



**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Cooperative Environmental Management**

**Meeting of the
Good Neighbor Environmental Board**



**June 10-11, 2009
El Cajon, California**

Record of the Proceedings

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Meeting Minutes.....	1
June 10, 2009	
Welcome and Introductions	1
Environmental Priorities of Indigenous Peoples Along the US-Mexican Border	1
Environmental Priorities of the US-Mexican Border	2
Environmental Priorities of the Border Governors Conference	5
Priorities of the Baja California Border Region.....	7
Cross Border Planning and Cooperation: The San Diego-Tijuana Region.....	9
Public Comments	11
Air Quality Issues	11
Water Issues in the California-Baja California Border Region.....	14
June 11, 2009	
Approval of Minutes of Washington, DC March 2009 Meeting.....	19
Other Business/Organizational Update.....	19
GNEB 13 th Report Working Meeting	25
Closing Session	28
Attachment 1: List of Participants	30
Attachment 2: Acronyms Used In These Meeting Minutes	31
Agenda for June 10-11, 2009.....	32

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Office of Cooperative Environmental Management

**GOOD NEIGHBOR ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD
June 10-11, 2009
El Cajon, California**

Minutes of the Meeting

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Cooperative Environmental Management (OCEM) convened a meeting of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB). The proceedings were held on June 10-11, 2009 at the Sycuan Resort in El Cajon, California.

Welcome and Introductions

Paul Ganster, Chair of GNEB, called the proceedings to order at 8:30 a.m. on June 10, 2009. He announced that GNEB's most recent annual report, the primary means for communicating recommendations to the President and Congress, was available, along with other publications. Management services for the Board were provided by the EPA and he thanked the agency for providing critical staff support to GNEB enabling it to do its work.

Mark Joyce, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for GNEB, welcomed the attendees to today's meeting. He also thanked Mike Connolly and all the members of the Kumeyaay Nation for their assistance in organizing the meeting, as well as yesterday's informative field trip. He welcomed the Board members and guests, including new Board members Commissioner C.W. "Bill" Ruth, IBWC, Luis Florez from the Department of the Interior, and Gary Gallegos from SANDAG. He then opened the floor for introductions. The list of participants is appended to the minutes as Attachment 1.

Environmental Priorities of Indigenous Peoples Along the US-Mexican Border

Mr. John Beresford, president of the Native American Environmental Protection Coalition (NAEPC), provided an overview of NAEPC's goals, which include environmental education, advocacy for environmental justice, strengthening intertribal partnerships, promoting environmental stewardship, providing technical training and support, and disseminating information to member tribes. Approximately 15 tribes currently are in the coalition and NAEPC provides them with information, working under an EPA grant. NAEPC is actively involved in activities along the US-Mexico border. Since 2004, it has been the tribal liaison for California Border Tribes, and it compiles the annual Tribal Accomplishments and Issues Report.

Mr. Beresford listed the California Border Tribes and the Mexico Indigenous Communities, indicating on a map the border tribes' area that covers three counties--San Diego, Riverside and Imperial--totaling over 153,000 acres. He outlined NAEPC's tribal priorities, which also reflect EPA's strategic plan for 2006-2011.

The first goal, funding for tribes, has been implemented through programs like the collaborative air project between the La Jolla and Pala bands. Ideally, the equipment used for this program will be available to other tribes. The second goal, clean and safe water, is being met by testing the water facilities in communities across the Border and drilling wells that provide safe drinking water. In addition, the Campo Rock Drop Project has enabled more than 60 willow grafts to be planted in order to reinforce rock structure engineering.

The third goal, land preservation and restoration, led to the Torres Martinez Solid Waste Collaborative, which strives to clean up and prevent illegal dumping. In order to facilitate this, some tribes are opening transfer stations in order to prevent further contamination, maintain their natural elements and collect and store hazardous waste. Recycling at both locations is also available.

The fourth goal, creating healthy communities and ecosystems, includes a focus on environmental health. For this goal, NAEPC is part of the Tribal Environmental Health Collaborative, in which information about tribal environmental health is collected and disseminated. Goal five, environmental stewardship, focuses on global climate change, sustainable development, and protection of natural resources.

Discussion

Board member, Mr. Stephen Niemeyer, commented he was impressed that NAEPC was able to generate so much cleanup activity on several sites. He indicated NAEPC is to be commended given that funds seemed to be scarce for such projects.

Mr. Rafael Guerrero (USDA) questioned if the coalition could extend their work to cover the entire 2,000 mile US-Mexico border stretching into Texas and Arizona. Mr. Beresford responded this is being considered.

Ms. Crystal Crawford (Mayor of Del Mar) asked if there were any issues regarding tribal members needing to cross back and forth over the border to engage in these activities. Mr. Beresford stated there were no issues. Board member Mr. Mike Connolly, stated they have an organization, the Kumeyaay Border Task Force, which works with the DHS. It has been instrumental in acquiring the proper documentation in assisting in the pass and re-pass from Mexico.

Environmental Priorities of the US-Mexican Border

Mr. Daniel Garza of the Department of Toxic Substances Control at Cal/EPA, talked about the environmental priorities along the US-Mexico Border.

Mr. Garza stated they recently met with US-EPA Region 9 and the Baja California Environmental Secretary in Sacramento to discuss a list of Border 2012 goals. Results from those discussions include a primary priority to reduce water contamination, specifically to support Baja in its effort to develop wastewater treatment capacity along the border. The focus is on helping with technology transfer in regards to the Las Arenitas Wastewater Treatment facility. The plan is for Cal/EPA to meet in Sacramento with staff from Mexico to exchange information about the newest technologies in wastewater treatment plants and to compile information about recent efforts.

Another priority focuses on the New River, which continues to be closely monitored. Mr. Garza stated the development of a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) should also be continued, including establishment of pollutant limits. In order to support this effort, it is necessary to translate training materials for wastewater operators in Mexico and to present a seminar for operators from both sides of the Border. The Tijuana River Valley is another important priority in this area, so Cal/EPA is undertaking several initiatives to address the trash and sediment issues in this waterway.

The second goal is to reduce air pollution in the region. One important focus has been in reducing air emissions from used vehicles that are exported to Mexico that might not meet U.S. emissions standards, and from vehicles idling and waiting to cross the border. Cal/EPA also aims to provide technical support for efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions along the border. In the last few years, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has led these efforts, but much of the responsibility has fallen primarily to Baja California officials.

The third goal is to reduce land contamination, particularly through cleanup efforts at the Tijuana River and Goat Canyon areas. Prevention of garbage from being dumped, which then gets washed into the Tijuana River Estuary by heavy rains, is necessary. Support for these efforts comes through funding of various projects throughout the region, as well as environmental education programs. Cal/EPA has developed a K-12 curriculum enabling students in California to develop an environmental consciousness. In addition, Cal/EPA is involved in efforts to reduce tire waste. A tire flow study will contribute to the development of new projects to eliminate tire waste, and Cal/EPA will support Baja California in their efforts.

The fourth goal, improving environmental health, has brought a number of agencies together to work on pesticide-related projects, including exposure prevention among farm workers and pesticide collection. A recent pesticide collection effort based in Mexicali brought in 36,000 pounds of unused and obsolete pesticides, thereby removing them the environment.

The fifth goal, joint readiness, focuses on coordinating with other agencies to respond to environmental events and joint exercises. Specifically, Cal/EPA received a grant last year to do firefighter training for waste tire piles, as tire fires are a big problem in California.

The sixth goal, improving environmental performance, can be met through promotion of compliance with voluntary programs. For example, the green chemistry initiative expands pollution prevention programs to areas beyond the border region. The "model shop" program encourages implementation of best management practices in various facilities. It is also achieved through compliance and pollution prevention training programs through a materials balance pilot project measuring the waste generated from moving raw materials across the

border. Northbound traffic is monitored, but it may be possible to monitor southbound traffic as well.

In addition to all these programs, Cal/EPA is involved with the California Mexico Border Relations Council. In fact, many of its priorities in effect right now come out of the Council, and it will continue to use the Council as a guidepost going forward.

Discussion

Board member Mr. Michael Dorsey asked, given the current state of California's budget, the kind of impact that affects the Department in accomplishing these goals. Mr. Garza stated that obviously budget deficits will affect their Department, but they are partnered with other resources, such as the US-EPA, which may help leverage any reduction in funding.

Board member Dr. Diane Austin commented how across the border the issues are the same. For instance, regarding the wastewaters operators' training program, she inquired if it was plant specific or more broadly defined. Mr. Garza responded the translated material came from Sacramento State's Office of Water Programs. The materials are available from Sacramento State and are not specific to the treatment facility; however, he was unsure if the material was copyrighted and available for purchase. Ms. Austin inquired further about translation to the circumstances specific to south of the border versus north of the border, wanting to know if that would be available. Mr. Garza stated in this case they were working with CONAGUA (Mexico's National Water Commission) and the project came specifically out of the MOU between California and Mexico. The four-day curriculum was modified to integrate Mexican laws and regulations into the training in which Mexican instructors will present that part of the training.

Board member Dr. Diane Austin asked if there were specifics about working on the issue of emissions from used vehicles because it was a shared issue across the border. Mr. Garza stated the US-EPA would take the lead via the Air Policy Forum of the Border 2012 Program. This issue was discussed at an April meeting in Monterrey. Representatives from Texas and Mexico have been tasked to look at the issue and then make recommendations to the Air Policy Forum.

Board member Dr. Christopher Brown remarked about monitoring and pollution prevention efforts in the New River. He asked Mr. Garza to speak to the binational component of that because it would originate in Mexico, flowing north into the Salton Sea and wondered if collaborative efforts were being undertaken with Mexican researchers. Mr. Garza mentioned the ongoing monitoring was on the U.S. side. He was unsure of the degree of monitoring effort on the Mexican side.

