that the GNEB had achieved a quorum for this meeting and could vote to approve the Report.

## **Overview of the Agenda**

*Diane Austin, Chair, GNEB*

Dr. Austin thanked all of the Board members and alternates for being on the call. She reviewed the agenda for today's meeting. She indicated that the meeting will begin with a Public Comment period, followed by discussion of substantive comments on the draft of the 16th GNEB report that had been sent in by Board members, a vote for or against approval of the Report, and a discussion of the final steps for transmission of the Report to the President of the United States. Dr. Austin thanked everyone who had contributed comments on the draft Report.

## **Public Comment Period**

There were no written public comments received by the Acting DFO prior to this meeting, and no oral public comments were offered during the meeting when Dr. Austin called for comments.

## **Discussion of the Draft Report**

Dr. Austin referred members to the draft Report sent by Ms. Gantner prior to this meeting. Dr. Austin had listed the substantive comments by page number in a separate document to facilitate the discussion at this meeting. Ms. Gantner noted that the comments from the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) were not incorporated in the draft report because the file could not be opened. Dr. Austin stated that the IBWC's substantive comments would be raised orally at this meeting by Ms. Sally Spener and Commissioner Edward Drusina of the IBWC. In addition, Dr. Cyrus Reed indicated that he had a comment that was intended to clarify a recommendation. Dr. Keith Pezzoli expressed appreciation to Dr. Austin for incorporating an urban perspective into the Report.

## ***Substantive Changes***

Dr. Austin reminded the Board members that the focus of the discussion is to provide and review substantive changes to the draft Report. Ms. Gantner requested that Board members send all further editorial changes to her by Thursday, November 6.

## ***Executive Summary (Page 1, Line 1)***

Ms. Spener noted a placeholder in the draft Report for an Executive Summary and asked whether one would be prepared and provided to the Board for review. Ms. Gantner responded that the Report traditionally includes an Executive Summary, which is written after the Report is completed. She asked the Board how they would like to proceed with writing it. Dr. Austin offered to write a draft Executive Summary by November 2 and send it to the Board for review. She would let Board members know if she needed further time to write it. Board members agreed with this plan, which included completing their review of the Executive Summary within 1 week of receipt.

*Page 4, Lines 6–9*

In the sentence "...the goal is nevertheless to incorporate sustainable ecological attributes of species assemblages..." Ms. Spener asked whether the goal is one of GNEB's goals and suggested that the sentence be reworded in lay terms. Dr. Austin replied that the goal is pursued by those who address ecological restoration, and the sentence does not refer to a GNEB goal. Dr. Eckert concurred with this. Dr. Austin asked that the language be simplified during the copyediting process.

*Page 4, Line 13*

Ms. Spener requested clarification of "mineral cycles." Dr. Eckert explained that this refers to nitrogen and carbon cycles. Dr. Austin suggested that the text be edited to refer to "water, carbon and nitrogen cycles." Members agreed with the change.

*Page 5, Line 18*

Dr. Austin acknowledged a typographical error of "elf" instead of "elk." This will be corrected during copyediting. Ms. Spener asked for further details about "wolf-elk-riparian vegetation studies." Dr. Greg Eckert said that the term often used is "food web." He noted that ecosystem studies have shown the effect of ungulate overabundance on changes in vegetation as well as water flows and geomorphology over time.

*Page 6, Line 16*

Dr. Ivonne Santiago cited a paragraph in the Advice Letter written in 2013 that discussed the global ecological value of the region. She suggested that the paragraph be incorporated as an introduction to the eco-regional approach being proposed in the Report.

*Page 7, Figure 2: Map of Commission for Environmental Cooperation's Ecological Regions*

Mr. Joyce referred to the notation "Need NatureServe To Update Map" at the end of the caption and asked how Figure 2 should be cited. Dr. Eckert replied that Pat Comer of NatureServe had sent a different map to Ms. Gantner, but it was noted that the newer map did not reflect the Report's text. Members agreed to retain the existing map.

*Page 10, Figure 3: Map of U.S. Federal Lands in the Border Region*

Ms. Spener recommended that the caption of Figure 3 be changed to read "U.S. federal lands and drainage basins along the U.S.-Mexico border. The border area has eight sub-areas with similar hydrologic and physiographic features." In response to a query by Mr. Stephen Niemeyer, Ms. Spener said that the original source document indicated the area is divided into sub-areas because of the similarities found within each sub-area. Dr. Austin said that the text modification should make it clear that similarities exist at the sub-area level. Members agreed with the change.

