



## Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB) Meeting

September 3, 2014  
1:00 – 3:00 p.m. EDT

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

### MEETING SUMMARY

#### Welcome and Introductions

*Ann-Marie Gantner, Acting GNEB Designated Federal Officer (DFO); Diane Austin, Chair, GNEB; Tim Treviño, Vice-Chair, GNEB; Denise Benjamin-Sirmons, Director, Office of Diversity, Advisory Committee Management and Outreach (ODACMO), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)*

Ms. Ann-Marie Gantner conducted the roll call and thanked the GNEB members and other attendees for their participation, recognizing that some of the Board members were participating while on vacation. Dr. Diane Austin, Chair of the GNEB, welcomed the Board members and expressed her gratitude for their efforts in preparing the draft Advice Letter. In addition, she thanked Ms. Gantner and Mr. Mark Joyce, Associate Director of ODACMO, for their assistance to the Board. Mr. Tim Treviño, Vice-Chair of the GNEB also thanked the GNEB members, especially those on vacation, as well as the members of the public who would offer their comments and perspectives on the Advice Letter during the Public Comments period.

Ms. Denise Benjamin-Sirmons, Director of ODACMO, added her welcome to the participating Board members and others in attendance. She appreciated the value the Board placed on having the opportunity to meet face-to-face at the previous meeting, which took place May 8–9, 2014, in El Paso, Texas. Ms. Benjamin-Sirmons recognized Ms. Gantner and Mr. Joyce for the excellent managerial support that they have provided to the Board and for keeping her up-to-date on all of the Board's activities. Ms. Benjamin-Sirmons offered her assistance in all matters to the members of the Board, as well as that of Ms. Toni Rousey, who recently succeeded Mr. James McCleary on detail to replace Ms. Cynthia Jones-Jackson.

## **Overview of the Agenda**

*Diane Austin, Chair, GNEB*

Dr. Austin reviewed the meeting agenda. She explained that the meeting would begin with a Public Comment period. The members of the public who have registered provided their comments and will be available for questions and answers from the Board members. After the Public Comment period the Board members will review and discuss the draft Advice Letter. The federal members of the Board will recuse themselves from the approval process but can provide input and respond to questions from the GNEB. The goal of the session is to achieve consensus on the Advice Letter. Dr. Austin urged the members to raise points on which they disagree during the discussion session, so that the Board can attempt to reach a consensus.

Dr. Austin proposed a timetable for next steps regarding the Advice Letter. If the Board approves the Advice Letter, it will be transmitted to the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) by Monday, September 8. After transmittal, the Advice Letter will be posted on the GNEB website. After the Advice Letter is publicly available online, the Board members are free to share it with others.

Dr. Austin indicated that the Board will discuss the 16<sup>th</sup> Report and other business following the Advice Letter session.

## **Public Comments**

*Maria Elena Giner, General Manager, Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC)*

Ms. Maria Elena Giner, General Manager, BECC, provided context for the proposed merger of the BECC and North American Development Bank (NADB). Many attempts have been made in the past to merge the two institutions. Ms. Giner has been at the BECC for 16 years, and has opposed these mergers as attempts by one institution to absorb the other. This most recent proposal, however, is different in that it was drafted by the management of the two institutions, not the U.S. or Mexican governments. The intent of the merger is to allow the institutions to have a greater impact on the border region and increase investments in the border region on environment-related projects. Merging the institutions would allow leveraging of assets and talent.

Ms. Giner provided some details about the proposal. The merger proposal involves maintaining two offices. The merged institutions would retain their environmental mandate. The merged institutions also would maintain their dedication to public participation, transparency, technical assistance and project development.

The BECC has done well leveraging other funding sources. Because the BECC and NADB are two separate organizations, some projects have had to be performed in a patchwork fashion, with each entity responsible for different pieces. Many of the successes realized by the two institutions have been based on the personality of the top management and their ability to get along with each other. When Ms. Giner assumed her position at the BECC, she was involved in

actively streamlining operations. In the last 4 years, investment in the organizations has increased by \$4 billion to more than \$8 billion because of quick responses to sponsors and an end to the conflict between the BECC and NADB. Since 2006, the BECC has funded 8 to 10 water projects each year, and the trend is expected to continue. The NADB created the Community Assistance Program (CAP) to administer infrastructure grants funded from its retained earnings. The BECC and NADB have a single Board of Directors with a strong interest in impacts and results. All projects now have a matrix to measure results and impacts. The staff of the BECC and NADB are strongly committed to having a positive impact.