Board member Dr. Christopher Brown asked what happened to the collected 36,000 pounds of pesticides. Mr. Garza stated it would probably go to a Class One landfill to be properly disposed.

Board member Mr. Daniel Darrach asked Mr. Garza to elaborate on the northbound inspections for trucks and the potential for starting southbound inspections. Mr. Garza stated currently California and San Diego County inspectors inspect northbound trucks to ensure hazardous materials and hazardous waste manifests line up with the loads. With regard to southbound inspections, the Calexico staff is checking to ensure nothing illegal is being sent to Baja

California. The idea is to prevent illegal shipment of hazardous waste both ways. Mr. Darrach asked for clarification of inspecting only declared HazMat vehicles. Mr. Garza deferred to Mr. Dorsey, who is more involved in the truck inspection program.

Board member Mr. Michael Dorsey responded to Mr. Darrach stating that inspections have been performed on vehicles moving southbound. In collaboration with U.S. Customs, vehicles are inspected for hazardous waste and the same thing occurs on the northbound side. Spot checks do occur as well. Mr. Darrach asked where the inspections occurred and Mr. Dorsey said in Otay, Tecate, and Calexico.

Board member Mr. Stephen Niemeyer stated that Texas collects pesticides, but it does so throughout the state, not just along the border. He indicated some waste could not be put in landfills because of disposal requirements and were instead incinerated. He also stated Texas had a bill requiring a study of electronic tracking of hazardous waste generated in Mexico being brought back to the U.S. As a result, a report revealed that mass balance was next to impossible. While California's efforts are to be commended, Cal/EPA might want to look at that report to get some more insights.

Commissioner Bill Ruth commented that only about 50% of desalinization plants in Mexico are operable, due in large part to a lack of knowledge about maintenance and operational procedures. Any kind of training in how to maintain and operate these facilities would be valuable.

Mr. Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) shared that there are a lot of California Highway Patrol (CHP) facilities throughout California and other facilities along the border encompassing multiple functions, including courts to collect fines. California is working with Caltrans and the federal government to create a state-of-the-art site that would bring together both the regulators and the enforcers to handle everything in one location instead of requiring the affected parties to travel to multiple sites.

Environmental Priorities of the Border Governors Conference

Mr. Daniel Garza of the Department of Toxic Substances Control at Cal/EPA, spoke about the environmental priorities set at the most recent Border Governors Conference. During the 2007 conference, the ten Border States made a series of declarations that would define their priorities. The first priority was to regulate emissions at ports of entry, a goal that has only recently seen any concrete action. The conference members have since petitioned the federal governments of the U.S. and Mexico to review the issue and provide resources via funds or grants to address this problem. The second declaration concerned waste tires, but hopefully the tire flow study mentioned earlier will lead to new solutions to this longstanding issue.

During the meeting in 2008, the governors discussed a new set of priorities and from those discussions they wrote Addendum #4, addressing climate change, under which the ten Border States would begin to develop greenhouse gas emission inventories. The governors also made new declarations. The first declaration concerned scrap tires. At the same time, EPA and SEMARNAT developed a tire initiative providing specific guidelines for addressing scrap tires, which received the support of the environmental secretaries in all ten states.

The second declaration revolved around utilizing the ever-dwindling resources allocated for border programs. The governors petitioned the federal government to start appropriating funds to those programs back to their previous levels; and to allow the Border Environmental Infrastructure Fund to review projects encompassing up to the allowable 300 km of Mexican land.

Declarations for this year's conference are still in negotiation, but they are likely to involve petitioning the U.S. and Mexican governments to work with Canada to complete transboundary environmental impact assessments; addressing pollution, particularly greenhouse gases; and preventing environmental impacts through source reduction and other "green chemistry" principles.

Discussion

Board member Dr. Diane Austin asked if it was a good idea for the expansion to include up to 300 km on the Mexican side, especially with the current budget restraints. At that time, there was no objection, but due to the current resource crunch the focus should be on the 100 km on both sides.

Board member Ms. Patti Krebs inquired if the green chemistry principles had been drafted yet and if they would reflect California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) principles. Mr. Garza stated the green chemistry principles were the 12 seen in literature. The first step in pollution prevention programs and policies is just beginning.

Board member Mr. Luis Florez asked if the Department had considered a cradle-to-grave management for tracking tires, involving the manufacturers in the solution process. He observed the symptoms were being treated, but the cure to tire waste was missing. He stated it seems as if these problems are only addressed at the end of the product cycle rather than mitigated in the beginning and that perhaps looking at tire composition could be helpful. Mr. Garza stated regarding the Board of Governors conference, discussions revolved around market development and support of those efforts. Last year, an international tire conference was held where they partnered with rubber manufacturers and discussed engineering uses for tires. A project in development is the idea of looking at the car as a whole unit, as a "green car" and its disposal.

Board member Dr. Christopher Brown asked for elaboration on opportunities to perform a transboundary environmental impact assessment at the binational level. Board member Mr. Stephen Niemeyer indicated there is nothing preventing the three federal governments (Canada, the U.S. and Mexico) from concluding an agreement regarding federal issues. It is something that needs to happen, it should have happened, and is long-delayed. The synergies are there and the complementarities are there.

Board member Dr. Christopher Brown asked if the IBWC would consider a pilot project to look at a transboundary environmental impact assessment. Commissioner Ruth stated there is opportunity to go into the binational field with some type of program. Some agencies have attempted it, but with little success, but since both the U.S. and Mexico are interested in it, other efforts are likely.

Priorities of the Baja California Border Region

Mr. Sócrates Bastida Hernández, secretary of the Baja California Environmental Protection Agency, outlined the priorities of his agency concerning the environmental health of the Baja California border region and the shared air quality between the U.S. and Mexico.

Secretary Bastida stated that 80% of the pollution is environmental, which included residential waste and vehicular emissions. He indicated the problem is how the government is defined into five separate municipalities creating five separate sets of laws and regulations; unification between the five municipalities is needed.

Another issue is the level of pollution generated due to the age of vehicles. Most autos brought over the border are over 10 years old and catalytic converters are removed once the vehicle is brought to Baja California. He also noted there is no smog check program in existence in Baja California.

Secretary Bastida addressed the issue of sanitary landfills. Again, when working with five different municipalities it is hard to have one set of rules. The country is looking for a holistic alternative to landfill waste and recycling units are needed. Currently, Baja California is growing at a rapid rate. The government needs to involve the private sector and some sort of waste treatment organization needs to be established between the two.

Waste tires are also a huge problem in Baja California. A technological treatment which would change the tire from waste to something else is needed. Secretary Bastida explained environmental issues included the need for an environmental lab to help with water issues. Eighteen years ago no water was being treated and currently 90% of the water is undergoing treatment; however, water resources are scarce and there is over exploitation of natural resources. Infringement is occurring in forested areas and a formal re-forestation project has begun. He indicated there is over exploitation of oil as well.

Secretary Bastida outlined the need for a State Climate Action Plan as no coordination for this existed and the government should take a leadership role. Air monitoring is needed and then mitigation and reduction strategies implemented. He indicated a "Clean Beaches" program was necessary, starting with wastewater treatment facilities. Agricultural burning of waste should be stopped.

Lastly, Secretary Bastida stated investment in clean energy such as wind generation and water projects should be studied. Also, educating the K-12 students about the environment and pollution impacts would be a very important step forward.

Discussion

Board member Mr. Michael Connolly spoke about the issues with sub-standard drinking water and assessment of fees asking if these issues had been resolved.

Mr. Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) asked about the tire issues and using asphalt pavement which includes tire waste. Secretary Bastida stated this could not be done in Baja California due to the lack of technology. It is not economically feasible for companies to pursue this type of recycling.

Board member Mr. Luis Florez stated there is a solution to the rubberized asphalt issue. However, it's surprising that asphalt companies say it is either not economically feasible to use it, or that they lack the technology, especially when so many of the highways in this area are made of rubberized asphalt. This should remain a topic of discussion, and perhaps the agencies can work with the contractors to find a solution.

Mr. Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) volunteered to work with the secretary to share information and possibly link him with contractors and producers of asphalt rubber in California.

Board member Mr. Luis Florez stated the same could be done in Arizona. He asked the secretary to comment on the impacts of their ports of entry on the environment in Baja California. Secretary Bastida stated border crossings are a big issue, with both time waiting and idling of vehicles. A third port of entry is in the process of being built.

Chairman Ganster stated the problem with rubberized asphalt is that municipal governments are expected to pave as much as possible rather than using longer-lasting materials. Municipal governments are only in existence for three years, so although asphalt is a little more expensive, the municipalities' goals are to pave the maximum possible. Paving is not reviewed on the basis of its impact on air pollution or tire waste disposal. The states need to push for a comprehensive assessment, since considering all those factors could lead to a better solution.

Chairman Ganster stated recent data shows an alarming spike in pollution from cars waiting to cross the border from Mexico at San Ysidro, thus resulting in numerous health problems. This may lead to a larger focus on the environmental health costs of the border crossings and not just production of pollution.

Mr. Daniel Garza (Cal/EPA) commented at the most recent Ten States Retreat, the states were encouraging BECC to fund new projects in Mexico related to asphalt. In fact, a lot of the current research is designed to make the case for promoting rubberized asphalt.

Mr. Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) added it is difficult to convince people to adopt asphalt rubber, particularly in Mexico, but the government could be instrumental in catalyzing its adoption through financial incentives and promoting the benefits in cost, health, noise, and air quality. It was difficult to make that transition in the U.S., but assistance is available if Mexico is interested.