*Page 13, Line 1*

Ms. Spener noted that listed candidate species and at-risk species are mentioned but not defined. She said that the reader might not understand these. Dr. Austin proposed that a footnote defining these terms could be included.

Mr. Niemeyer asked if a Glossary would be included in the Report and in which such definitions could be included rather than as footnotes. Mr. Steven Kameny advocated for a Glossary, which would be helpful to non-technical readers. Dr. Austin said that the List of Acronyms could be expanded to include glossary terms; the simple approach is to take terms that already are defined in the Report and consolidate their definitions into a glossary. Dr. Pezzoli noted that readers might use the glossary to determine priorities or a roadmap for the document and encouraged members during the process of reviewing comments to consider which terms should be included in the glossary; he suggested that the terms “reclamation” and “rehabilitation” be included. Dr. Austin indicated that the Glossary could be sent to Board members for review with the draft Executive Summary.

*Page 14, Line 42 – Page 15, Line 1*

Dr. Eckert referred to a comment and references that he sent regarding the habitat conditions section. He said that evidence exists tying an overabundance of ungulates—native and non-native—to increased prevalence of the cattle tick, which provides a stronger link between cattle ticks and ecological restoration. Dr. Austin said that this comment will be incorporated during the copyediting process.

*Page 16, Line 12*

Dr. Austin referred to additional text from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), which is to describe the National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS) that is referred to at a later point in the Report. The following text was added: “The Office for Coastal Management within the NOS administers programs under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA): Coastal Zone Management Programs (CZMPs) and the National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS). The CZMPs are established to manage and balance competing uses of and impacts to coastal resources while the NERRS is a network of coastal areas protected for long-term research, water-quality monitoring, education and coastal stewardship. The States of California and Texas are the only states in the U.S.-Mexico border region that are eligible to participate in the program and both states have chosen to develop these programs. (see page XX for a case study of state-federal partnership in habitat restoration at the Tijuana River NERR).” The page cross-reference will be added during the copyediting process.

Dr. Austin said that NOAA suggested that an additional paragraph be included in this section. The following text was added: “The CZMA emphasizes the primacy of state decision-making regarding the coastal zone. Federal consistency is a powerful tool that states use to manage coastal uses and resources and to facilitate cooperation and coordination with federal agencies. Federal consistency requires federal agency activities, including habitat restoration activities, that have reasonably foreseeable effects on any land or water use or natural resource of the coastal

zone must be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of a coastal state's federally approved coastal management program.”

*Page 19, Line 13*

Ms. Spener noted an inconsistency in the section “The Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Hueco Tanks Traditional Lands” section, which references the three federally recognized Texas tribes although there are only two federally recognized tribes in Texas. The text was changed from three to two tribes.

*Page 21, Figure 5*

Dr. Austin stated that a citation was needed for the maps. She informed members that the maps were replaced. Dr. Eckert explained that he contacted staff at the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to obtain higher quality images and was sent three maps of New Mexico that showed the historic dominant vegetation, the dominant vegetation current at the onset of the grassland restorative project and progress made to date. He said that the current caption reflects the new maps. The Board agreed to include the new maps and citation with a new caption provided by Dr. Eckert describing the three maps.

*Page 23, Line 1*

During copyediting, the editors will ensure that “binational” rather than “bi-national” is used consistently.

*Page 25, Line 41*

During copyediting, the editors will ensure that “It a binational...” is corrected to “It is a binational...”

*Page 26, Line 14*

During copyediting, the editors will ensure that “is anticipated...” is corrected to “anticipated...”.

*Page 26, Line 14*

During copyediting, the editors will ensure that “conducts provides...” is corrected to “develops and provides...”.

