

**MINUTES
of the
204th COUNCIL MEETING
DoubleTree by Hilton
West Fargo, North Dakota
July 26, 2024**

Table of Contents

Welcome and Introductions	4
Approval of Minutes	4
Committee Reports	4
Water Resources Committee.....	4
Water Quality Committee	5
Legal Committee.....	5
Executive Committee.....	5
WestFAST Report.....	5
International Boundary Water Challenges & Opportunities.....	7
Landsat Next Update.....	12
Future Council Meetings.....	13
State Reports	13
Sunsetting Positions for the 2024 Fall Meetings	14
Other Matters	14

**MINUTES
of the
204th COUNCIL MEETING
DoubleTree by Hilton
West Fargo, North Dakota
July 26, 2024**

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT *(via zoom)*

ALASKA	Christina Carpenter <i>Tom Barrett</i>
ARIZONA	<i>Trevor Baggione</i>
CALIFORNIA	Joaquin Esquivel Jeanine Jones
COLORADO	Jojo La <i>Lauren Ris</i>
IDAHO	Jerry Rigby John Simpson
KANSAS	Earl Lewis Tom Stiles Connie Owen <i>Matt Unruh</i>
MONTANA	Anna Pakenham Stevenson <i>Jay Weiner</i>
NEBRASKA	Justin Lavene Tom Riley
NEVADA	Jennifer Carr Cathy Erskine Melissa Flatley
NEW MEXICO	<i>John Rhoderick</i> <i>Tanya Trujillo</i>
NORTH DAKOTA	Andrea Travnicek
OKLAHOMA	Sara Gibson

OREGON	Racquel Rancier
SOUTH DAKOTA	Nakaila Steen
TEXAS	Jon Niermann
UTAH	Sarah Shechter Todd Stonely <i>Candice Hasenyager</i>
WASHINGTON	Leslie Connelly <i>Ria Bearns</i>
WYOMING	Chris Brown Jennifer Zygmunt <i>Jeff Cowley</i>

GUESTS

Eric Dodds, AE2S
Jen Verleger, State of South Dakota
Brian Clark, U.S. Geological Survey
Charles Scaife, U.S. Department of Energy
Lance Yohe, International Joint Commission
Erica Gaddis, SWCA Environmental Consultants
Andrew Hadsell, SWCA Environmental Consultants
Hannah Singleton, Southern Nevada Water Authority
Nicole Klobas, Arizona Department of Water Resources
Jim Rizk, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Aubrey Bettencourt, Netafim - Orbia Precision Agriculture
Yaping Chi, North Dakota Department of Water Resources
Alexa Davis, North Dakota Department of Water Resources
Abby Ebach, North Dakota Department of Water Resources
Aaron Carranza, North Dakota Department of Water Resources
Cammie Wright, North Dakota Department of Water Resources
Peter Wax, North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality
Kathy Alexander, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
George Russell, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality
Dehvyne Ashmore, Nebraska Department of Natural Resources
Amy Winkelman, North Dakota Department of Water Resources
George Russell, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality
Mark Mayer, South Dakota Dept. of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Luévano Grano José de Jesús, Comisión Internacional de Límites y Aguas

Trevor Watson, Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation
Kathleen Ronning-Schimetz, North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality

WESTFAST

Michael Eberle, USDA Forest Service
Stephanie Granger, National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Madeline Franklin, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (WestFAST Liaison)

STAFF

Tony Willardson
Michelle Bushman
Elysse Campbell

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

WSWC Chair Jon Niermann welcomed everyone.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the meetings held on March 14, 2024, in Washington, D.C. was offered and seconded. The minutes of the meeting were unanimously approved.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Water Resources Committee

Andrea Travnicek reported that the Water Resources Committee meeting had a jam-packed agenda. She expressed appreciation to all the different speakers highlighting updates on carbon energy, integrated water financing, and precision agriculture solutions, and the North Dakota Western States water survey, and further information will be coming on that. Ryan James provided an update on WaDE, which we will have further discussions related to WestCAT, the information that is being collected and how it's being used. Then Duane DeKrey gave some information on the Red River Valley Water Supply Project. We had some good roundtable discussions on water supply for Corps projects and on rural water systems funding.

We did move to recommend Position #468, Rural Water Supply Infrastructure to be considered by the Full Council. I'd like to make a motion for approval. There was a second, and the motion carried.

B. Water Quality Committee

Jennifer Zygmunt – We appreciated all of our presenters. We heard from Peter Wax, North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality on North Dakota's water quality issues, which was very interesting to learn they have early terms from 1900s. Mark Mayer from South Dakota talked to the Committee about a proposal to lengthen NPDES Permit terms. We have a subcommittee that has volunteered to work on that between now and the Kansas meeting. We heard from EPA on the WOTUS update and the mapping tools for wetlands. We heard from Alaska and Washington about their Human Health Criteria standards, vision processes, and some challenges that they are having with working with EPA. Aaron Vollmer, AE2S talked to us about a very impressive PFAS project in Minnesota. Very impressive on what they've accomplished over a 10-year period. Michelle gave us some updates on the federal mining dialogue.

The Committee has two positions that were moved to forward to the Full Council. The first is a new position on nutrients that was worked on by a subcommittee with several edits with other states and the Executive Committee. There were no further edits made to the position yesterday, so I have motion to approve that new position on nutrients. There was a second, and the position was unanimously approved.

The second position (#469) is regarding water transfers and NPDES discharge permits and there were no proposed changes to that position and so I would like to make a motion for approval. There was a second, and the position was unanimously approved.

