



**Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB) Teleconference
Call-in Number: 1-202-991-0477; Conference Code: 7706890#
April 19, 2019; 12:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. EDT**

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome, Introductions and Overview of Agenda

Ann-Marie Gantner, GNEB Designated Federal Officer, Federal Advisory Committee Management Division (FACMD), Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Paul Ganster, Chair, GNEB

Ms. Ann-Marie Gantner welcomed the participants and conducted the roll call. A list of meeting participants is included as Appendix A. Ms. Gantner thanked the GNEB members for attending the teleconference and introduced a new member, Kristine Yurdin, an environmental officer in the Chief Scientist's Office of the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED), who provided information about her background.

Dr. Paul Ganster, GNEB Chair, thanked the members for attending the call and explained that the Board members would need to contribute in the writing of the upcoming report. A timeline for writing and agency review needs to be developed. Dr. Ganster provided an overview of the agenda (Appendix B). The official certification of the minutes by the Chair is included as Appendix C.

Public Comments

Ms. Gantner called for public comments. No oral or written comments were offered.

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Response on Advice Letter

Dr. Ganster explained that CEQ had responded to the Board's letter of December 2018. CEQ was pleased with the letter and suggested that during the development of GNEB's 20th report the Board should focus on regulatory barriers to the development of infrastructure related to energy in the border region while maintaining environmental quality. To implement Executive Order (EO) 13807, CEQ and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to federal agencies on April 9, 2019, which outlines responsibilities for agencies in carrying out the "One Federal Decision" policy related to environmental review for infrastructure-related projects, including those related to energy. This will need to be considered in the Board's report as well.

Dr. Teresa Pohlman is working very closely with the steering committee for One Federal Decision and volunteered to assist with this aspect of the report. Dr. Julie Smith is the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) representative on the One Federal Decision Workgroup and negotiated the MOU that was signed by the agencies. Dr. Ganster thanked Drs. Pohlman and Smith for volunteering their expertise.

Mr. Lawrence Lucero asked whether the steering committee is assisting with very many projects going through the process. Dr. Smith responded that the number varies by agency. Generally, land agencies and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers tend to have more projects because of permitting regulations. Information and schedules regarding current projects are publicly tracked on the OMB website.

Mr. Lucero commented that GNEB should be mindful of the projects because they may affect the focus of the Board's report. Dr. Smith added that as the report is developed, she will ensure that issues relevant to

the policy are discussed properly. She also suggested adding the MOU and EO to the report as appendices.

Discussion of 19th Report

Dr. Ganster explained that the members had received an outline of the draft report, which is based on the contents of the Board's December 2018 letter to CEQ. He reminded the members that appropriate graphs, charts and illustrations would need to be included in the report. He expects that the report will be approximately 60 to 80 pages plus appendices. Dr. Ganster asked the Board members for overarching comments about the outline.

Dr. Kimberly Collins thought that the outline is comprehensive. Dr. Margaret Wilder agreed and noted that the outline emphasizes infrastructure, which is appropriate for the topic of energy, and suggested adding information about uneven access to energy at the community or household levels. Section 5.1.6 could focus on the poverty-energy issue. Dr. Ganster agreed that the initial section on the socioeconomic and environmental context of the border should discuss energy use and demand. Dr. Wilder agreed that it should be discussed in a general manner in the initial section but could be discussed in a more specific, data-driven manner later in the report. She noticed that the topics of green infrastructure and indigenous issues were not included in the outline.

In terms of indigenous issues, Dr. Ganster noted that border tribes have challenges related to access, production and transmission. Ms. Kathryn Becker noted that Tohono O'odham Nation has energy-related issues; Mr. Rob Roy agreed and added that adverse effects from infrastructure and cultural issues (e.g., archaeological) could be highlighted as well. Dr. Smith explained that the DOE recently worked with the Tohono O'odham Nation on a Presidential Permit for a cross-border energy project and could provide information related to archaeological and cultural resources and important tribal practices that could be affected by border energy infrastructure. Mr. Roy will work with Mr. Cornelius Antone, who was not present on the teleconference, on a section about indigenous energy issues in the border region. Mr. Lucero's company has projects on the Tohono O'odham Nation and is working closely with the tribe's leadership. He has some knowledge of the tribal energy utility and volunteered to assist with this section. Mr. Soll Sussman noted that the Texas Energy Poverty Research Institute could serve as an additional resource for information on this topic.