*Page 31, Lines 31–37*

Ms. Spener said that the current phrasing implies that the states have sole jurisdiction over surface water management, but jurisdiction varies, depending on the river basin and activities involved. She read text including suggested changes. A participant asked about the meaning of the phrase “and may oversee water quality and quantity issues.” Ms. Spener replied that the intent is to avoid an implication that states have sole jurisdiction over these items; she indicated that she would try to contact the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) regarding this issue. It was noted that the states issue all the water surface rights as well as surface water

quality standards, subject to EPA's review. Members discussed the responsibilities of states and EPA, including the phrase "and may oversee water quality and quantity issues," which was deemed not necessary to include. Members agreed to the following revised text: "Managing the supply, quantity and use of scarce border resources is challenging, as governance is fragmented; whereas in Mexico, the federal government manages surface and groundwater and establishes water quality standards, in the United States groundwater management lies with the states (and each state has different regulatory regimes) while surface water management may be addressed by various state and federal agencies. States administer water rights, set water quality standards (subject to EPA review), and can develop large-scale water projects."

*Pages 32–33, Figures 6 and 7*

Mr. Joyce said that Figures 6 and 7 have notes indicating that citations are needed. He asked if the figures were final, and if those who provided the figures could send citations to him and Ms. Gantner for inclusion in the Report.

Mr. Niemeyer and Dr. Reed were unsure of the originating source for the Figures. Ms. Gantner indicated that they were included in original drafts of the section. Ms. Spener said that the figures came from the IBWC.

*Page 34, Lines 25–27*

Ms. Spener recommended additional text ("under normal conditions") to clarify water rights. Members discussed normal versus flood conditions. They also agreed to delete "individual" in the phrase "individual water rights holders." The sentence was revised to read: "Except in flood conditions, all U.S. waters of the Rio Grande under both the Convention of 1906 and the 1944 Water Treaty belong to water rights holders, and in the United States, these water rights are granted by state agencies."

*Page 34, Lines 31–34*

Ms. Spener suggested that the first bullet under Institutional Challenges be expanded to reference river waters and irrigation. Members discussed the term "border river" and whether the bullets were focused on the Colorado River and Rio Grande. They agreed to use the general term "rivers" in the added text.

The sentence preceding and introducing the bullets was revised to read: "Among the more specific consequences of the prioritization of irrigation and municipal needs for the Colorado River and Rio Grande are:"

The following text was added to the end of the first bullet: "For these rivers, like many in the Southwestern United States, irrigation accounts for the vast majority of surface water use."

*Page 35, Line 42*

Dr. Austin said that the text "climactic changes" will be revised to read "climatic changes."

*Page 35, Line 44*

Ms. Spener raised a concern about the characterization of mesquite always in a negative context. The members agreed, and the text “and mesquite” was deleted from the sentence.

*Page 36, Line 3*

Ms. Spener noted that the conversions of acre-feet to metric units should be checked. Dr. Austin stated that during copyediting, all of the conversions between English and metric units will be verified.

*Page 36, Lines 38–40*

A participant noted that the sentence does not flow in the paragraph because description is lacking. Mr. Niemeyer responded that explanatory text was not provided for the example. Mr. Kevin Bixby suggested combining two bullets titled “**Loss of Spawning Habitat and Riparian Vegetation**” and “**Reduction of Native Vegetation**” to read as: “**Loss of Important Habitat for Fish and Wildlife.** Channelization, including straightening of the river and removal of side channels, has eliminated the slow-water habitats that serve as spawning and nursery grounds for native fish as well as the off-channel aquatic habitats that provide refugia for fish when the river is dewatered. Frequent mowing of the river’s banks for flood control purposes has eliminated riparian plant communities that provide important wildlife habitat.” Members agreed with this change.

*Page 37, Lines 25–27*

Ms. Spener stated the sentence that provides an example of IBWC restoration activities along the Rio Grande appears to be misplaced. The members agreed to delete it.

*Page 37, Lines 29–38*

Dr. Austin said that a concern had been raised about the population figures mentioned in the introductory paragraph to the Tijuana River Watershed section. Dr. Jose Francisco Zamora-Arroyo and Mr. Mike Vizzier discussed the reference to the populations. Dr. Zamora-Arroyo suggested that the text “1.5 million in the City of Tijuana” reference Mexican census data. In response to a concern expressed by Mr. Niemeyer that the 3 million people in San Diego County might not reside in the Tijuana River Watershed, Dr. Austin suggested modifying the second sentence in the paragraph to read, “It lies within...” instead of “It is...” Members agreed to the following changes: the second sentence of the paragraph will begin “It lies within...”; the total regional population will be changed to 4.5 million; and the U.S. and Mexican population data referenced will be 2010 census data describing the San Diego County and City of Tijuana population numbers.