Board member Mr. Luis Ramirez-Thomas asked Secretary Bastida if it would be better to extend the three-year term for government municipalities. Secretary Bastida responded this is a question for Congress. There is a lot of municipality power but very little time in office to accomplish that which is necessary.

Chairman Ganster presented Secretary Bastida Hernández with a GNEB pin and thanked him.

Cross-Border Planning and Cooperation: The San Diego-Tijuana Region

Ms. Crystal Crawford, mayor of Del Mar, California, and representative on the SANDAG Borders Committee, talked about SANDAG's recent activities. She began her presentation with an overview that used satellite imagery of how the region has changed over the last 25 years and the challenges that have arisen from the development of communities along the border. SANDAG is part of a collaborative process including binational planning projects, the California Biodiversity Council and the Border Master Plan. She stressed though progress seems to be slow, patience is necessary to continue these sustained efforts.

Ms. Crawford then gave a brief overview of SANDAG, which is heavily involved in issues surrounding growth along the border. It is active in planning and coordination in 18 cities and San Diego County, and along the way it has become a forum for regional decision making. Its members include mayors, council members, supervisors, and local tribal representatives, and its advisory members come from the transit authorities, water authorities, and the Consul General from Mexico. SANDAG also has a number of committees, including the Borders Committee, which reflects increased activity across the border and includes outreach and communication to surrounding counties.

Some of SANDAG's projects include the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Comprehensive Plan, which attempts to bring together information about all the jurisdictions in the county to facilitate county-wide planning efforts on water, energy, transportation, and other issues. The plan also includes a Borders Chapter, which addresses border-specific issues.

SANDAG's involvement in binational planning began with the creation of COBRO, which allows for better communication between agencies in the U.S. and Mexico. The Borders Committee has since expanded this program to include elected officials. These efforts have led Instituto Nacional de Planeación (IMPLAN) to invite SANDAG into its discussions in Mexico, which has enabled even greater collaboration.

SANDAG has taken part in several binational projects. In estimating the economic impact of border wait times, interviews with people at major border crossings have revealed significant financial, environmental, and health impacts related to long wait times, and that information was useful in getting the attention of policy makers. The Estimating Economic Impacts of Border Wait Times April 2006 report showed that billions of dollars are being lost at the border because of the long wait times, in addition to the impacts on air quality and quality of life.

The Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan looked at transportation, housing, public health issues, employment, industrial areas, and environmental conservation activities in San Diego and in Tijuana. It greatly helped in the siting and development for the east Otay Mesa border crossing. It was a great pilot project for the binational strategic planning between SANDAG and Mexico.

Ms. Crawford discussed her role on the California Biodiversity Council. CBC includes 42 representatives from federal, state and local agencies, who meet to develop strategies to ensure that all agencies are working together and communicating with one another. In 2006, CBC met in San Diego and toured several biodiversity hotspots along the border. The end result

was the formation of two working groups, the Las Californias Working Group and the Tijuana Estuary Issues Working Group that have had some success in preserving those spots. In addition, Baja California has talked about forming a sister biodiversity council that would work with CBC.

The Border Master Plan, SANDAG's most recent project, was adopted and praised by the participating agencies, and efforts are underway to replicate it along the border. Its purpose was to assess the transportation needs on both sides of the border and coordinate the planning and delivery of the resulting projects. Six land ports of entry were studied, which were ranked, and those numbers helped SANDAG rank the importance of each port of entry.

Discussion

Chairman Ganster commented on Ms. Crawford's statement on need for patience. It is important to balance political turnover with the longer timeframes required to develop and complete many of these projects. Some continuity can be achieved by NGOs and business associations that can ensure these projects remain priorities from one political term to another. Ms. Crawford concurred with Chairman Ganster's comments, noting that success depends on stakeholder involvement and not complete dependence on elected officials who might come and go.

Board member Mr. Stephen Niemeyer stated he felt disheartened after seeing the picture of the Tijuana Estuary before the triple security fence was built. Though the border might be safer now, he stated a representative from DHS should be present at board meetings to talk about how to balance these two issues. This representative should have an eye towards an international focus, since so many of GNEB's priorities require working with Mexico. Ms. Crawford commented it was good for the region and the whole southwest to have former Governor Napolitano now as Secretary of Homeland Security. Ms. Napolitano has visited the region and understands the Arizona border, as well as the dynamics in dealing with border issues. Ms. Crawford stated it is easier to preserve the habitat rather than to go back and mitigate, but now that it's been done the fencing issues have to be addressed.

Mr. Mark Joyce, DFO for GNEB, stated this issue will be reviewed at tomorrow's meeting. Preliminary discussions with CEQ reveal interest in the fence. Representatives from DHS and other federal agencies need to be appointed to the board.

Board member Dr. Christopher Brown commented an international context may broaden the discussion past what CBP and DHS only care about, which is security. He asked if she could clarify the relationship between the Border Committee within SANDAG's internal administrative structure and COBRO. Ms. Crawford stated the COBRO is a working group. Once the Borders Committee was created in 2002, the COBRO now reports to Borders and the Borders Committee reports to the full Board.

Mr. Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) stated a lot of this work is only possible through the participation of stakeholders and people with expertise in specific areas. They are able to provide information to the working groups and committees, who then bring it to the board; COBRO plays that role.

Ms. Sylvia Grijalva (Department of Transportation) expressed her gratitude and pleasure in working with SANDAG and Caltrans and their great working relationship.

Mr. Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) shared accomplishments occurred by de-politicizing the environment. The investments are grounded by criteria; policy and not politics.

Board member Mr. Michael Connolly complimented SANDAG in the incorporation of tribal representatives, which has been valuable to regional planning initiatives. The tribes in San Diego control more than 20% of developable county land, but the County Department of Planning and Land Use has refused to build out reservations as part of their long-term planning. Due to the inter-governmental nature of SANDAG it has provided a forum to bring these types of issues into discussion.

Public Comments

Chairman Ganster opened the floor for public comments; no participants responded.

Air Quality Issues

Mr. Michael Gibbs, assistant secretary for regional climate initiatives at Cal/EPA, discussed the effects of climate change on the Border Regions and provided an update on California's climate change programs. A history of California's Climate Activities includes promotion of an energy efficiency portfolio. It set the standard by creating a registry for greenhouse gas emissions, and its regulations concerning emissions standards for vehicles, which has now reached the federal level. Moreover, in 2006, the state legislature enacted SB 1368, a bill that required setting emissions performance standards for new power plant capacity, the first in the nation to do that. The governor issued a Market Mechanisms Executive Order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to set low carbon fuel standards.

Last year, the state passed a law requiring regional planning organizations to set greenhouse gas emissions targets and incorporate them into their planning initiatives. No other state has this requirement, so if it succeeds, it could provide a model for how other states could guide planning and growth towards reducing these emissions.

One reason California has been so active in environmental reform is because there is concern about what is at stake. There has been a lot of literature speaking to the impact of climate change; and those risks are exacerbated due to the size of the state. California's agencies are drafting a research report that will assess the physical and economic impacts of climate change on what is at stake. This includes water resources, public health and air quality, coastal and ocean resources, agriculture and forestry, hydroelectric power, and wildfires.

While a number of programs were already in place, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, AB 32, created the framework in which the state now addresses climate change. For example, the act aims to bring greenhouse gas emissions back to 1990 levels by 2020; several advisory committees are devoted to environmental justice and economic and technology advancement; and a review board looks at how the various pieces can fit together in a larger framework. The

Air Resources Board adopted the Scoping Plan last December which creates a roadmap for how all this comes together.

A mandatory reporting rule requires facilities to report their emissions of greenhouse gases. The law was adopted in 2007, and the first set of reports was due June 1. Third-party verification is not required this first year, but it will be required going forward. This rule applies to stationary sources that emit a minimum of 25,000 metric tons or more of CO₂. These facilities are also required to report the emissions produced elsewhere that enter the state.

While many of the requirements in AB 32 will take a long time to implement, some measures can go into effect immediately. The low carbon fuel standard, for example, requires the fuel used by cars and trucks to have lower carbon content, through advanced biofuels or another source, leading to a 10% carbon reduction by 2020. Not only would this have the largest emissions impact, but it also diversifies the fuel supply. The Scoping Plan in AB 32 includes a range of measures that can reduce emissions, including a cap and trade program, vehicle standards, increased investment in energy efficiency, and a diversified fuel portfolio that includes wind and solar power.

The Western Climate Initiative (WCI), which includes seven Western states and four Canadian provinces, has proposed a cap and trade standard that could be adopted by each state and province and trading could take place across the entire region. Observer states, which include six Mexican Border States, observe and participate in WCI's discussions, and they have the opportunity to lend a perspective on the issues that affect them. For example, an emissions offset project would improve efficiency in the border region, which could produce cap and trade credits to be used in WCI's program. The cap and trade program would operate in two phases. In the first phase, facilities would see their standards ratcheted down as the program progressed, and then in 2015 transportation fuel standards would be introduced. The standards would start at actual emissions, until a 15% goal is achieved by 2020.

Mr. Gibbs noted that climate change is better managed at the regional level than at the local level because greenhouse gases have a global impact, and so the source of the emissions is irrelevant. A regional program encompasses more sites in more jurisdictions, thus creating a larger impact, and has more influence over a national program, such as the proposed guidelines under discussion in Washington right now. While federal action would be welcome, it does not mean that regional actions can fall away. If the federal program is enacted, California will adjust its program so that it is more efficient while still contributing to the federal program.