In response to a question from Dr. Ganster, Dr. Wilder indicated that she had not considered in which section the green infrastructure issue should be included. The Board could return to some of the green infrastructure topics that relate to energy and sustainability that were discussed in its most recent report. GNEB should encourage the government to build green infrastructure whenever possible. Dr. Smith reiterated her comments from the December 2018 teleconference that not everyone appreciates green infrastructure, and the Board needs to be cognizant of this. Dr. Wilder agreed and suggested that community consultation during the infrastructure development process should be discussed in the report. Mr. Lucero added that a strong section on the status of energy efficiency also should be included, especially in respect to improving standards of energy efficiency along the border. He noted that the Board also must recognize that every state and jurisdiction has its own notification process for siting infrastructure, which includes fairly robust stakeholder processes to inform the community of infrastructure expansions. GNEB may want to recognize the existing regulatory structures that must be considered in infrastructure investment. Dr. Wilder agreed and wondered whether a focus should be on the built environment, which influences energy siting and use. Mr. Lucero agreed that this is an important aspect of the discussion.

Mr. Bryan Early thought that it would make sense to include a discussion of energy demand trends in border states. The report also could include a discussion about demand on the Mexican side of the border

and different strategies that states have implemented to increase energy efficiency. Several topics related to energy efficiency could be discussed in this area. Mr. Early volunteered to develop text addressing energy efficiency, and Dr. Sweedler offered his assistance. Dr. Ganster noted the need to include representatives from Arizona, New Mexico and Texas in developing this section. Access to DOE data will be critical. Dr. Smith noted that the U.S. Energy Information Administration is the foremost source of publicly available data. Utility data will need to be acquired directly from utilities because they are not required to report their data to DOE. Additional data may be available from the DOE's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. Also, some data may be proprietary.

Mr. Lucero explained that Arizona utilities must report their data to the Arizona Corporation Commission. Other states may have a similar requirement, and summary data may be available. Mr. Early noted that California has a good deal of energy data. Dr. Sweedler did not think that the Board would have a problem acquiring U.S. data and would need to be selective and choose data that allow GNEB to develop useful recommendations. He thought that obtaining and ground-truthing data from Mexico would be necessary. Mr. Early explained that California has an MOU with Mexico's Secretaría del Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources), and data from this agreement could assist in writing the report. Mr. Lucero added that data from the Arizona-Mexico Commission could assist as well. Data should be obtained from Mexico's Comisión Federal de Electricidad (Federal Electricity Commission) about energy theft and unauthorized use, which is an important issue to be considered. Mr. Early, Mr. Lucero, Mr. Sussman and Dr. Sweedler agreed to work together to identify and obtain necessary energy-related data. Dr. Smith will assist with any DOE-relevant data questions.

Mr. Eddie Moderow asked about the intent behind using data from the Mexico side of the border. Dr. Sweedler responded that this information would help the Board to illustrate where the energy demand is within the border region, which includes Mexico. This helps to inform the placement of infrastructure and how much of the demand could be met with alternate energy sources. Without having information from Mexico, only half of the picture would be known. Dr. Ganster added that having a better understanding of the evolving energy policy in Mexico will be useful because the policy will drive energy use and export of energy across the border, which affects U.S. interests. It is necessary to understand the full border region and not simply the U.S. component.

Dr. Pohlman mentioned that the federal government has high-performance sustainable building principles that it must abide by when building infrastructure. The Interagency Sustainability Working Group is a part of this aspect and could be mentioned in the report; Dr. Smith agreed. Dr. Sweedler asked whether anyone knew about a similar policy in Mexico; this type of information would be quite helpful. The GNEB members thought that the U.S. Department of State would have this information. Mr. Early volunteered to facilitate a discussion with a director general who has information about plant standards in Mexico.