*Gerónimo Gutiérrez, Managing Director, NADB*

Mr. Gerónimo Gutiérrez, Managing Director, NADB, introduced himself to the Board members. He expressed the support of the NADB management for the proposed merger. The management is convinced that the merger will strengthen rather than diminish the capacity of the BECC. The proposal was put forward by the management of both institutions. As such, there is no intent by the NADB to change the BECC's charter, alter its environmental mandate, or promote other types of projects. He noted that there is an abundance of work to be done on the environmental infrastructure in the border region in the next few decades. The NADB is not requesting an increase in the scope of its operations.

Mr. Gutiérrez offered to provide more details about the merger to interested Board members in a follow-up teleconference. Mr. Gutiérrez then reviewed some of the points made in the Board's draft Advice Letter. He disagreed with the assertion that there is insufficient transparency at the NADB. It is codified in the Bank's charter and policies to provide full disclosure of all of its operations. Mr. Gutiérrez offered to review specific cases with Board members. There would be no change in stakeholders' capacity to access the institutions, and the offices of the merged institutions would remain at their current locations in San Antonio, Texas, and Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua. Mr. Gutiérrez agreed that there exists an important need to continue to develop basic water infrastructure, and the NADB, together with the BECC, is working to ensure that projects receive the necessary funding and technical assistance. He asserted that large-scale projects can produce environmental benefits. All of the BECC and NADB projects receive appropriate review by EPA and other agencies. He mentioned that the Board's insufficient transparency comment is a separate issue from the proposed merger.

The joint recommendation on the proposed merger by the BECC and NADB will be deliberated by the institutions' Board of Directors. The BECC-NADB Board will make the final decision about whether to go forward with the merger.

### ***Discussion***

Members of the GNEB expressed concerns about the September 15 deadline to register public comments given the importance of the issue. They asked about the timeline for the decision and potential resulting changes. Mr. Gutiérrez responded that the management of the BECC and NADB had met with the Board of Directors in June 2011, and based on a considered analysis, both institutions concluded that it would be beneficial if they acted as one. There have been numerous meetings with the Board of Directors since that time, and at the most recent meeting, the Board of Directors voted to permit the institutions' management to draft a proposal for the

merger to be submitted for public comment. After receiving input from the public, the proposal will be discussed at the December 2014 meeting of the BECC-NADB Board of Directors. The Board of Directors will recommend changes to the proposal, if any. If the Board of Directors does not recommend changes, the management will present the proposal to the U.S. and Mexican governments. The two governments would schedule talks on the proposal in 2015. If the governments reach an agreement, the proposal will be submitted for legislative approval according to the procedures of each country. If the merger proposal proceeds through legislative approval, the process would likely conclude by the end of 2015. Operational aspects of the proposed merger likely would take 2 to 3 years to finalize. Mr. Gutiérrez reminded the Board members that the meetings of the BECC-NADB Board of Directors are open to the public.

The GNEB members inquired about progress filling vacancies for state and public representatives on the BECC-NADB Board of Directors. This was included as a priority of the GNEB in its Advice Letter. Mr. Gutiérrez replied that the BECC and NADB managers have voiced their concern about filling the vacancies promptly, but decisions on BECC-NADB Board members are made by the governments of each country.

The GNEB asked about ensuring that the institutions maintain their environmental focus in the future. Mr. Gutiérrez assured the Board members that the proposed merger would not include any changes to the institutions' charters that would allow an alteration in focus from environmental projects on water, solid waste, air quality, energy efficiency, and clean and renewable energy. In addition, there would be no change in the certification process for projects, and eligibility requirements for projects would remain the same. Under the merger proposal, a new position of Chief Environmental Officer would be established to improve technical assistance available for developing projects, grants and studies; facilitate collaboration with other national and binational agencies such as the Global Environment Facility and the U.S. Agency for International Development; and be responsible for day-to-day supervision of operations related to the institutions' environmental mandate. Ms. Giner and Mr. Gutiérrez offered to provide the GNEB members with materials related to current initiatives and recent accomplishments of the BECC and NADB, including information about an upcoming green urban infrastructure workshop in September 2014.

The Public Comments period closed at 1:46 p.m.

## **Review and Approval of the Advice Letter**

Dr. Austin initiated the session on the review and approval of the Advice Letter. Mr. Thomas Hastings noted that as an employee of a federal agency, the State Department, he would abstain from the decision on whether to approve the Advice Letter, but he was available to answer questions and offer clarifications.