In addition, Ms. Spener suggested greater specificity about the outflow of the Tijuana River in the sentence beginning “The river empties...” The members agreed that the following text be added to the end of the sentence: “...at Imperial Beach, California.”

Ms. Spener suggested that the sentence beginning “Key impacts...” be modified to include the ideas of degraded water quality, sediment accumulation. The sentence was changed to read: “Key impacts include habitat destruction, trash dumping, degraded water quality, sediment accumulation, off-road vehicle travel, and invasion by exotic plant species.”

Ms. Spener also noted progress made on an agreement regarding binational cooperation on transboundary issues in the Tijuana River Basin. She recommended that the following text be included to reflect this progress: “The International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, has been working with stakeholders in both countries to address some of these impacts and has developed a draft agreement establishing a framework for binational cooperation on transboundary issues in the Tijuana River Basin. This agreement is expected to be finalized in late 2014 as a Commission minute. The agreement will provide the means for U.S.-Mexico cooperation on issues related to the watershed with a particular focus on trash, sediment and water quality.” A participant suggested that “as a Commission minute” in the paragraph added above be changed to “as an IBWC minute.” Members agreed with this change.

Ms. Edna Mendoza asked whether the recommendations would need to be updated to reflect the progress made in the Tijuana River watershed. Dr. Austin said that she will revisit this when the group has reached the Recommendations section.

Dr. Austin confirmed that the following sentence remain as the last sentence of the section: “Two programs within the Tijuana River watershed illustrate the benefits and complexities of ecological restoration along the U.S.-Mexico border.” The word “other” will be included to read “The two other programs...” Members agreed with these changes.

*Page 38, Line 3*

During the copyediting process, the word “has” will be deleted.

*Page 39, Lines 30–37*

Dr. Zamora-Arroyo suggested including additional text to describe areas as riparian, add correct Latin names for native willow and cottonwood, and show the positive results of the brief connection between the Colorado River and the ocean. Members agreed with the changes. The paragraph was revised to read “In March-May 2014, the one-time ‘Pulse Flow’ of 105,392 acre-feet (130 million cubic meters) of water was released downstream from Morelos Dam to aid the environment in the Colorado River Delta, primarily the riparian corridor. Under normal conditions, water is not released downstream from Morelos Dam so the river channel is largely dry. The Pulse Flow, coupled with 52,696 acre-feet (65 million cubic meters) of water (known as the Base Flow), for delivery at lower flow rates within Mexico and during a longer period of time, are expected to provide for the restoration of about 2,300 acres (950 hectares) of riparian habitat, allowing for seed germination for native willow (*Salix goodingii*) and cottonwood trees (*Populus fremonti*) as well as other native species and water to sustain their growth. On May 15, 2014, the Colorado River recorded a milestone when it connected, for a short period of time, with the ocean for the first time in years at a location known as the upper part of the estuary, about 15 miles from the Gulf of California.”



*Page 41, Figure 8*

Mr. Joyce referred Board members to the note calling for a map that shows dams mentioned in the case study. Ms. Gantner replied that Ms. Spener has forwarded a map for Figure 8.

*Page 42, Line 10*

During copyediting, a space will be added to correct “1969to” to “1969 to.”

*Page 46, Box: Research on Water Harvesting Best Practices*

Ms. Mendoza commented that an update to the water harvesting case study after the flooding from Hurricane Odile should be included. The following text was proposed, accepted by the Board, and included as the second paragraph in the Box: “On September 17, 2014, CLO’s San Bernardino Ranch was impacted by extreme flooding from Hurricane Odile. Many gabions were damaged, but some held together thanks to stabilization by native vegetation. The ability of trees and grasses to regenerate diminishes reliance on limited resources for repair. In response, CLO is investigating natural regenerative strategies that can help restore water harvesting features impacted by extreme weather events.”

Ms. Mendoza agreed to forward separately to Ms. Gantner a picture to include with the case study. She will send the picture in Joint Photographic Experts Group (JPEG) format along with photo credit information.

In addition, “in in” will be corrected to “in” during copyediting.