In response to a question from Dr. Sweedler, Dr. Pohlman explained that ports of entry are designed to be LEED-certified, and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security is moving toward building resilient, net-zero facilities. Dr. Sweedler thought that this would be a good topic to include in the report. Dr. Smith explained that a large portion of her job relates to high-performance sustainable buildings. She agreed that this is an important topic and will be viewing the report with an eye toward including this.

Dr. Wilder cited a DOE report, *Climate Change and the U.S. Energy Sector: Regional Vulnerabilities and Resilience Solutions* (www.energy.gov/policy/downloads/climate-change-and-us-energy-sector-regional-vulnerabilities-and-resilience), and suggested including climate change projections in terms of energy in the border area. Dr. Jeff Payne noted that the letter to CEQ included mention of climate change effects and agreed that in terms of infrastructure siting and sustainability, the report should include a discussion

of climate change. Dr. Ganster thought that this topic would fit best in Section 2 and would need to be a fairly sensitive discussion. It also fits in the efficiency section of the report. Dr. Sweedler noted the discussion during GNEB's December 2018 teleconference that climate change is an overarching element that should be included in all sections rather than as a stand-alone discussion. Dr. Smith agreed with Dr. Sweedler's recollection, adding that climate change is integral to this topic and, therefore, should be included in every section. Dr. Sweedler added that new climate change data and information about specific regions (i.e., the U.S.-Mexico border region) have become available from the National Climate Assessment.

Dr. Wilder recommended creating a subsection within Section 2 that provides an overview of climate change issues, and in each other section of the report include a subsection that discusses climate change effects on the specific topic being discussed in that section. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration manages Regional Integrated Sciences and Assessments Centers that can be used as resources. One is located in California, another is located in Arizona that covers Arizona and New Mexico, and another is located in Texas. Dr. Payne agreed with Dr. Wilder's suggested approach and volunteered to assist her in developing the subsection of Section 2 that will provide an overarching discussion of climate change; Dr. Sweedler will provide a substantive review. All GNEB members will be responsible for including climate change discussion in each of the remaining sections.

Dr. Ganster noted that the estimated number of pages for each section probably would change, particularly Section 2, which will be expanded to include subsections on indigenous and climate change issues.

A GNEB member asked how the potential closing of the border could affect the energy situation in the U.S.-Mexico border region. Dr. Pohlman did not think that the report should include this topic because of the amount of conjecture and uncertainty. The report should focus on environmental issues and not include political issues. Ms. Gantner agreed, noting that GNEB always produces neutral, apolitical reports in response to a given charge. Dr. Ganster added that GNEB achieves consensus when it reports to the President and Congress. The Board is free to discuss the political issues and their challenges while writing the report, but ultimately they should not be included in the report.

The Board members discussed the specific sections of the report and developed writing workgroups. Dr. Wilder volunteered to help develop Section 2.

For Section 3, Dr. Sweedler noted that in addition to the differences between the U.S. and Mexico sectors, U.S. states have differences among each other. He volunteered to assist with language to introduce this concept. Mr. Early added that a unique phenomenon exists in that Baja California is connected to the California grid and not the Mexico grid, and this should be noted as well. Dr. Sweedler commented that readers of the report will understand that the Board recognizes that differences exist if this topic is summarized in Section 2. Dr. Ganster stated that a summary of the differences could be created after Section 5 has been completed and more information on the differences is available. It is important to note the regulatory differences of each state.

Dr. Smith has knowledge about the regulatory aspects of the energy issue and can assist with Section 4. Ms. Gantner noted that Ms. Michelle Freemark, who was not present on the teleconference, could provide information on Arizona's regulatory landscape. Mr. Erik Lee, also not present on the teleconference, had previously volunteered to contribute to Section 4.3 on permitting. Mr. John McNeece also can contribute in terms of California's regulatory policies.