### ***Review***

Dr. Austin indicated that the first paragraph provided background on the BECC, NADB and GNEB, while the second paragraph described the ways in which the United States and Mexico have benefited from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), but expresses

concern that the provisions to protect the environment have not kept pace with the resulting economic growth. In addition, although inefficiencies are cited as the initiating factor for the merger, the paragraph notes that the Discussion Paper on the proposed merger recognizes that the BECC and NADB have taken measures to improve their efficiency. There were no revisions from the Board members to paragraphs 1 (lines 28–39) and 2 (lines 40–45).

Dr. Austin read aloud the text of the first, second, third, eighth and ninth recommendations. There were no revisions from the Board members to recommendations 1 (lines 57–59), 2 (lines 60–64), 3 (lines 65–71), 8 (lines 103–110), and 9 (lines 111–112).

There also were no revisions from the Board members to the closing paragraph (lines 114–120).

#### *Paragraph 3 (lines 46–56)*

Dr. Austin reviewed the content of paragraph 3, which quotes from the *Institutional Integration* document. She stated that this quote conveys the impression that the decision to proceed with the merger already has been made. This paragraph of the Advice Letter recognizes that the proposed merger would realize additional efficiencies but expresses the Board’s concern that the merger will sacrifice the environmental focus of the institutions. Mr. Hastings disagreed with the characterization made during the public comment period that the proposed BECC-NADB merger is *pro forma*. The Departments of State and Treasury, as well as EPA, have not decided their positions on the merger and are seeking input from the public to inform their decisions. The BECC and NADB, however, are strongly in favor of the merger. In addition, U.S. federal agencies are not limited to a yes-no decision. There is the option to support the merger with the stipulation that particular concerns are addressed. Dr. Cyrus Reed proposed to modify or remove the sentence from the Advice Letter on the grounds that it overstates the Board’s case and at the same time negates the potential for the Advice Letter to have any impact on the merger decision. To reflect the commitment of the Departments of State and Treasury, as well as EPA, to solicit public comment to inform their decision regarding the proposed merger of the BECC and NADB, the Board members agreed to delete the sentence beginning “In this context ...” (lines 50–51).

The GNEB members discussed the use of the word “sacrifice.” “Lessen focus on” and “compromise” were proposed as being more apt. It was suggested that the sentence be rephrased so that it states what the Board wants rather than what it questions. To more clearly reflect the nature of the Board’s concern, the members agreed to change “sacrifice” to “undermine” on line 55.

#### *Recommendation 4 (lines 72–76)*

To avoid the impression that the decision to merge the BECC and NADB has been finalized, the Board members agreed to use the term “proposed merger” rather than “merger” in this recommendation and throughout the Advice Letter.

Dr. Jose Francisco Zamora-Arroyo and the Board members noted that the merger represented an opportunity to increase the capacity of the BECC in terms of number of projects and funding available to implement them, as well as the BECC’s technical capacity. It was noted that the BECC has a strong field presence and technical ability to administer projects. Dr. Zamora-

Arroyo recognized that there is the potential for the merger to decrease the technical capacity of the BECC, and other Board members agreed with this concern. The GNEB members debated whether increasing capacity should be added as an additional recommendation, but resolved to include it in recommendation 4. To reflect the potential of the proposed merger to enhance the already strong technical capacity of the BECC, the Board members agreed to add the following sentence at the end of the recommendation (line 76): “Consequently, we would also like to be assured that the new institution would have enhanced environmental technical capacity.”

*Recommendation 5 (lines 77–84)*

Dr. Austin read the text of recommendation 5. Mr. Jose Angel suggested changing “concerned” to “very concerned.” Given that concern about support for large-scale investment projects superseding that for basic infrastructure projects is at the heart of the Advice Letter, the Board members agreed to change “concerned” to “very concerned” on line 77.

Regarding analyzing and measuring the environmental impacts of projects, Mr. Stephen Niemeyer stated that it would be useful for the BECC and NADB to revisit past certified projects to determine whether they had achieved what they had been certified to do. Dr. Austin suggested focusing on proposed projects and revisiting this point in the future.

Dr. Ivonne Santiago expressed discomfort with the Board stating under its own authority that environmental and infrastructure needs in the border region were caused by NAFTA-fueled economic growth. Other Board members cited past assertions of this relationship by the BECC. To provide a reference for the statement of fact in the sentence beginning “Border residents need ...” (line 81), the Board members agreed to add the phrase “As documented by BECC” to the beginning of the sentence.

*Recommendation 6 (lines 85–92)*

Regarding the examples of border water quality problems, the Board members noted that these have persisted despite substantial investment by the BECC and NADB. Mr. Niemeyer’s suggestion (see recommendation 5) that past projects be evaluated is pertinent to the persistence of water quality problems. The Board members discussed the need to establish systematic evaluation procedures to ensure that certified projects meet their goals. Because past projects might not have been evaluated to determine whether they achieved their goals, the Board members agreed to add the following sentence at the end of the recommendation: “The proposed merged institution should also have established review procedures to ensure that the certified objectives are being met.”