*Page 47, Line 37*

Ms. Mendoza commented that a description of an Active Management Area is needed and agreed to provide a description for Board review. The Board agreed with her proposed text, and the following text was added: “The 1980 Arizona Groundwater Code recognized the need to aggressively manage the state’s finite groundwater resources. To support the growing economy, areas with heavy reliance on lying groundwater were identified and designated as Active Management Areas (AMAs). The AMAs are subject to regulation under the Groundwater Code and carry out programs consistent with its goals, while considering and incorporating a unique character of each AMA and water users.”

*Page 49, Line 19*

Dr. Austin referred to text changes suggested by Dr. Eckert to emphasize the need for prioritization and mention urban areas in the first bullet under Recommendation 2, **Promote Ecological Restoration Programs and Projects**. Members debated whether to include the term “large scale” or if the term is incorporated adequately in other recommendations; they agreed to omit the term “large scale” in the bullet. They also discussed whether to include “underrepresented” and agreed that it speaks to a federal language of representation. The agencies listed in the bullet are those most likely to engage in urban work. The text was revised as follows: “...U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE]) to prioritize ecological restoration activities in underrepresented areas such as urban environments and transboundary ecosystems.”

Mr. Bixby suggested that the two sentences comprising the fifth bullet under Recommendation 2, **Promote Ecological Restoration Programs and Projects**, be separated as they seem unrelated. He indicated that he preferred that the recovery plan for native Rio Grande fish be given greater prominence. Mr. Niemeyer agreed that planning could be useful but pointed out the significant amount of salt cedar to eradicate in the “Forgotten River” stretch. It was noted that recommendations regarding the forgotten river and revitalizing agreements were provided on Page 51, Lines 6–12.

Dr. Austin reminded the members that based on comments received, the bullets were written to provide a general recommendation followed by a specific example. Members agreed to revise the broader recommendation to include developing metrics and plans, and discussed the meaning of “developing metrics.” They recognized that terms can be used differently depending on the context. Dr. Eckert explained that metrics refers to goal structuring (i.e., goals with a sequence) that makes it easier for multiple partners to compare and contrast their interests and capacities. He stated that metrics also could refer to an attribute—such as a river flow—or an indicator (e.g., cubic feet per second); an example of a measure could be “3,500 cubic feet per second in the Rio Grande at peak flow.” Dr. Santiago stressed that performance indicators precede metrics for ecological efforts and should be included.

The fifth bullet was moved to become the second bullet of the section. The beginning of the first sentence was revised to read: “Develop performance indicators and metrics-based plans for high-priority species, community, and ecosystem recovery, similar...” The second sentence was revised to start “As part of this, develop ...”

Mr. Bixby expressed the hope that the recommendations section would include specific restoration projects or priorities. Dr. Austin stated that changes accepted during this meeting would be the final revisions to the Report. In addition, recommendations in the Report have been balanced between general ideas that can be broadly applicable and those specific enough to allow actions by relevant federal groups; they have never been provided at a project-specific level. Dr. Santiago noted that the Board does not have the specific knowledge to prioritize projects but could offer the recommendation that agencies prioritize specific implementation plans along the border. Members suggested that the introduction of the Recommendations Chapter could provide encouragement to prioritize multi-agency project work (e.g., the North American Development Bank) at multiple scales. As an alternative, text could be placed at the beginning of the four recommendations. Dr. Eckert summarized the potential text: “While individual agencies have their respective priorities, the Board’s recommendations should provide tools for agencies to consider ecoregional priorities and issues at a higher scale.” Dr. Pezzoli said that the recommendations would: (1) emphasize the need for connectivity (i.e., interagency collaboration); and (2) recognize the challenges of scale. Dr. Eckert agreed to prepare text to include in the introduction of the Recommendations Chapter; he drafted text, and members agreed that the overarching points were captured.

*Page 50, Line 13*

Dr. Reed suggested modifying the sub-bullet to include the idea of saved water, which frees up water for freshwater inflows or recharging aquifers. A discussion ensued about the allocation of Rio Grande water, and Dr. Reed mentioned that the modification would make the point that water conservation can serve another goal, namely that of freeing up water for ecological uses.

Dr. Santiago asked whether water reuse projects should be included. Members determined that inclusion of this language would require consultation with others, and so agreed to not include it.

The text was amended to read: "... to encourage greater investment in water conservation and make more water available for ecological restoration."

*Page 50, Line 14*

Dr. Zamora-Arroyo suggested that the restoration projects be characterized as being along the border. The text was revised to read: "Establish a grant program to support border restoration projects undertaken by nonfederal entities."