Dr. Sweedler noted the issue of cross-border air pollution related to energy infrastructure and asked that EPA and DOE address this in the report. Ms. Gantner explained that EPA regional staff will be involved

in writing the report and could provide input on this topic. Dr. Smith did not think a specific section on this topic needed to be developed and indicated that she already had planned to review the report with an eye toward this issue. Mr. Lucero thought that this could be included in the environmental context set forth in Section 2, with a description of recent examples. Dr. Smith agreed with this approach. A GNEB member thought that this topic would be covered in Section 9.1. Dr. Ganster noted that this is an issue that would be covered in various sections and summarized in Section 2 to foreshadow the later discussion. He thought that Section 7 is another appropriate section in which to discuss this topic.

Dr. Sweedler asked Dr. Smith whether DOE assesses cross-border environmental effects when issuing a Presidential Permit. Dr. Smith responded that in cases in which it is appropriate, it would be considered before permit issuance. Mr. Gilbert Anaya volunteered to outline the permitting process of the International Boundary and Water Commission. Dr. Smith added that she would work with the DOE Office of Fossil Energy, which authorizes natural gas Presidential Permits, to obtain that office's input as well.

GNEB discussed the assignments for Section 5, with Dr. Ganster noting that information should be shared among the teams developing the subsections for each state so that there is some consistency among them. Dr. Sweedler, Mr. Early and Mr. Lucero will develop the section related to California. Dr. Sweedler mentioned the difficulty he had in obtaining data on the location of transmission lines and other infrastructure; Mr. Early has publicly available information that he can share among the group. Dr. Smith commented that including a map of energy sites in the report could be a national security issue, which also may be a reason that Dr. Sweedler has been having issues obtaining data. Based on recent events, she will be reviewing the report with an eye toward national security concerns. Dr. Sweedler only would like to provide an overarching overview without specific details. Dr. Ganster noted the importance of including graphs, illustrations and maps, but he agreed that national security concerns must be addressed.

Mr. Lucero and Mr. Lee will follow the outline developed for Section 5.1 to write Section 5.2 on Arizona. Mr. Lucero noted that he would be relying heavily on Ms. Freark for information. Mr. Leonard Drago volunteered to contribute to this section as well.

Ms. Yurdin will work with Ms. Tiffany Goolsby on Section 5.3 on New Mexico, also following the outline developed for Section 5.1.

Mr. Sussman and his group will take the Section 5.1 outline into consideration when developing Section 5.4 on Texas, but recent shale and other developments occurring in the state will need to be considered as well. He noted that Section 5.4.6 needs to be broadened to include solar energy and carbon capture. Dr. Sweedler thought that climate change could be discussed in this section. Mr. Moderow added that he and Mr. Jonathan Niermann, who was not present on the call, would work with Mr. Sussman. The group will use the outline for California as a guide in developing the section.

In developing the outline for Section 6, the group decided to discuss each of the Mexico states separately. Dr. Sweedler and Mr. Mario Lopez, not present on the teleconference, are the leads for Section 6.1 on Baja California. Dr. Sweedler reported that much of the text has been written and provided a brief overview of the current energy situation in Baja California.

Mr. Lucero and Mr. Lee will take the lead on Section 6.2 on Sonora. Mr. Lucero will ensure that the section is consistent with the other subsections within Section 6. He provided an overview of what he planned to cover in this subsection. Dr. Sweedler commented that the differences between Sonora and Baja California would be important to highlight, as well as the move toward natural gas.

Mr. Moderow will develop Section 6.3 on Chihuahua and asked for representatives from New Mexico to contribute as well. Ms. Yurdin and Ms. Becker will work with Mr. Moderow and the Texas Commission

on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) on this section. Mr. Moderow and TCEQ also will develop Sections 6.4 (Coahuila), 6.5 (Nuevo León) and 6.6. (Tamaulipas).

Dr. Smith has a colleague who is an expert on the water-energy nexus, and she will ask her to identify potential resources for the teams developing Section 6. Mr. Sussman will obtain input from the North American Development Bank (NADB).