*Recommendation 7 (lines 93–102)*

Dr. Austin read the text of this recommendation. Mr. Jack Monger stated that the first sentence conveyed the impression that the Board was not confident that difficulty obtaining information actually had been encountered. Ms. Edna Mendoza and Mr. Angel indicated that they personally had encountered difficulty in obtaining information from the NADB. The second sentence (lines 94–95) was revised to clarify that some of the GNEB members have had difficulty obtaining information from the NADB.

The Board members discussed whether the public should have access to working documents and other types of information. It was recognized that public entities need to vet information before it is released to the general public. The Board members agreed that there is a need, however, for timely access to information. It was noted that, because they are binational entities, the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) does not apply to the BECC and NADB nor do U.S. state public information access laws. Mr. Angel asserted that the information he sought, which was project-specific, should have been readily available. He had to contact multiple people before he obtained the information he sought. Ms. Sherry Sass noted the importance of every project having a contact person, which the Board could suggest, but other members were concerned that offering solutions to problems was not appropriate in the Board's letters. Mr. Angel added that he had started his search for information with the project contact person, but that person did not have the authority to provide additional information that was not published. Ms. Mendoza indicated that when she had contacted the NADB, she had been referred to the Bank's quarterly reports, but the information published in those reports had not been specific enough for her needs. The information that she needed, which was project-related and pertained to a certified project, was not available on the NADB website either. In the third sentence (lines 96–98), the GNEB members added text to clarify that the type of information that needs to be readily accessible is "project-specific information for certified projects."

Mr. Hastings commented that other institutions similar to the BECC and NADB are developing transparency policies. The GNEB members added a sentence suggesting that the proposed merged institution reference the transparency and disclosure policies of other international organizations when developing its transparency and disclosure policies.

Because the Advice Letter is not clear as to whether the GNEB recommends that the BECC and NADB offices remain in their current locations or whether the Board's primary concern is that the institutions remain accessible, this issue was discussed. The members recognized that access is important for citizens in EPA Region 9 as well as Region 6. To reflect the consensus that continued access was more important than office location for the proposed merged institution, the GNEB members agreed to delete the fourth and fifth sentences of the recommendation (lines 98–100).

### *Approval*

The GNEB members discussed the issue of whether the Advice Letter was in support of the merger or not. Dr. Austin stated that the Advice Letter was not advocating for or against the merger but was expressing concerns about possible consequences of the merger. She urged the members to encourage the organizations that they represent to submit comments.

The nonfederal members of the GNEB approved the revised Advice Letter. Dr. Austin indicated that the contractor, The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc. (SCG), will make the agreed-upon revisions and edit the revised Advice Letter by close-of-business, September 3. Ms. Gantner will distribute the revised and edited Advice Letter to the Board members via email. The Board will submit the Advice Letter to the CEQ by Monday, September 8. Mr. Joyce stated that EPA will post the Advice Letter to the GNEB website by Tuesday, September 9. After the Advice Letter is posted online, it will be in the public domain and Board members will be able to disseminate it further.

## **Discussion of Next Meetings and Other Business**

### ***Discussion on the 16<sup>th</sup> Report***

Dr. Austin acknowledged that the Board is somewhat behind schedule in preparing the 16<sup>th</sup> Report. The current schedule calls for the Board to complete a draft no later than September 10, 2014. The Board will meet via teleconference on September 16 to discuss the Report. The GNEB will meet again at the end of October to approve the Report.

Dr. Austin stated that the original draft contained a significant amount of material that was either repetitive or not pertinent. Someone needed to integrate all of the parts. She has reduced the length from 138 to 60 pages. Currently, she is reviewing the draft recommendation by recommendation to ensure that all of the recommendations are supported in the Report.

When the Board members receive the draft, Dr. Austin asked them to review it to ensure that none of the main points were excluded. She noted that some of the recommendations were modified from the previous draft. Given the accelerated schedule, there will not be time for Board members to submit the draft Report to their agencies for a separate round of review prior to the September call.

### ***Upcoming Meetings***

At the September 16 meeting, the Board will discuss substantive comments on the Report.

## **Adjournment**

Dr. Austin thanked the participants for their efforts to draft and revise the Advice Letter. The meeting was adjourned at 3:08 p.m.