*Page 50, Lines 20–21*

Ms. Spener asked about the meaning of "aggressive native invasive." A participant provided an example of creosote, which in New Mexico invaded grasslands because of cattle preferences; creosote is native but can invade other ecosystems. Mr. Bixby suggested deleting confusing text in the sentence. The text was revised to read: "Among other actions, create and implement interagency invasive species strike teams and expand ..."

*Page 50, Lines 38–41*

Ms. Spener asked whether the reference to the Special Area Management Plan needed modification because the case study was updated. She also requested a definition of a Special Area Management Plan. Ms. Mendoza described a concern expressed by Mexican government officials that activities in the Tijuana River Watershed have implications for Mexico, but Mexico has been brought in late stages. The Special Area Management Plan should be binational unless it is truly a domestic only concern. Members discussed whether the bullet could be revised to reflect the multi-stakeholder group that has led to the new minutes. Mr. Michael Migliori responded that this plan is focused on coastal areas under local U.S. jurisdiction. Dr. Pezzoli described the impact given that the water flow is north to south and encouraged the integration of common goal structures across the border. Several members advocated for the inclusion of the Special Area Management Plan reference as a way to encourage the IBWC's participation in such activities. Dr. Austin said that the term "Special Area Management Plan" would be explained in a footnote and included in the Glossary, and the members agreed.

*Page 51, Line 14*

The acronym USIBWC was changed to IBWC. Members agreed that the international commission is meant, not the U.S. Section of the IBWC.

Ms. Spener requested clarification about the Colorado River Pulse Study. She said that a study concerning the impact of Colorado River flow is underway and is focused on monitoring. Members agreed to replace the study reference with Minute 319. The text was revised to read: "... such as has been authorized in the State of Texas, or on the Colorado River pursuant to Minute 319, are a positive development."

### ***Approval of the Report***

Dr. Austin asked for additional concerns, and none were raised. She asked members who did not agree to approve the Report to indicate such. No members indicated disagreement, and Dr. Austin stated that the Report was approved.

### **Next Steps**

#### ***Editing***

Ms. Gantner stated that the edits will be incorporated and sent to Dr. Austin for final review and approval. Ms. Gantner indicated that Dr. Jennifer Lee, a contractor from The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc. (SCG), will be serving as a notetaker and will be preparing the meeting summary. SCG also will be copyediting the Report and preparing it for desktop publishing. Dr. Austin requested that the copyeditor ensure that the first reference to Minute 319 in the Recommendations uses the phrase "IBWC Minute 319."

Ms. Gantner requested that terms for the Glossary, acknowledgments (title and organization), and pictures for the Report, including photo credits and permissions, be forwarded to her no later than Thursday, November 6. The Report is expected to be released in early December 2014.

Mr. Joyce indicated that the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) will be informed about the Board's approval of the Report, and options for transmission to the President will be considered. The Board will be informed as discussions and decisions are made. He recognized the valuable contributions of Board members to the Reports, particularly those who will not be returning, including Dr. Austin.

#### ***Transmittal to the President***

Mr. Joyce discussed the official transmittal of the Report to the President. He described ways that the Report has been transmitted in the past, including in conjunction with the Southwest Border Interagency Working Group (SBIWG) meeting hosted by the CEQ, as well as roundtable discussions with the Wilson Center, panel discussions and press conferences. Mr. Joyce said that ODACMO will ask the CEQ for its preference regarding formal transmission of the Report and will apprise the Board of the CEQ's recommendation.

## **Other Issues**

### ***Membership***

Ms. Gantner reminded attendees that the current membership round expires in March 2015 and encouraged those interested in reappointment to contact her with their resume or to provide names and contact information for potential candidates. She thanked everyone for their participation and work during the past 2 years, particularly the Board's 2013 Advice Letter, which was well received by the CEQ.

In response to a question from Ms. Spener, Ms. Gantner described the appointment process for federal and state members. The Administrator soon will send letters to heads of the federal agencies and to the governors of the four border states, who will nominate their respective representative for the Board. Once the letters have been sent, Ms. Gantner will forward copies to each of the federal and state members to keep all parties informed. She noted that the letters request an early December 2014 reply.