Mr. Sussman and Mr. McNeece are the leads for Section 7 on the evolving Mexico energy policy. Mr. Sussman provided a brief overview to highlight how the current situation is in flux. Dr. Ganster noted that last-minute changes may need to be made to the report just before the report goes to press to address changes in the evolving situation. Dr. Sweedler suggested that an appendix or addendum be added to the report if significant changes occur between the writing of the report and when it is ready to be published.

Section 8 focuses on the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) and energy trade and investment in the U.S.-Mexico border region. Dr. Sweedler reported that the agreement has been held up by concerns of the U.S. Congress. Mr. Lucero added that the environmental community also has concerns. Dr. Ganster noted that the governments of Mexico and Canada have decided not to act on it until the U.S. Congress has made a decision. Dr. Sweedler commented that this topic also may need an addendum if significant changes occur prior to the report being published. The Board discussed various possibilities regarding the termination of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) once the USMCA is in place. The USMCA text has been completed, but the legislative body of each country must ratify it. Although there is uncertainty in the implementation of USMCA, it will be helpful to the readers of the GNEB report to understand the USMCA elements related to energy, which can be described based on the current USMCA text. An overview of the effects of policy changes on socioeconomic issues could be included in Section 2.

Mr. McNeece provided an overview of three possible scenarios. (1) The USMCA is adopted. (2) The USMCA is not adopted, but NAFTA remains in place. (3) USMCA is not adopted, NAFTA is terminated, and the parties return to World Trade Organization (WTO) policies. Because of the uncertainty, he did not think that it would be beneficial to discuss this topic in depth in the report; however, it might be helpful to highlight the three possibilities. Dr. Ganster agreed with the approach to concisely summarize the possibilities. If the countries revert to WTO policies before the report is released, the Board will need to address it at that time.

Section 9 provides an opportunity to summarize the topics discussed earlier in the report while focusing on the challenges and opportunities for border energy development and trade. Mr. Lucero, the section lead, noted that the sections on the states will drive this section to highlight the significant developments that could answer the challenges and opportunities. The report should discuss how any policy changes will provide environmental and quality of life benefits in border communities. He agreed with Dr. Ganster's suggested approach to sketch the section initially and then fill in more specific details once the sections on the states have been completed. To ensure a consistent approach throughout the report, the section can highlight key concerns and obstacles with high-level remedies that can provide benefit and address the concerns. Drs. Sweedler and Smith agreed that Sections 5 and 6 should be completed before Section 9 is developed. The face-to-face meeting may provide an opportunity for the GNEB members to discuss this section in depth. Dr. Ganster commented that a good portion of the meeting would be spent discussing the report, including a substantive discussion of Sections 9 and 10. That said, Section 9 needs to be expanded beyond the current outline before the face-to-face meeting so that the Board's discussion will be more efficient. Mr. Lucero will obtain information from the GNEB members to develop a very rough draft of Section 9 for discussion, which he will provide to the Board members before the face-to-face meeting.

Mr. Moderow thought that Sections 9.7.1, 9.7.2, 9.7.3 and 9.7.6 would be better addressed in a border-wide discussion rather than be focused only on California and Baja California. Dr. Ganster agreed that it should be broadened to discuss the entire border with regional variations. Dr. Sweedler also agreed. Mr. Lucero invited all GNEB members to provide him with topics and issues important to their states so that he could include them in Section 9.

Dr. Ganster commented on the importance of addressing EO 13807 and the One Federal Decision MOU for large border infrastructure projects. Dr. Smith thought that a high-level overview with current federal examples could be included in Section 2, and more specific details could be included in Section 9. EO 13807 and the One Federal Decision MOU provide specific timeframes for completing environmental reviews and issuance of authorizations. The important point behind the policy is engaging in early agency collaboration and better planning to create a more efficient review process that reduces or eliminates duplicative reviews. Under this policy, before an agency issues a Notice of Intent, which initiates the formal environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), it will have the necessary information and specificity of data to move forward with NEPA technical requirements in a meaningful way that the public can understand. The EO and MOU create opportunities for early engagement among federal agencies and with international partners. This allows the initiating agency to understand the potential concerns and area resources to avoid or minimize negative environmental effects. The EO also requires agencies to be more transparent and develop timelines that the agencies are held to, which provides predictability. Section 9.1 is an appropriate section to discuss the opportunities and the One Federal Decision framework. Section 9.2 could discuss the challenges of decisions that need to be made (“downstream decisions”); for example, decisions about the timeline for working with international partners on international decisions.