California has an MOU with SEMARNAT that covers vehicles, tires, water, and other issues, but it also contains a climate change component, under which the two agencies will exchange information about carbon markets and emissions registries. Cal/EPA is currently initiating the next round of research on which it would like to collaborate with SEMARNAT. In addition, it will hold workshops discussing the new vehicle emission standards and carbon fuel standards.

Discussion

Mr. Gibbs stated in response to Board member Mr. Stephen Niemeyer's question that AEO meant Annual Energy Outlook produced by the Energy Information Agency. Mr. Niemeyer asked if cap and trade made sense versus a national carbon tax. Mr. Gibbs stated California is moving in the cap and trade direction. Congress is heading toward a cap and trade program.

Debate continues about which is better, easier, more effective, less subject to manipulation, better protective, and which would create a more level playing field. With cap and trade, more certainty towards goal would be more achievable than with a carbon tax, which does not guarantee or bring one closer to goal over a period of time. On the other hand, if concern exists about market manipulation and inability to provide effective oversight to that market, then movement to a carbon tax direction would be suggested.

Board member Mr. Stephen Niemeyer stated that economists' models show if everything was done according to plan and absent BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India and China) countries taking a role, by the year 2050 only a 6th percentile change would occur in CO₂ generated. Mr. Gibbs stated that the U.S. and Europe cannot work alone. It is important for a strong global agreement between other countries, India and China in particular, to get involved in these initiatives. The foundation for international discussions on this issue was set in 1992 in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, with a goal of bringing developed and underdeveloped countries together to work towards emissions reduction globally. Mr. Niemeyer stated the U.S.'s history with natural resources will make it difficult to convince other nations to be sensitive to environmental impacts, using as an analogy development of water resources in the U.S. and the U.S. NGO attempts to stop Chilean development of hydroelectric power. Mr. Gibbs noted there still remains lack of agreement on the issue of needing renewable power facilities, but nowhere to site these stations and that the U.S. needs to be a leader to convince the BRIC nations to reduce CO₂ emissions.

Board member Ms. Ann Marie Wolfe asked if environmental justice issues regarding the cap and trade were reviewed during the scoping process. Mr. Gibbs stated the environmental justice component of the Scoping Plan was highly visible and a series of meetings occurred. The environmental justice representatives on the committee were not satisfied with the end result. Discussion continues. The objective is to put together a balanced program that delivers the cost effective benefits required by law while also putting in place an enduring policy that will achieve the long-term goals.

Mr. Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) stated the biggest producers of GHG are the transportation and energy sectors. He asked what role technology will play in a way that protects both quality of life and Mother Earth. Mr. Gibbs looks at this problem in time sections; between now and 2020 what should be done; from 2020 to 2035 and then 2040 on. Between now and 2020, new technology is not needed. The ability to site, fund and build energy stations and retrofit existing buildings to make them more efficient is necessary. Between 2020 and 2035, penetration of new technology will be seen, most likely in the transportation sector. California has tried to approach the three pieces of transportation at the same time: The vehicles themselves by emission reduction requirements from the tailpipe; the fuel by starting with the low carbon fuel standard; and the requirements for travel itself, the SB 375 impact, which is the most innovative and most experimental of all three. Aligning the incentives is the challenge.

Board member Dr. Christopher Brown in response to Mr. Niemeyer's comments stated if we cannot address the BRIC we're sunk. Only by leading by action can one hope to ask and argue for change from the other nations. Dr. Brown asked how one would change from an observer to a participant in the Western Climate Initiative. Mr. Gibbs stated the WCI partners are committing to do the cap and trade program. In order to do this a Climate Action Plan and an Emissions Goal are required. The WCI is not trying to gather new partners currently. Dr. Brown asked where was Texas in the WCI.

Board member Mr. Stephen Niemeyer responded Texas is the leading provider of wind energy in the nation. However, the cap and trade program proposed in the Waxman-Markey bill would cause a lot of economical problems for Texas, and if Texas suffers, the rest of the country will follow suit. Texas produces 40 percent of the nation's petrochemical products.

Mr. Jose Garcia (EPA) asked how much research has been done looking at the cost effectiveness of leasing roof space in California for establishment of erecting solar arrays. Mr. Gibbs stated a couple of programs are in place. SB 1, the California Solar Initiative, provides incentives for this. SCE has a rent-a-roof program to create this capacity. It is seen as a very valuable and available resource. There is a large-scale solar program, which is not roof oriented but would go in the desert, and this is an important part of the solution.

Board member Ms. Patti Krebs asked what does stage four generation mean in biofuels. Mr. Gibbs could not answer her question.

Board member Mr. Michael Connolly requested that Mr. Gibbs speak to the Climate Registry. Mr. Gibbs is a voluntary program for corporations and other organizations to report GHG emissions in a consistent way using well-recognized and robust protocols. The Climate Registry is made of 40 states, the District of Columbia, 12 Canadian provinces, 6 border states, and 4 tribes. Though Texas has not joined, there are companies based in Texas that do report.

Dr. Efrain Nieblas is the head of environmental planning for Secretaría de Protección al Ambiente, Baja California (SPABC). He discussed the greenhouse gases initiative taking place in Baja California. Since 2005, the government has taken action towards climate change, whereby a national strategy has been implemented. In 2008, an agreement was signed, the PEAC-BC, and a series of work groups were created to address the issues of climate change on agriculture, health and ecosystems.

Dr. Nieblas provided an overview of the Plan Estatal de Acción Climática – Baja California (PEAC-BC), noting it includes external experts with technical knowledge and government agencies. An inventory on GHG was established using 2005 as the base year in order to development guidelines. He provided regional and local results, reviewed temperature changes, and precipitation data. He noted climate change would impact health, agriculture, energy, water, and tourism. He indicated mitigation measures of GHG needed development, but currently no state funding existed so they were looking toward federal funding.

Discussion

Chairman Ganster asked how things were progressing in California and Baja California. Dr. Nieblas stated they had a meeting last week at SANDAG's invitation. They are working on a climate change action plan that will hopefully comply with SB 375.

Mr. Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) stated to make that goal easier to achieve, it is important to work with Mexican agencies so that everyone is working towards the same goal.

Water Issues in the California-Baja California Border Region

Mr. Hernando Durán Cabrera, director of the Comisión Estatal de Servicios Públicos de Tijuana, gave an overview of Tijuana's water treatment and supply programs. He explained CESPT is a state water and wastewater entity serving 500,000 homes and businesses. It has 1,764 employees, 3 potabilization plants, and 13 wastewater treatment plants in 7 districts. He reviewed bar graphs showing population growth and effect on water coverage from 1990 to 2009.

Mr. Durán indicated water was a development instrument, outlining current projects such as the Colorado River Aqueduct expansion, the Florido Popotla Hydraulic System, the Valle de Las Palmas System, the Valle Redondo Works, the Coastal Zone, and the desalination project. The aim of water development is to not turn away any investment opportunities due to lack of water.

Binational issues include the Tijuana River Watershed; and the signing of the 1944 Water Treaty, which has current implications. National issues include the Zero Discharges Initiative; the Wastewater Treatment Plants in Monte de los Olivos and La Morita; and the Purple Pipe Project. Goals of the Purple Pipe Project are to increase green areas for Tijuana and Rosarito beaches; increase recycled water consumption to 20% by 2013; install purple pipe lines throughout the city where recycled water is available; and reduce treated water discharges to the Pacific Ocean.

Discussion

Mr. Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) and Commissioner Bill Ruth congratulated and applauded CESPT on the excellent work accomplished.

Ms. Halla Razak (San Diego County Water Authority) asked if there were private uses for the treated water. Mr. Durán stated currently there were none, but businesses have expressed interest in buying, treating and reselling the water. Ms. Razak asked if there were planned uses for potable water. Mr. Durán responded there was a business plan in development and studies are being done. The water needs to be taken from further upstream in order to create a natural potabilization system. There would be an impact on rates for the end user.

Board member Mr. John Wood asked if CESPT conducted many general public presentations and what was the public's response. Mr. Durán replied it was not necessary to hold public hearings and they were meeting their government's standards.

Ms. Halla Razak, Colorado River Programs Director of the San Diego County Water Authority, talked about water supply issues affecting San Diego. The San Diego County Water Authority is a wholesale water agency that includes 24 member agencies and 35 board members. The group serves 3 million people, or 97% of the county's population, over 920,000 acres.

Contrary to popular belief, only about 18% of San Diego's water comes from within the county. The rest is imported, most notably from the Sacramento Bay Delta and the Colorado River. Because of new pumping restrictions in the Bay Delta, San Diego had to declare a water

emergency in April, which led to water reductions and allocations of 13% in the metropolitan area and 8% by the Water Authority. These allocations will be in place until June 2010.

The long-term water supply outlook is focused on diversifying San Diego's water sources. A \$3.6 billion Capital Improvement Program was launched to improve water delivery and storage and create an emergency supply system. In an effort to expand local water supplies, the Water Authority is greenlighting projects around recycled water, groundwater, seawater desalinization and conservation. These programs are performed in tandem with efforts to secure new imported water supplies and resolving issues in the Bay Delta.

Several imported water supplies were secured under the Quantification Settlement Agreement, including the Imperial Irrigation District and the Imperial Valley of San Diego, as well as two canal lining projects. This has increased the imported water supply by 280,000 acre feet per year over several decades. Since 1991, the water supply portfolio has been greatly diversified, and will continue to branch out through 2020.

The Water Authority has also been involved in cooperative programs with Mexico, which are overseen by IBWC, which strive to improve the water supply, management and efficiency in both countries. Much of the dialogue taking place now stemmed from challenges that arose in prior projects. For example, some projects helped reduce excess water from the Colorado River to Mexico, but they took as long as 20 years to complete.