### ***Publicity for the Release of the Report***

Dr. Pezzoli asked about the process to involve EPA or the Board in press releases or events regarding the Report. He encouraged that a quotation be made available for a press release. Mr. Joyce replied that involvement of EPA's Press Office has varied over the years, and that ODACMO will follow up to determine the level of engagement this year. In recent years, the Press Office assisted with a press advisory at a minimum. Mr. Joyce expressed appreciation to Board members for any assistance in promoting the Report and its recommendations within their organizations. ODACMO will work with Dr. Austin for a quote from her as Chair of the Board.

## **Adjournment**

Dr. Austin thanked the participants for their efforts, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

## Action Items

- ✧ Dr. Austin will provide an Executive Summary by Sunday, November 2. Members will review it and provide comments within 1 week of receipt.
- ✧ Members should send all additional editorial (i.e., nonsubstantive) changes to the Report by Thursday, November 6.
- ✧ Members should send entries for the Glossary to Ms. Gantner by Thursday, November 6.
- ✧ Ms. Mendoza will forward to Ms. Gantner a picture for the Research on Water Harvesting Best Practices Box (in JPEG file format) along with photo credit information.
- ✧ Ms. Mendoza will provide a description of an Active Management Area.
- ✧ Current GNEB members who are not representatives of federal or state agencies should send a message via email to Ms. Gantner if they are interested in being reappointed to the GNEB.
- ✧ Ms. Gantner will send to the federal and state GNEB members a copy of the EPA Administrator's letter to all of the applicable federal and state agencies asking them to nominate representatives to serve on the GNEB.
- ✧ Current federal and state GNEB members who are interested in serving another term on the Board should follow up with their agencies.
- ✧ Ms. Gantner will notify Board members of the *Federal Register* notice announcing openings for membership on the GNEB.
- ✧ GNEB members should provide Ms. Gantner recommendations of individuals who might be interested in serving on the GNEB.
- ✧ SCG will copyedit the Report and check to ensure conversions between English and metric units are correct.

## **Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB) Meeting Participants**

### **Nonfederal State, Local and Tribal Members**

#### **Diane Austin, Ph.D. (Chair)**

Associate Research Anthropologist  
Bureau of Applied Research in  
Anthropology  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ

#### **Timothy Treviño, M.C.P. (Vice-Chair)**

Senior Director  
Strategic Planning and Agency  
Communications  
Alamo Area Council of Governments  
San Antonio, TX

#### **Gerardo E. Alvidrez**

Manager  
EH&S Department  
Cardinal Health  
El Paso, TX

#### **Jose Angel**

Assistant Executive Officer  
Colorado River Basin Region  
California Regional Water Quality  
Control Board  
Palm Desert, CA

#### **Kevin Bixby**

Executive Director  
Southwest Environmental Center  
Las Cruces, NM

#### **David Henkel**

Professor  
School of Architecture and Planning  
University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, NM

#### **Edna A. Mendoza**

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

#### **Jamie Michael**

Department Manager  
Health and Human Services  
Dona Aña County  
Las Cruces, NM

#### **Jack Monger**

Executive Director  
Industrial Environmental Association  
San Diego, CA

#### **Luis Olmedo**

Executive Director  
Comite Civico Del Valle, Inc.  
Brawley, CA

#### **Keith Pezzoli, Ph.D.**

Director of Field Research, Continuing  
Lecturer  
Superfund Research Center, Community  
Engagement  
Urban Studies and Planning Program  
University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA

#### **Luis E. Ramírez, M.S.F.S.**

President  
Ramirez Advisors Inter-National, LLC  
Phoenix, AZ

#### **Cyrus B.H. Reed, Ph.D.**

Conservation Director  
Sierra Club, Lone Star Chapter  
Austin, TX

**Ivonne Santiago, Ph.D.**  
Lecturer  
Department of Civil Engineering  
The University of Texas at El Paso  
El Paso, TX

**Sherry Sass**  
Treasurer  
Friends of the Santa Cruz  
Tubac, AZ

**Mike Vizzier**  
Chief  
Hazardous Materials Division  
Department of Environmental Health  
County of San Diego  
San Diego, CA

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

### **Federal Members**

***Department of Homeland Security***  
**Teresa R. Pohlman, Ph.D., LEED AP**  
Director  
Sustainability and Environmental Programs  
Chief Readiness Support Officer  
Washington, D.C.