Ms. Gantner highlighted the timeline for completing the report.

- The GNEB members, working in teams, must write their sections of the report by June 14, 2019, so that a draft is ready for the June 2019 face-to-face meeting.
- The Board will discuss the first draft of the report during its June 2019 face-to-face meeting and develop a plan for creating the final draft.
- The Board members will continue to work on and refine the report in July and August 2019.
- The GNEB will hold a teleconference to approve the report in mid-September 2019; a quorum must be present on the teleconference.
- The contractor will edit (including the reference list) and format (including the insertion of photographs, illustrations, graphs and charts) the report in October and November 2019.
- The report will be printed during the beginning of December 2019.
- The report must be delivered by December 31, 2019.

June Face-to-Face Meeting

Ms. Gantner expects that the face-to-face meeting will be held on June 27 and 28, 2019, in San Diego, California. She is having difficulty finding hotel availability during that time, so the dates may need to be adjusted. Mr. Roy volunteered to assist Ms. Gantner in finding a suitable hotel. Ms. Gantner also is working on obtaining approval for a site visit, which would occur the day before the meeting begins. A half-day of presentations on topics pertaining to the report will be scheduled for the morning of the first

day of the meeting. The remainder of the meeting will be focused on discussion of the draft report. The meeting will adjourn between 12:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. local time on the second day of the meeting.

Dr. Ganster explained that GNEB invites experts to address issues that will help the Board develop the final report. Based on the conversations during this teleconference, he suggested the following topics be presented during the meeting: climate change, evolving Mexico energy policy, One Federal Decision approach and USMCA. Invited experts must be able to support their own travel to the meeting. Site visits also should relate to the report topic. GNEB members with suggestions on presentation topics, experts or site visits should contact Dr. Ganster and Ms. Gantner.

Dr. Sweedler and Mr. Roy volunteered to serve on the workgroup to develop the face-to-face meeting agenda.

Mr. Lucero suggested that the Mexico Consul General stationed in the San Diego area be invited to discuss Mexico's evolving energy policy. Mr. Ganster explained that the Consul Generals are in the process of moving, and the new Consul General for the San Diego area, who is arriving from Austin, Texas, may not be in San Diego by the meeting. A GNEB member noted that the Mexico Ambassador recently visited border states; if the Consuls General are not in place by the face-to-face meeting, a representative from Washington, D.C. may be able to attend. Dr. Ganster asked the Board members to consider who might be able to help GNEB understand the rate and direction of change. Dr. Patricia Juárez-Carrillo stated that she would try to identify such individuals in the San Diego area.

Ms. Gantner urged the GNEB representatives who have not returned their invitational travel forms to do so as soon as possible to ensure that their travel to the face-to-face meeting is supported by EPA. Invitational travel does not pertain to alternates or federal agency representatives, who must be supported by their own agencies.

Adjournment

Dr. Ganster thanked the GNEB members for their thoughtful input and discussion. Dr. Sweedler thanked Dr. Ganster for his efforts in finalizing and delivering the 2018 advisory letter within the tight timeframe.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:56 p.m. EDT.

Action Items

- The GNEB members, working in teams, will write their assigned sections of the report by June 14, 2019.
- Drs. Pohlman and Smith will help to ensure that the One Federal Decision policy is considered during the writing of the report.
- Mr. Roy, Mr. Antone and Mr. Lucero will develop a subsection about indigenous energy issues in the border region for Section 2.
- Mr. Early and Dr. Sweedler will develop text focusing on energy efficiency in the border region for Section 2.
- Mr. Early, Mr. Lawrence Lucero, Mr. Sussman and Dr. Sweedler will identify and obtain necessary energy-related data; Dr. Smith will assist with any DOE-relevant data questions.