There were also political conflicts. Seepage from the All American Canal was providing water for an aquifer, and Mexican farmers used that water, so when project began to line the All American Canal, Mexico opposed it. However, the U.S. referred to treaty requirements that barred Mexico from using that water. In addition, the U.S. is building a Drop 2 structure that will catch excess flows going into Mexico, and a pilot Yuma desalinization program will affect both water supply to Mexico and the environment in the region. The issues arising from these projects have led to greater dialogue between the two countries, as well as some litigation.

The Colorado River Basin States have worked together to complete shortage criteria. The Colorado River has flowed in such a way that it hasn't seen significant drought, but there has been a drought over the last seven years, raising questions over water allocation. So the Basin States were told to find a solution to the shortage sharing issue. However, Mexico was not involved in those discussions. There were also informal conversations about cost-sharing projects with Mexico. All these issues combined made a strong case for working with Mexico on future water projects.

Among the current water resources issues, climate change is critical, as it is difficult to predict how the river will act under its impact, so it is important to have a system for dealing with any potential shortages and maintaining water quality. Mexico has long complained that their incoming water is heavily salinated, so it is asking the U.S. to examine this and other water quality issues. The system operations are under review that will make existing facilities more efficient. For example, Mexico is interested in moving some of its water through the All American Canal, from the Colorado River to Tijuana on the coast.

In these binational initiatives, the U.S. State Department and Mexico's SRE have delegated authority to IBWC and CILA, respectively. Each agency oversees core groups and work groups that concentrate on specific aspects of these efforts; the four work groups are focused on new

water supply, water conservation, system operations, and environmental issues. These groups are not trying to change the 1944 treaty with Mexico; rather, they are trying to develop concepts that enable both countries to work within the treaty, thus allowing for better shortage management and beneficial changes to system operations.

The U.S. and Mexico are continually looking at potential projects in both countries, including ocean desalination sites, irrigation improvements in the Mexicali Valley, the Colorado Delta wetlands, and New River water treatment. When looking at these projects, both countries consider how to deal with potential conflicts before they happen, better water management at the river basin, benefits for areas on both sides of the border, and how to improve international relations. However, there are also challenges concerning legal and institutional issues, differences in federal and state laws, and issues that might supersede water management, such as homeland security. In addition, people on one side of the border might not trust the authorities on the other side, so it is important to share what is being done and why with the people these projects will impact.

The work groups and core groups meet every other month, and this regular contact has made a significant difference in what both sides are doing and how they work together.

Discussion

Mr. Rafael Guerrero (USDA) asked if the agricultural land where water was lost from transfer to the urban areas had been seeded so it was protected from wind erosion. Mr. Guerrero also asked if the IBWC process for binational cooperation was implemented in the Rio Grande basin. Ms. Razak stated on the agriculture to urban transfer, the area was seeded and no erosion occurred. Farming farmers do not like it, though they can sell the unused water, but seed companies and workers who are also dependent on farming are negatively socio-economically impacted. Commissioner Bill Ruth stated with regard to the IBWC and the Rio Grande basin, the process is very complex and dialogue is continuing.

Board member Dr. Christopher Brown spoke of the elephant in the room not being identified. He brought up the lining of the All American Canal, as well as establishment of the Drop 2 Reservoir. He stated in all cases Mexico's water supply is reduced dramatically. He challenged the collective in the room to think about the equity issues involved. He stated in all instances a transboundary environmental impact assessment was missing.

Board member Mr. Daniel Darrach responded to Dr. Brown's comments, stating Commissioner Ruth urged everybody to work towards solution of some of the equity issues, though plans are still in process. It brings Mexico, the U.S. and NGOs together to find a cooperative solution to the impact on the wetlands. Orders were given to build the Drop 2 Reservoir and congressional orders were followed.

Mr. Craig Nettleton, co-chair of the Tijuana River Valley Recovery Team and president of Open Oceans Global, provided an update to the recovery team's effort. The Tijuana River Valley is defined by highlands with canyons that run across the border. It has three major water entry points: the Main Channel in San Ysidro, Smuggler's Gulch, and Goat Canyon. The biggest problem in the valley is the sedimentation that occurs after a rainfall as well as the trash and contaminants that collect and affect water flow. Even before the 1944 Treaty, the U.S. and Mexico were talking about how to handle wastewater coming from both sides of the border.

When IBWC's plan for secondary treatment at the International Wastewater Treatment Plant was developed, it created an opportunity to address the issues in the valley, and so the Tijuana River Valley Recovery Team was created. The team is primarily focused on the trash and sediment aspects of the valley. However, there are complex answers to the question of who owns the property, who regulates it, who uses it and why. The challenge is how to integrate those disparate parts and players into a team that can work together and also reach out to the Mexican agencies.

The team includes more than 30 federal, state and local agencies from the U.S. and Mexico. Its four action teams work together under the guidance of one policy committee. Its vision is to rid Tijuana River Valley of trash and sediment now and in the future, and to maintain the physical and chemical integrity. The mission is to bring together government agencies, regulators and funding agencies to seek advice from the scientific and environmental community to find ways to eliminate accumulations and restore the valley's ecosystem.

The team takes a linear approach, and to criticism from those who prefer a more comprehensive approach, Mr. Nettleton noted that many activities occur simultaneously and in parallel, and if those activities succeed, then larger goals can be achieved. Many of those solutions involve stopping trash and sediment at the source using strategically placed bar screens, assessing where accumulation occurs and how much, and removing unwanted trash and sediment and transferring it to recycling centers. Sedimentation basins can collect and dredge out sediment, which can be used for beaches or commercial applications.

The team has four action teams:

- The Border Action Team develops and implements solutions in the immediate vicinity of the valley.
- The Cleanup Action Team cleans up trash and manages sediment in the valley in an environmentally sensitive way.
- The Restoration Action Team plans, coordinates and implements the restoration of the valley.
- The Binational Action Team works with agencies in Mexico to determine how they can work together.

More than 30 agencies, including government agencies, citizen groups and environmental groups, are involved in these efforts, and many others are asking to get involved. The team's successes so far have a lot to do with that. The team has been awarded large grants to assess the trash and sediment in the valley, implement cleanup efforts, and to test nets in Goat Canyon to catch trash. In addition, the team is in discussions with Tijuana about working together, it has created a website, and it has published "The River Team Update."

Future projects include applications for grants to sweep the valley surface free of trash and to plan a sedimentation basin in Smuggler's Gulch. The team is also researching additional grant opportunities, which will help raise the several million dollars needed to complete these projects. If the team's work is completed, the cost savings, while not yet calculable, would be seen among several state and local agencies.

In terms of its relationship to GNEB, the River Team is a prime example of “good neighbor” practices. It is focused on the environmental infrastructure needs of the land touching the border, and it welcomes advice from GNEB.

Discussion

Board member Dr. Christopher Brown asked if Mr. Nettleton could speak to the management mechanism. Mr. Nettleton stated Clay Phillips heads this and welcomes the high level of interest, appreciating all members and their input.

Board member Mr. Stephen Niemeyer GNEB asked if it was only U.S. involvement. Mr. Nettleton stated they have a binational team working with agencies on the Mexican side of the border. Mr. Niemeyer stated they just completed the 12th report which deals with innovative and practical approaches to solving border environmental issues, and this presentation would have fit nicely with it. Perhaps the next report can incorporate more case studies in this area. Mr. Nettleton stated the idea is to build communities of interest such as an international ocean group, along with others that share global issues.

Conclusion

Chairman Ganster excused the guests and other participants, but asked the GNEB members to remain. Mr. Mark Joyce, DFO for GNEB concluded the day's proceedings by introducing and thanking members of EPA's staff in Washington, D.C., Ann-Marie Gantner and Stephanie McCoy. Mr. Joyce discussed membership issues, noting the distribution of materials from the administrator's office, which needed acceptance, signatures and return. With no further discussion or business brought before GNEB, Chairman Ganster recessed the meeting at 5:50 p.m. on June 10, 2009.

Approval of Minutes of Washington, DC March 2009 Meeting

Chairman Ganster reconvened the GNEB meeting at 8:15 a.m. on June 11, 2009, and asked the Board to approve the minutes of the March 2009 meeting. Mr. Gillen moved to approve the minutes of the September 2008 meeting, and Mr. Florez seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Regarding the March 2009, meeting minutes, Mr. Niemeyer asked that the penultimate paragraph on Page 8 which started “Other 2008 BGC declarations include” be changed to “Another 2008 BGC declaration included.” Mr. Gillen stated he liked the way these particular minutes were laid out as items were easy to track. Mr. Niemeyer asked approval of the minutes be deferred until the next meeting. Chairman Ganster replied there had been ample time for review. Mr. Ramirez-Thomas made a motion to approve the March 2009 minutes and Ms. Wolf seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Other Business

Planning for the September Meeting

Chairman Ganster opened the floor for discussion about the next GNEB meeting, which is scheduled for September 24-25, 2009, in Tucson, Arizona. Chairman Ganster said the venue was still in question and suggested reopening that discussion.

Mr. Ruth recommended Nogales, which is suffering a number of environmental issues that the Board could examine firsthand. Fieldtrips could be taken in order to highlight some of the areas of concern. A new wastewater treatment plant was being commissioned this month. Dr. Austin seconded that idea, particularly because of the new facility opening in the vicinity, noting easy travel in the city. Ms. Krebs asked to confirm the proposed dates did not conflict with the National Border Coordinators Meeting, which it would not. Dr. Brown supported Mr. Ruth's proposed site, listing Sonora, Mexico, as a field trip site, which has a wastewater treatment facility and would provide a great opportunity for a binational discussion. Mr. Ramirez-Thomas volunteered to assist in the planning of a meeting in Nogales. In addition, the meeting could be timed to coincide with a groundbreaking of the Mariposa Reconfiguration Project.