***Department of the Interior***  
**Greg Eckert, Ph.D.**  
Restoration Ecologist  
National Park Service  
Department of Interior  
Fort Collins, CO

***Department of State***  
**Steven Kameny**  
International Relations Officer  
U.S.-Mexico Border Affairs  
Department of State  
Washington, D.C.

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

***International Boundary and Water  
Commission***  
**Edward Drusina**  
Commissioner  
U.S. Section  
International Boundary and Water  
Commission  
Department of State  
El Paso, TX

### **Acting Designated Federal Officer**

**Ann-Marie Gantner**  
Acting Designated Federal Officer  
Good Neighbor Environmental Board  
Office of Diversity, Advisory Committee  
Management and Outreach  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Washington, D.C.

### **Nonfederal State, Local and Tribal Alternates**

***Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality***  
**Stephen M. Niemeyer, P.E.**  
Border Affairs Manager and Colonias  
Coordinator  
Intergovernmental Relations Division  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Austin, TX



***Texas Commission on Environmental Quality***

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

Chairman

Texas Commission on Environmental

Quality

Austin, TX

***International Boundary and Water Commission***

**Sally Spener**

Foreign Affairs Officer

U.S. Section

International Boundary and Water

Commission

Department of State

El Paso, TX

**Federal Alternates**

***Department of Commerce***

**Michael Migliori**

Estuarine Reserves Division

Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource

Management

National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration

Department of Commerce

Silver Spring, MD

***Department of Health and Human Services***

**Lori Navarrete, M.P.H.**

Binational Operations Coordinator

U.S. Section Office

U.S.-México Border Health Commission

Office of Global Affairs

El Paso, TX

***Department of Transportation***

**Camille Mittelholtz**

Deputy Director

Office of Safety, Energy and Environment

Office of Transportation Policy

Department of Transportation

Washington, D.C.

**EPA Participants**

**Mark Joyce**

Associate Director

Office of Diversity, Advisory Committee

Management and Outreach

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, D.C.

**Toni Rousey**

Acting Associate Director

Office of Diversity, Advisory Committee

Management and Outreach

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, D.C.

**Other Participants**

**Diana Jiménez Trejo, M.A.**

Consulado General de México

Embassy of Mexico

New York, NY

**Contractor Support**

**Jennifer Lee, Ph.D.**

Science Writer/Editor

The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.

Gaithersburg, MD



## Good Neighbor Environmental Board

### Agenda

Thursday, October 30, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. (EDT)

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

---

- 11:00 a.m.            **Welcome and Introductions**
- **Ann-Marie Gantner**  
Acting Designated Federal Officer  
Office of Diversity, Advisory Committee Management and Outreach
  - **Diane Austin**  
Chair  
Good Neighbor Environmental Board
  - **Tim Treviño**  
Vice-Chair  
Good Neighbor Environmental Board
  - **Denise Benjamin-Sirmons**  
Director  
Office of Diversity, Advisory Committee Management and Outreach
  - **Board Introductions**
- 11:15 a.m.            **Overview of Agenda**
- **Diane Austin**  
Chair  
Good Neighbor Environmental Board
  - **Tim Treviño**  
Vice-Chair  
Good Neighbor Environmental Board
- 11:25 a.m.            **Public Comments**
- 11:45 a.m.            **Discussion and Approval of Draft Report**
- 2:30 p.m.             **Next Steps**
- Editing
  - Transmittal to President
- 2:45 p.m.             **Other Issues**
- **Membership**
- 3:00 p.m.             **Adjournment**

## Gantner, Ann-Marie

---

**From:** Austin, Diane E - (daustin) <daustin@email.arizona.edu>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 23, 2014 12:21 AM  
**To:** Gantner, Ann-Marie  
**Subject:** October meeting summary

Dear Ann-Marie,

I have reviewed and approve the summary of the October 30 meeting of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board.

Sincerely,

Diane Austin, Chair

These minutes are an accurate description of the matters discussed during this meeting.



Diane Austin  
Chair  
Good Neighbor Environmental Board

12/23/2014  
Date

The Good Neighbor Environmental Board was created by the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative Act of 1992. The board is responsible for providing advice to the President and Congress on environmental and infrastructure issues and needs within the states contiguous to Mexico. The findings and recommendations of the Board do not represent the views of the Agency, and this document does not represent information approved or disseminated by the Environmental Protection Agency.