- Mr. Early will facilitate a discussion with a director general who has information about plant standards in Mexico.
- Drs. Wilder and Payne will develop a subsection of Section 2 that will provide an overarching discussion of climate change, and Dr. Sweedler will provide a substantive review.
- All GNEB members will include a discussion of climate change in their assigned sections of the report.
- After Section 5 has been completed, and the differences among the states have been described, Dr. Sweedler will develop text for Section 3 that provides an overarching summary of the differences among U.S. border states.
- Mr. Early will advise on the unique energy situation of Baja California.
- Dr. Smith, Mr. Lee, Mr. McNeece, Mr. Anaya and Ms. Freeark will contribute regulatory and permitting information to Section 4. Representatives from other border states will provide information as necessary.
- For Section 5, information should be shared among the various state teams so that there is some consistency among the subsections.
- Dr. Sweedler, Mr. Early and Mr. Lucero will develop Section 5.1 on California.
- Mr. Lucero and Mr. Lee will follow the outline developed for Section 5.1 to write Section 5.2 (Arizona); Mr. Drago will contribute to the section as well.
- Ms. Yurdin will work with Ms. Goolsby on Section 5.3 on New Mexico, following the outline developed for Section 5.1.
- Mr. Sussman, Mr. Moderow and Mr. Niermann will consider the Section 5.1 outline when developing Section 5.4 on Texas, but other Texas-specific issues need to be considered as well.
- Dr. Sweedler and Mr. Lopez will develop Section 6.1 on Baja California.
- Mr. Lucero and Mr. Lee will develop Section 6.2 on Sonora. Mr. Lucero will ensure that the section is consistent with the other subsections within Section 6.
- Mr. Moderow, Ms. Yurdin and Ms. Becker will develop Section 6.3 on Chihuahua.
- Mr. Moderow and other colleagues from the TCEQ will develop Sections 6.4 (Coahuila), 6.5 (Nuevo León) and 6.6. (Tamaulipas).
- Dr. Smith will ask her colleague about potential water-energy resources for the teams developing Section 6.
- Mr. Sussman will obtain input from the NADB.
- Mr. Sussman and Mr. McNeece will lead the development of Section 7, with the caveat that the section may need to be revised prior to the release of the report if any new developments occur.
- Mr. McNeece will draft Section 8, with the caveat that the section may need to be revised prior to the release of the report if any new developments occur.

- Mr. Lucero will obtain information from the GNEB members to develop a rough draft of Section 9 for discussion, which he will provide to the Board members before the face-to-face meeting.
- GNEB members will provide Mr. Lucero with topics or issues important to their states to include in Section 9.

Appendix A: Meeting Participants

Chair

Paul Ganster, Ph.D.

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

Nonfederal, State, Local and Tribal Members

Kimberly Collins, Ph.D.

Executive Director, Barbara and William
Leonard Transportation Center
Professor, Department of Public Relations
California State University, San Bernardino
San Bernardino, CA

Leonard Drago

Ombudsman/Tribal Liaison
Director's Office
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Phoenix, AZ

Bryan Early

Special Advisor to Commissioner McAllister
and Advisor to Chair Weisenmiller on Mexico
California Energy Commission
Sacramento, CA

Tiffany Goolsby, AICP

Senior Planner
South Central Council of Governments
Mesilla, NM

Patricia M. Juárez-Carrillo, Ph.D.

Coordinator/Research Associate
Center for Inter-American and Border Studies
The University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX

Erik Lee

Executive Director
North American Research Partnership
Sierra Vista, AZ

Gregory F. Lucero

City Council Member
City of Nogales
Nogales, AZ

Lawrence T. Lucero

Senior Director of Government and External
Affairs
Tucson Electric Power Company
Tucson, AZ

John McNeece, III

Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies
University of California, San Diego
San Diego, CA

Rob Roy

Environmental Director
Environmental Protection Office
La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians
Pauma Valley, CA

Soll A. Sussman

Managing Director
S cubed Studio
Austin, TX

Alan Sweedler, Ph.D.