Chairman Ganster confirmed the meeting will likely be held in Nogales, but the dates are still to be confirmed and asked the members to keep the days around September 24-25 open until the dates could be finalized.

Board Member Report Outs

Chairman Ganster asked the members to provide updates on their respective organizations.

TCEQ:

Mr. Niemeyer passed out the updated TCEQ Border Initiative, which they also translate into Spanish. He noted they are trying to define "extraordinary drought." At a drought conference in March 2009, options were provided to Mexican colleagues, and TCEQ is waiting for their feedback. The definition must be set and be presented to the Border Governors Conference by 2009.

Ramirez Advisors Inter-National:

Mr. Ramirez-Thomas said the Mariposa project, which was funded in the Recovery Act, is near completion. That port of entry is one of the most congested on the border, far exceeding its traffic capacity. The funding was used to double the capacity for inspection of vehicles, and it will have pedestrian crossing facilities. Other improvements are being made on the Mexican side of the border. The San Luis 2 crossing will see a ribbon cutting ceremony before the end of the year. Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has undertaken a 26.2 mile high-speed connector road from San Luis 2 to Interstate 8, and the ribbon cutting ceremony will take place around that same time. The safety inspection facility for incoming trucks should be completed as well. In the San Luis-Yuma area, in those four projects, \$175 million worth of investments will come on line, dramatically impacting border wait times, safety, and economic development for the entire southwest of the state and the northwest corner of Sonora. A new partnership by the Arizona-Mexico Commission and other stakeholders used contributions to build two new lanes at the Lucville inspection facility, which should be completed before early next year. A presentation was made for the Commission demonstrating long wait times and old infrastructure has cost Arizona 4 million visitors annually. Most visitors have to wait at least 45 minutes to

cross despite decreasing traffic. Ms. Grijalva commented this is the first time Mexican money is being put into a port entry in the U.S. and it was a private-public partnership. Arizona and Sonora are to be congratulated on their efforts.

Department of Transportation:

Ms. Grijalva commented that the Department of Transportation is trying to collect data on border wait times and performance measures. Only anecdotal data is currently shared. Baseline data is being collected in El Paso, Nogales, Otay, Laredo and other sites, so this should create a set of hard data in this area, which would be useful in demonstrating the cost savings and other benefits of the ideas discussed earlier. "Greening" the border and environmental issues are priorities. Chairman Ganster reported a study by a San Diego State master's student looking at CPB data on wait time along the border has been done. Mr. Rodriguez-Thomas talked about a University of Arizona research study, available online, that examined the characteristics of border crossings. The study concluded Mexican visitors spend over \$7 million in Arizona every day. Mr. Gallegos asked if they knew the average spending by crosser. Mr. Rodriguez-Thomas stated only averages were reported.

Border 2012 Program:

Mr. Torres provided handouts, which included topics for the Summer 2009 meeting, Regions 6 and 9 recent accomplishments, and 2009 RFPs. He stated the next National Coordinators meeting takes place October 27-29. For the first time, it will be held on a tribal reservation at the Rincon tribe, and the format might change from working groups to more interactive panels that include industry and NGOs. Both regions have started to submit their RFPs for Border 2012 funding. Region 9 will conclude its process this month, while Region 6 will begin June 1. This year's focus is on climate change and greenhouse gas projects, so some money is set aside for those types of projects. The EPA National Coordinator, Scott Fulton, has been nominated to the Office of General Counsel. Michelle DePass has been nominated for the assistant administrator's position at EPA's Office of International Affairs (OIA). The Border States Climate Change Workshop in April was very successful, bringing together many stakeholders and experts to discuss climate change and effects of GHG. A report on the activities by the Border States is available online. Chairman Ganster asked how arrangements with BECC have been working out in terms of flow of funding. Mr. Torres stated EPA entered into an agreement with BECC in Region 9 three years ago, and this has enabled EPA to fund projects from Mexican organizations. The agreement will expand into Region 6. Everything has been working well with the arrangement. Mr. Niemeyer asked if Mr. Fulton's position required confirmation, which Mr. Torres affirmed. Mr. Niemeyer asked about Ms. DePass' background. Mr. Manzanilla indicated she was from the East Coast and her bio will be made available to the Board. Mr. Niemeyer asked if Pete Silva had been confirmed by the Senate. Mr. Torres stated nothing official has occurred. Mr. Ruth indicated Pete Silva's confirmation was out of the committee but as of Friday he had not gone through confirmation by the Senate. Mr. Manzanilla stated several appointees were traveling in a group through the confirmation process.

San Diego Department of Environmental Health:

Mr. Dorsey said assembly bill 1079 is in the state legislature. The bill would create a New River improvement project account, and the funds would expand activities related to New River. CBC would oversee the state agencies involved in the project. The author of the bill is Assemblyman Manuel Perez.

University of Arizona:

Dr. Austin commented that the Border 2012 information meetings could disseminate bilingual versions of the proceedings, rather than an English version for the U.S. and a Spanish version for Mexico. She stated collaboration with BECC is going smoothly. One example of the success of Border 2012 is in providing composting toilets for areas that will not see any wastewater treatment services in the foreseeable future. Those toilets have been built, and federal funding helped those families who could not afford to pay for their own toilets. Chairman Ganster commented it took approximately eight years for sewage services to be installed in newly established colonias in the Tijuana Region. He asked about the length of the process in Nogales. Dr. Austin stated it depended on each colonia, but this particular site was not one Nogales was going to pursue.

USDA:

Mr. Guerrero said grant money is available for the planning and implementation of conservation practices and USDA is working with a number of tribes and landowners. USDA continues to work with SEMARNAT on the Plant Materials Center Initiative. A trip was planned for the spring, but the H1N1 virus forced it to be postponed indefinitely. USDA is working with Animal, Plant, Health and Inspection Service to address the issue of cattle tick fever, providing planning assistance to help control and eradicate the disease.

Campo Kumeyaay Nation:

Mr. Connolly said he gave a presentation on GNEB at the Department of the Interior's April workgroup. He is currently working across San Diego County with other tribes developing a consortium on water issues with the state and county. Many conveyance systems were paid for with federal funds for the purpose of providing water to tribes and other groups, but so far no tribe has seen a benefit from these systems. The consortium is addressing that issue. The tribe signed an MOU with San Diego Gas & Electric in the hopes of adding to its existing wind power project. Construction should start next year.

New Mexico State University:

Dr. Brown said his group is on the Joint Working Committee as a technical consultant for binational transportation planning efforts. The next JWC meeting will be in mid-July in Santa Fe. A project funded by the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency is underway to revise the curriculum for GIS tools. Dr. Brown related information regarding the Environmental Trunk Project, stating it has gone full circle with two graduate students implementing this project successfully.

SANDAG:

Mr. Gallegos reported that ground has broken on the last piece of State Route 905, which will connect the Otay Mesa border crossing to the freeway system. The federal government is redoing the port at San Ysidro, and despite some struggles with GSA, progress has been made. However, the State Department could assist in this effort, particularly on a southbound pedestrian crossing on the east side. Right now, pedestrians have to navigate the highway to cross, so this lane would create a safer alternative for crossing. SANDAG has secured infrastructure bond dollars from the state, which will be used to improve access to the port of San Diego. An intermodal center will increase both vehicle and rail capacity for shipping. Changes to the border crossing at Otay East are in progress. If successful, the model can offer a new way of investing in the border infrastructure, specifically generating enough revenue to cover the costs of the infrastructure and operations. It has also garnered interest from the business community, which could create other opportunities for funding. SB 375 requires that

SANDAG develop a sustainable community strategy to demonstrate how it would get a target from ARB and how it would achieve it. Because a lot of people work on one side of the border and live on another, it is necessary to factor in the impact on greenhouse gases associated with that cross-border travel. Mr. Darrach commented on the Otay Mesa East Project, noting border crossing projects require agreement among dozens of federal, state and local agencies on both sides of the border. California held regular meetings over three years before going to the federal government for funding for its current projects. Mr. Gallegos provided highlights of the partnership between Mexico and the U.S. for this particular project.

IBWC:

Commissioner Ruth reported that IBWC is now constructing secondary treatment facilities for a wastewater treatment plant that began operating in 1997. The project is scheduled to be completed in two years. FEMA has been accelerating its plans and schedules for requiring flood insurance on all projects. IBWC received \$220 million in stimulus money and is currently seeking flood protection projects in New Mexico and Texas. The first contract is expected to be issued July 6. Levee projects are being completed in those areas so that they can meet revised FEMA standards. Presidio, for example, was struck by a huge and unexpected flood, but their levees were able to protect the town. IBWC is performing emergency repairs on the levees protecting the town of Presidio and should have it completed sometime in June. Nogales presents tremendous challenges in terms of both storm water and wastewater, and it will cost a lot of money to repair those structures. Some pipelines are more than 30 years old, and they need repairs. Meanwhile, the growth rate is tremendous, and so IBWC is trying to work with city, state and other agencies to develop a comprehensive plan to deal with Nogales. IBWC is starting a dialogue with Mexico regarding the Rio Grande, specifically reinstating the Rio Grande Summit.

National Park Service:

Mr. Florez introduced himself as the program manager for the International Conservation Program, where he assists different parks in the U.S. in securing funding for projects with Mexico and Canada. He offered assistance to those agencies that need it. Mexico proposed expansion of the protected area around Big Bend National Park and make it a binational entity. Mexico has also added five protected areas. Chairman Ganster welcomed Mr. Florez to the Board.