## **Action Items**

- ✧ The contractor, The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc. (SCG), will make the changes to the draft Advice Letter that were approved by the Board.
- ✧ SCG will edit the revised Advice Letter.
- ✧ Ms. Gantner will distribute the revised and edited Advice Letter to the Board members via email.
- ✧ The Board will submit the Advice Letter to the CEQ by Monday, September 8.
- ✧ EPA will post the Advice Letter to the GNEB website by Tuesday, September 9.
- ✧ Dr. Austin will distribute a draft of the 16<sup>th</sup> Report to the Board members by September 10.
- ✧ The Board members should review the draft 16<sup>th</sup> Report prior to September 16.
- ✧ The next meeting of the GNEB will be September 16, 2014.

## **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 (Vice-Chair)**

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

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

EH&S Manager  
Cardinal Health  
Medical Group  
El Paso, TX

#### **Dave Anderson, P.E., D.WRE, CFM, CPESC**

Client Service Manager  
CDM Smith, Inc.  
Austin, TX

#### **Jose Angel**

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

#### **David Henkel, Ph.D.**

Professor Emeritus  
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 Ana County  
Las Cruces, NM

#### **Jack Monger**

Executive Director  
Industrial Environmental Association  
San Diego, 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, MSFS**

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

**Bryan W. Shaw, Ph.D., P.E.**  
Chairman  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Austin, TX

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

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

### **Federal Members**

***Department of Agriculture***  
Salvador Salinas  
Acting Regional Conservationist, West  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Department of Agriculture  
Temple, TX

***Department of Health and Human Services***  
**José Luis Velasco**  
Executive Director  
U.S. Section  
U.S.-México Border Health Commission  
Office of Global Affairs  
Department of Health and Human Services  
El Paso, TX

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

***International Boundary and Water  
Commission***  
**Edward Drusina**  
Commissioner  
U.S. Section  
International Boundary and Water  
Commission  
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

## **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***

#### **Lorraine Navarrete**

Binational Operations Coordinator  
U.S. Section  
U.S.-México Border Health Commission  
Department of Health and Human Services  
El Paso, TX

### ***Department of State***

#### **Sally Spener**

Foreign Affairs Officer  
U.S. Section  
International Boundary and Water  
Commission  
Department of State  
El Paso, TX

### ***Department of State***

#### **Thomas Hastings**

Department of State  
Washington, D.C.

## **EPA Regional Office Contact**

### **Region 6**

#### **Debra Tellez**

TX-CHIH-NM Coordinator  
U.S. EPA, Region 6  
El Paso, TX

## **EPA Participants**

### **Denise Benjamin-Sirmons**

Director  
Office of Diversity, Advisory Committee  
Management and Outreach  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Washington, D.C.

### **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**

### **Juan Antonio Flores**

Associate Director of Public Affairs  
North American Development Bank  
San Antonio, TX

### **Maria Elena Giner, P.E.**

General Manager  
Border Environment Cooperation  
Commission  
Cd. Juárez, Chihuahua, Mexico

### **Gerónimo Gutiérrez, M.P.A.**

Managing Director  
North American Development Bank  
San Antonio, TX

### **Alex Hinojosa, M.B.A., C.P.A.**

Deputy Managing Director  
North American Development Bank  
San Antonio, TX

**Contractor Support**

**Jennifer Lee, Ph.D.**

Science Writer/Editor

The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.

Gaithersburg, MD



## Good Neighbor Environmental Board

### Agenda

**Wednesday, September 3, 2014**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m. EDT**

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

---

- 1:00 p.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**
- 1:15 – 1:25 p.m.      **Overview of Agenda**
- **Diane Austin**  
Chair  
Good Neighbor Environmental
  
  - **Tim Treviño**  
Vice-Chair  
Good Neighbor Environmental Board
- 1:25 – 1:35 p.m.      **Public Comments**
- 1:35 – 2:35 p.m.      **Review and Approval of Advice Letter**
- 2:35 – 3:00 p.m.      **Discussion of Next Meetings and Other Business**
- Discussion on 16<sup>th</sup> Report
- 3:00 p.m.      **Adjournment**

~~Gantner, Ann-Marie~~

---

**From:** Austin, Diane E - (daustin) <daustin@email.arizona.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 24, 2014 8:51 PM  
**To:** Gantner, Ann-Marie  
**Subject:** GNEB September 3 Meeting Summary - Approval  
**Attachments:** GNEB September 3 2014 Meeting Summary - final.docx

Dear AnnMarie,

I deleted the remaining comment from the Sept. 3 summary and am attaching the final document.

I approve this summary.

Sincerely,

Diane

Diane Austin  
Chair  
Good Neighbor Environmental Board

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



Diane Austin  
Chair  
Good Neighbor Environmental Board

11/24/2014  
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.