Professor Emeritus
Sustainability Advisory Board
City of Del Mar
Del Mar, CA

Kristine Yurdin

Non-Discrimination Coordinator
New Mexico Environment Department
Santa Fe, NM

Margaret Wilder, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
School of Geography and Development
Center for Latin American Studies
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

Federal Members

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Natural Resource Conservation Service

Salvador Salinas

State Conservationist
Natural Resource Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Temple, TX

U.S. Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Jeffrey L. Payne, Ph.D.

Director
Office for Coastal Management
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce
Mount Pleasant, SC

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Teresa R. Pohlman, Ph.D., LEED, AP

Executive Director
Sustainability and Environmental Programs
Office of the Chief Readiness Support Officer
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of State

Hillary C. Quam

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

International Boundary and Water Commission

Jayne Harkins, P.E.

Commissioner
U.S. Section
International Boundary and Water Commission
El Paso, TX

Federal Alternates

U.S. Department of Energy

Julie A. Smith, Ph.D.

Management and Program Analyst
Transmission Permitting and Technical Assistance Division
Office of Electricity
U.S. Department of Energy
Washington, D.C.

International Boundary and Water Commission

Gilbert Anaya

Division Chief
Environmental Management Division
U.S. Section
International Boundary and Water Commission
El Paso, TX

U.S. Department of Transportation

Sylvia Grijalva

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

State Alternate

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

Jim Rizk

Senior Advisor to Chairman Niermann
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Austin, TX

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regional Office Participant

Region 9

Jessica Helgesen

Environmental Health Coordinator and
Communications Lead
Border 2020 U.S.-Mexico Environmental
Program
Region 9
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
San Diego, CA

Designated Federal Official

Ann-Marie Gantner

Designated Federal Official
Good Neighbor Environmental Board
Federal Advisory Committee Management Division
Office of Administration and Resources Management
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C

Other Participants

Kathryn Becker, J.D.

Assistant General Counsel
Office of General Counsel and Environmental
Policy
New Mexico Environment Department
Santa Fe, NM

Joyce Marie Britt

Energy Management Engineer
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, D.C.

Eddie Moderow

Border Affairs Program Coordinator
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Austin, TX

Contractor Support

Kristen LeBaron

The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.
Gaithersburg, MD

Appendix B: Teleconference Agenda



Good Neighbor Environmental Board

Public Teleconference
Discussion of the Draft Report on
Energy Transmission in the U.S.-Mexico Border Region

April 19, 2019
12:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. EDT

Call-In Number: 1-202-991-0477 Conference Code: 7706890#

AGENDA

- 12:00–12:45 p.m. Welcome, Introductions and Overview of Agenda
- Ann-Marie Gantner, Designated Federal Officer
 - Paul Ganster, Chair, Good Neighbor Environmental Board
 - Board introductions
- 12:45–1:00 p.m. Public Comments
- 1:00–1:20 p.m. Council of Environmental Quality Response on Advice Letter
- One Federal Decision Memorandum of Understanding
 - Executive Order 13807
- 1:20–3:30 p.m. Discussion of 19th Report
- Overarching concerns or questions on outline
 - Overall report structure
 - Establish workgroups
 - Timeline
 - Next steps
- 1:30–4:00 p.m. June Face-to-Face Meeting
- San Diego, California
 - Workgroup (for agenda/speakers and site visits)
 - Potential site visits
- 4:00 p.m. Adjournment

Appendix C: Chair Certification of Minutes

I, Paul Ganster, Chair of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB), certify that this is the final version of the complete minutes for the teleconference held on April 19, 2019, and that the minutes accurately reflect the discussions and decisions of the meeting.



7/09/2019

Paul Ganster, GNEB Chair

Date