City of Brownsville:

Mr. Wood congratulated Ms. Wolf on her award. He thanked the IBWC for the levee rehab in Cameron County, which is complete. He said GSA went to Brownsville to talk about expanding one of its bridges, which would thus expedite traffic, but it would require closing a main street. After a lengthy discussion, GSA will adjust its plans to keep the road open. The Veterans Bridge expansion is going well, as is the West Rail relocation to the west of the town. Brownsville continues to have issues with a border fence being built by DHS. There is a flood valve that is supposed to be fenced off, but discussions are under way to find another solution.

Membership Issues

Mr. Joyce discussed membership issues with the Board. As some terms expire, EPA hopes to replace outgoing members with a full compliment of federal members. Several agencies can be represented, so EPA wants to ensure that GNEB has a diverse group from within the federal government.

GNEB 13th Report Overview

Mr. Joyce then discussed GNEB's recent advice letter outlining important issues for the administration. He said CEQ wants greater focus on the border fence. EPA staff met with CEQ and provided the most recent reports. There has not yet been any feedback, but now that CEQ is responsible for responding to these reports, it should be coming soon. Mr. Joyce also listed some of Nancy Sutley's input on the advice letter. She requested the following:

- More specific, detailed suggestions on how recommendations can be put into effect.
- Additional emphasis on the highest priority issues while still listing everything that is deemed important.
- Adaptation measures to climate change, including drought, precipitation, and water quality issues.
- Preservation of major water resources and how to better coordinate multiple efforts.
- Renewable energy and how these efforts can be best coordinated; how renewables can tie into economic revitalization, and how stimulus funds can create green jobs.
- Improved electrification at points of entry and the resulting environmental benefits.
- Reducing PM problems.
- How to build onto existing agreements and leverage the associated goals.
- How can these recommendations be implemented?

Discussion

Mr. Brown asked since a lot of issues in recent reports have focused on security if more insight might be gleaned into how DHS can better collaborate with agencies so they can work together to address more specific issues. Mr. Joyce responded given CEQ's interest in the fence, GNEB might want to send a second advice letter. For example, the border fence will raise different issues at different points along the border, such as the activities around Mount Cuchama do not appear to be environmentally sensitive; perhaps the use of sensors or cameras which would be more sensitive to this sacred site. The advice letter pointing to specific detailed instances would speak volumes, noting these have been concerns in the past and remain so today.

Ms. Grijalva stated the letter should not only point out specific problems but include potential solutions to those issues, including some that have worked in past situations.

Mr. Connolly has been told the barriers are not for people but for vehicles and the area around Mount Cuchama is dangerous and difficult terrain. Mr. Joyce stated this is a perfect example of why a more reasoned and thoughtful approach is needed.

Dr. Austin indicated in the areas where the fence has been built, the suggestions could be easily implemented. However, the areas where it has not been built require greater effort, so GNEB can demonstrate its expertise by giving specific ideas. It may help to choose a specific area and focus ideas there before spending the money.

Dr. Brown noted while taking a recent tour of the US-Mexico border, it was clear that some areas are well designed and secure, while others are not. This is the best illustration of what can happen when there is healthy discussion between DHS and local groups, and what happens when there is not.

Mr. Ruth stated the decision to build the fence was made so quickly that it removed any chance for dialogue. The people of Hidalgo County consulted IBWC, who recommended creating a wall out of levees that meet FEMA certification. Presidio is doing the same thing, and it is more aesthetically pleasing. However, this could have been done in other areas where those concerns arose had there been more discussion among the different stakeholders. Dialogue is necessary versus mitigation after the fact.

Mr. Niemeyer said it would be helpful to revisit the language from the 10th report, which talked about border security and the environment. DHS ignored the recommendations. He reiterated that a DHS member be involved in the meetings on a regular basis. Specifically, that person can read the 10th report and see the ideas that GNEB was putting out. Mr. Niemeyer reviewed past happenings in the 1990s, when a committee where the late Barbara Jordan was appointed chair by President Clinton recommended national identification cards to prevent illegal immigration. While that idea was criticized, it was based on a consensus, and it might be worth suggesting again as part of the overall goal of keeping illegal immigrants away. That is the purpose of the fence, but an ID card has merit as well.

Mr. Wood stated walled levees work well for towns that have levees, but for those that do not, grants are available to make drainage improvements. Some grant money was used for the levee wall system, which may be reimbursable, but it has to be appropriated by Congress. They are not guaranteed reimbursement, so without that funding those drainage systems will not get built, and those areas will flood.

Mr. Dorsey said the discussion should stay away from illegal immigration, which was addressed at length in the 10th Report, and focus more on other areas where solutions can be found.

Mr. Connolly asked if this letter was to be in the form of a follow-up to the 10th Report. Chairman Ganster responded it will be just a stand-alone advice letter.

After the Board agreed that a second advice letter was needed, members made suggestions. Mr. Gallegos stated the letter needs to recognize the need for security while providing examples of what did and did not work. Chairman Ganster said the letter will be written with Board input via conference calls and various drafts as the Board operates on a consensus basis. Mr. Gillen stated he would gladly participate in the writing of this letter. Mr. Niemeyer stated care should be taken when noting comments from conference calls. He said there needs to be a way to ensure the agreed upon language is reflected in the writing of the document. Chairman Ganster stated it is actually a very timely process to get out a quick letter and he did his best in scripting the document. Mr. Wood stated each member should lend their respective expertise in their specific areas. There are some places still without contractual implications and it would be great to get input for better problem solving prior to contracts and build out. Mr. Joyce indicated it is incumbent upon each member to send specific examples during the drafting stage before approval of the letter. Mr. Gallegos asked for clarification of standard Board operating procedures, which Mr. Joyce provided.

The drafting committee will consist of Mr. Gillen, Ms. Wolf, Mr. Wood, and Mr. Brown, who will chair the effort. Mr. Niemeyer volunteered to record members' changes. Ideally, the committee will draft a letter in the next few weeks, circulate it and then schedule a conference call where members will submit their changes.

GNEB 13th Report Working Meeting

Chairman Ganster initiated a discussion about what to include in the 13th report, with a recommendation to focus on only a few issues. He asked for suggestions on how to create workgroups. The top priorities are air quality, and water quantity and quality. Other possible topics include cross-cutting coordination of efforts, i.e. a breaking down of the traditional silo approach; climate variability; and GHG. Chairman Ganster asked the Board for comments.

Dr. Austin indicated GNEB's suggested topics should be enfolded with the topics raised by CEQ. Mr. Joyce said responses to Ms. Sutley should not be the sole basis of report, but rather additional areas needing emphasis. Dr. Austin agreed, noting examples such as water supply fit well with preservation of water resources, and air quality fits with reduction of PM10. Therefore, the workgroups can address the general issues with a specific focus per Ms. Sutley's feedback.

Mr. Torres stated there could be a focus on President Obama's recent announcement on framework on energy and climate change. Many of the issues discussed with CEQ could be incorporated into that context. For instance, rather than have a separate portion for air quality, discuss climate and GHG.

Mr. Gallegos asked where infrastructure fit into the priorities. He indicated contamination could be mitigated if there were better infrastructures in Mexico, or more efficient ports of entry as a way to improve air quality. Chairman Ganster stated infrastructure is implicit in the reports.

Ms. Krebs commented climate change is broad enough to envelop several subcategories, such as electrification at ports or reduction of PM10, so it might be useful to take the topics from Mr. Gibbs's presentation and organize them under the climate change heading. She stated the topics should cover implementable ideas. Some topics might be too ambitious right now, but others, while they might face obstacles, could be achieved in the short term.

Dr. Brown said since so many greenhouse gas emissions come from electricity generation, the report could talk about their impact, especially since it touches on climate change, greenhouse gases, and green jobs on the border. Coming up with actionable recommendations that would create financial or labor incentives would generate a lot of interest. Chairman Ganster reiterated this needs to be a stand-alone document which can refer to other reports, but it has to be understandable on its own.

Mr. Niemeyer stated the report needs to be simple, focusing on two or three main topics. It can reference other specific aspects, but it should not stray from those few general topics. Also, it should include concrete recommendations. Chairman Ganster noted agreement that few lead topics are needed.

Mr. Joyce noted while the main topics need to be the primary focus, it is still possible to touch on other topics such as border issues. Given there is a new administration and great resources available it would be best not to completely ignore the longstanding border problems.

Mr. Manzanilla indicated since CEQ has provided a framework that builds on the agreement between presidents Obama and Calderon, it creates a great opportunity to press for quicker action on specific issues that have been discussed for several years.

Dr. Brown stated strong agreement with Mr. Manzanilla's and Mr. Torres' statements. He asked the Board to support their ideas as the driving theme of the report structure as it is current and unfolding right before us. He stated the urgency of certain pressing issues should be emphasized. It might not come through in all topics, but it could affect the areas where immediate action is possible. From that, other topics can be incorporated.

Dr. Austin remarked there is no question that adaptation to climate change must be included, but there is a question as to whether it should be the leading topic or whether it should run through more specific topics. Mr. Manzanilla stated water resources and public health and air quality seem to be relevant topics to the border. Chairman Ganster noted water supply and water quality issues have always been linked. Mr. Joyce indicated whatever organizational framework is adopted CEQ's suggestions should be incorporated.

Mr. Connolly stated little attention is paid to the unintended consequences of planned actions. For example, he asks what the net impact of solar panels is as they relate to the manufacturing process, and how much impact comes from transporting water from desalinization plants. Mr. Joyce echoed Mr. Connolly's remarks, asking what are total costs associated with possible solutions.

Mr. Florez asked how issues are generated. Mr. Joyce reviewed the process stating the Board will generate a short list of important issues, followed by discussions with CEQ, and subsequently returning back to the Board. Mr. Florez stated presentations contain concrete solutions that can be implemented immediately and should be issue driven. They could be incorporated into the report without straying from the larger issues. Mr. Joyce indicated page 6 of the letter addresses the issues of approaches and solutions.

Mr. Niemeyer stated water supply is the most important issue; without water there is no economic development. Air quality comes in a close second.

Discussion then moved to the structure and theme of the report. Dr. Brown stated a rough draft of an outline can open with climate change and energy and then narrow to impacts on the border region. Focus on the first two topics from Mr. Gibbs's presentation, and then map them to Ms. Sutley's recommendations.

Mr. Ruth agreed water supply should be the top priority. He indicated conservation needs to be interwoven into the discussions about water because it is the cheapest way to augment supplies. In order to achieve conservation an educational program is necessary, which needs to start by informing the children.

Mr. Joyce opined while the agreement between the U.S. and Mexico is important, it should not be the framework for the entire report.

Mr. Manzanilla did not mean to imply it needed to be the framework of the report; however, it is a significant agreement. The issues need to be looked at as holistically as possible, which will provide a greater understanding of them and will help break the silos that currently exist.

Mr. Torres reiterated the GNEB needs to examine the relevant and emerging issue and take advantage of it. Wrap discussions on air and water into what the whole world is looking at. His message is not to miss this opportunity.

Ms. Wolf asked about the working title of "Environmental Challenges along the US-Mexico Border Caused by Climate Change." It would incorporate everyone's concerns and the topic is broad enough, yet could provide focus on one to two issues. Chairman Ganster stated the title "Border Environmental Issues: New Challenges" might be more suitable as climate change is not the only issue. Dr. Austin indicated it cannot be too specific because the focus might become too narrow which could produce misleading cause-and-effect scenarios. Ideally, the report brings some issues to the table, and EPA will address them no matter how specific GNEB's focus. Mr. Connolly suggested the title "Priorities and Adaptations to Changing Conditions in the Border Area," and Dr. Brown suggested "Environmental Challenges along the US-Mexico Border: Adaptations and Coping Mechanisms," with chapters devoted to water resources, climate change, and population growth impacts. Mr. Niemeyer stated the report should include a brief history and overview of the Border Region, the major challenges and issues, and the steps that need to occur to address them. Mr. Dorsey noted population growth can be incorporated as long as it focuses on the impact of population growth and not a solution to the issue.

Chairman Ganster shifted the focus of the meeting to the drafting process. Workgroups will be assigned to the following topics:

- Water resources and supply
- Air quality, climate change and energy provision
- Population growth impacts and potential solutions
- Additional priorities/areas for additional work
- Specific recommendations, including cross-cutting mechanisms
- A group to outline the report and define the approach

Each of those topics should include stressors, and population growth and additional topics could be written as smaller chapters. Dr. Austin said the outline should be directed by the expertise of each member, but Dr. Brown disagreed, saying the outline will direct the focus and discussion. Dr. Brown will draft an outline and then send it to the other members of the workgroup. Once finalized, the outline will be distributed to the other members.

The workgroups are assigned as follows:

- Outline: Dr. Brown, Ms. Wolf, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Niemeyer, Mr. Torres
- Water: Mr. Ganster, Mr. Dorsey, Mr. Wood, Ms. Spener, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Gallegos
- Air Quality: Ms. Krebs, Ms. Siwik, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Gibbs
- Cross-Cutting Mechanisms: Mr. Ganster, Mr. Manzanilla, Mr. Brown, Mr. Wood, Mr. Niemeyer, Mr. Martinez

Some draft text should be ready by the meeting scheduled for September. At that time, the writer/editor would make revisions based on members' comments. In order to have a draft by then, the draft should be written by September 1, thus giving the other members time to review it before the meeting. The outline workgroup will schedule a conference call on June 17 at 1:00

p.m., MST, and receive an outline by June 19. After revisions are made, it will go to the entire Board by June 29. The Board would then provide feedback over the next two weeks, until July 10. During that time, the workgroups will schedule their conference calls and draft their chapters through July and August.

Closing Session

Chairman Ganster thanked everyone for their participation. The next GNEB meeting will be held in September 2009, with dates TBD. With no further discussion or business brought before GNEB, Chairman Ganster adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m. on June 11, 2009.

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing Minutes of the proceedings are accurate and complete.

Date

Paul Ganster
GNEB Chair

ATTACHMENT 1

List of Participants

GNEB Members

Mr. Paul Ganster, Chair
Dr. Diane Austin
Dr. Christopher Brown
Mr. Michael Connolly
Mr. Daniel Darrach
Mr. Michael Dorsey
Mr. Luis Florez
Mr. Gary Gallegos
Mr. Gary Gillen
Ms. Patti Krebs
Mr. Stephen Niemeyer
Mr. Luis Ramirez-Thomas
Mr. Bill Ruth
Ms. Ann Marie Wolf
Mr. John Wood

Designated Federal Officer

Mr. Mark Joyce

EPA Representatives

David Fege
Jose Garcia
Michael Gibbs
Alheli Baños-Keener
Enrique Manzanilla
Alexis St. Julien
Tomas Torres
Stephanie McCoy
Ann-Marie Gantner

Guest Presenters and Members of the Public

John Beresford (Native American Environmental Protection Coalition)
Hernando Durán Cabrera (CESPT)
Cami Compton (TCEQ)
Crystal Crawford (Mayor of Del Mar)
Toribio Cueva (CESPT)
Rafael Guerrero (USDA)
Sócrates Bastida Hernández (SPABC)
Lisa Gover (Governmental Advisory Committee, Campo Band EPA)
Sylvia Grijalva (Department of Transportation)
Jack Keener (Geocom)
Lisa Nakagawa (The San Diego Foundation)
Dr. Efraín Nieblas (Secretaria de Protección al Ambiente)

Craig Nettleton (Open Oceans Global)
Halla Razak (San Diego County Water Authority)
Sally Spener (International Boundary and Water Commission)
Paula Stigler (The San Diego Foundation)
Dolores Wesson (National Advisory Committee)

ATTACHMENT 2

Acronyms Used In These Meeting Minutes

ARB	---	Air Resource Board
BECC	---	Border Environment Cooperation Commission
BRIC	---	Brazil, Russia, India, and China
CBC	---	California Biodiversity Council
CEQ	---	Commission on Environmental Quality
CESPT	---	Comision Estatal de Servicios Publicas de Tijuana
CHP	---	California Highway Patrols
COBRO	---	Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities
DFO	---	Designated Federal Officer
DHS	---	Department of Homeland Security
EPA	—	Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	---	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GHG	---	Greenhouse Gas
GNEB	---	Good Neighbor Environmental Board
IBWC	---	International Boundary and Water Commission
IMPLAN	---	Instituto Municipal de Planeación
MOU	---	Memorandum of Understanding
NAEPC	---	Native American Environmental Protection Coalition
NGOs	—	Non-Governmental Organizations
OCEM	—	Office of Cooperative Environmental Management
OIA	---	Office of International Affairs
SANDAG	---	San Diego Association of Governments
SEMARNAT	---	Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
SPABC	---	Secretariat de Proteccion al Ambiente, Baja California
TMDL	---	Total Maximum Daily Load
USDA	---	United States Department of Agriculture
WCI	---	West Coast Initiative

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY



Good Neighbor Environmental Board

June 10-11, 2009
Sycuan Resort, El Cajon, CA

AGENDA

Wednesday, June 10, 2009

8:00 A.M. **Registration**

8:30 **Welcome and Introductions**

Welcome: Paul Ganster, Chair, GNEB
 Rafael DeLeon, Director
 Office of Cooperative Environmental Management
 US Environmental Protection Agency
 Mark Joyce* GNEB Designated Federal Officer
 Board Members, Attendee Self Introductions

9:00 **Welcome from the Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation**

9:30 **Environmental Priorities of Indigenous Peoples along the U.S.-Mexican Border**

10:00-12:20 **Environmental Priorities of the U.S.-Mexico Border**

California's Border Environmental Priorities (Ricardo Martinez*, Deputy Secretary for Border Affairs, Cal/EPA)

Baja California's Border Environmental Priorities (Sócrates Bastida Hernández, Secretary, SPABC)

Environmental Priorities of the Border Governors Conference (Dan Garza*, DTSC, Cal/EPA)

Cross Border Planning and Cooperation: The San Diego-Tijuana Region
(Crystal Crawford*, SANDAG Board and Mayor, Del Mar)

12:20 **Public Comments**

01:00 **Lunch**

02:00 **Air Quality Issues**

Climate Change: A California Perspective (Michael Gibbs*, Assistant Secretary
for Regional Climate Initiatives, Cal/EPA)

Baja California's Greenhouse Gasses Initiative (Efraín Nieblas, SPABC)

03:30 **Water Issues in the California-Baja California Border Region**

Tijuana's Water Treatment and Supply Programs (Toribio Cueva*, CESPT)

San Diego Water Supply Issues, (Halla Razak*, Colorado River Programs
Director, San Diego County Water Authority)

Tijuana River Valley Recovery Team (Carl Nettleton, Co-Chair, Tijuana River
Valley Recovery Team, and President, Open Oceans Global)

05:00 **Adjourn**

Thursday, June 11, 2009

7:40 A.M . **Registration**

8:00 **Business Meeting Call to Order**

- 8:10 **Approval of Minutes**
Washington, D.C., March 2009 Meeting
Paul Ganster, Chair, GNEB
- 8:30 **Other Business:**
- 9:00 **GNEB 13th Report Working Meeting:** *“Environmental Priorities along the U.S.-
Mexico Border”*
Paul Ganster, Chair, GNEB
- 11:30 **Public Comments**
- 12:00 **Adjourn**