C. Legal Committee

Chris Brown reported on the presentations on North Dakota's sovereign lands, the legal challenges to Florida's assumption of CWA 404 authority. We had an update on the post-2026 Colorado River operations, the Navajo-Hopi water rights settlement in Arizona, and the recent Supreme Court decision on the interstate Rio Grande compact. We also held a roundtable discussion on national groundwater use and initial ideas for a states' groundwater workshop in the near future.

There is one sunseting position (#470) regarding endangered species and state water rights, which Chris moved for approval. There was a second, and the position was unanimously approved.

D. Executive Committee

Jon Niermann - We also had a very full agenda, but got to none of it, except for one particular budget item which has to do with the Bureau of Reclamation grant to advance our work on state water data. There were a number of concerns raised about that because that grant calls for matching funds and we do not have another entity currently lined up to provide those matching

funds, so they would come out of the Council's reserves. There were questions around that, and we never reached a resolution and so we're going to continue the conversation. To highlight some concerns that I heard. There was concern about the utility of the product, and the politics. It seems to be serving some customers that the states had some concerns about. There were concerns about the cost to the states, as well as the OpenET piece that Tony can explain in a moment.

The Executive Committee is going to talk further about all those concerns later and create kind of a baseline understanding of what the product is, without any question or merit as to whether the Council moves forward to make this match or not, but rather just to address what the product is. That was really the substance of the Executive Committee meeting.

Tony provided an overview behind the WestCAT Tool, focusing on water supplies and voluntary reductions in use. He described the tool's calculation process, using OpenET Coalition models and API building. He outlined the tool's features, including user control, transparency, and cost-sharing requirements and discussed the tool's potential benefits, including facilitating review and conservation efforts.

WESTFAST REPORT

Michael Eberle, Water Rights and Uses Program Manager, USDA Forest Service (WestFAST) thanked the states who participated in the WestFAST meeting in Washington, DC, back in March. There were a lot of states present, and the WestFAST representatives had their principles there. The agencies we're able to tell some stories and really share some of the positive results with the relationships between WestFAST and the WSWC.

As presented yesterday, WestFAST is supporting the effort in the State of New Mexico in connecting critical water projects with federal programs, expertise and funding opportunities. We expect that this project will create a network of local and regional experts at both the state and federal level. This is an extension of the support WestFAST provided to the State of Nevada, which you heard more about during the WSWC meeting in Reno, Nevada.

We have had a webinar series on stream restoration and water rights associated with restoration. We've had presentations on the science and the funding, and we've heard from four states, California, Colorado, Nebraska and Utah in our webinar series, but we are really looking for opportunities to see either successes, or almost successes, or near business from the ground level of like restoration projects. If there are other topics that you'd like us to include in our webinar series, please let us know.

WestFAST also continues to expand our group, and over the next year we are working to include FEMA and the Department of Energy. There have been some changes to WestFAST Leadership. Roger Gorke (EPA), who has served as Chair for a while, will now serve as past chair with Chris Carlson, U.S. Forest Service, serving as Chair for the next term. He will be supported by a larger group of vice chairs to include Paula Cutillo (BLM); Heather Hoffman (NRCS); and myself. In addition, we are working on the recruitment process for the new liaison.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY WATER CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES

Panel Members Included:

Luévano Grano José de Jesús, Comisión Internacional de Límites y Aguas
Lance Yohe, U.S. Commissioner, International Joint Commission
Raquel Rancier, Deputy Director, Oregon Department of Water Resources
John Simpson, Partner, Marten Law, LLP, Boise, Idaho
Tanya Trujillo, Deputy State Engineer, New Mexico
Nicole Klobas, Chief Counsel, Arizona Department of Water Resources

Andrea: We appreciate everybody taking this opportunity to talk about cross border issues. Tony and I put together a list of questions that we sent out to folks last night. We just want to have a high-level discussion on how we can share information, talk through some challenges and opportunities. I know that Jesús has some slides related to some of the discussion on the river and so maybe we'll start with that, and then continue on with others.

Jesús spoke briefly about the Colorado River process, which we began in 1907. We have accomplished a lot of things. As you know, Mexico has a treaty with the U.S., where the U.S. allots 1.5 million acre-feet of Colorado River water to Mexico. This could be up to 1.7 million if there is enough water in the in the system. If there is not, Mexico would take cuts, as well as the other states in the U.S.

The All-American Canal, which runs parallel to the U.S.-Mexico border seeped some of its water into Mexico and was taken by the Mexican farmers. The farmers wanted the continued use of that water and so they presented a lawsuit in the U.S. court. They lost, but because of that, we began this cooperation process in 2007. Since then, we have signed Minutes 317; 318; 319; 323; and 330. We are working on the process of implementing all these Minutes, which has allowed us to identify many projects for the benefit of the two countries, and the benefit of the system in trying to increase the levels in the main reservoirs in the basin.

Minute 319 identified what we can do to preserve the system, what actions Mexico can take on their side. The U.S. is also an extension of those cooperation measures that we adopted in Minute 319. We are still in the process of implementing Minute 323 and also Minute 330, which is more aggressive in the way that we want to conserve water.

The key element for Minute 323 is its distribution of flows under high elevation reservoir conditions. That means that when there is excess water, Mexico could have access to that water in a scheduled manner. Minute 323 also focuses on improving the environment along the river, especially in the Delta. It also touches on the distribution of flows under low elevations. That's the case for now. The last few years, both countries have taken a lot of cuts in order to preserve the system. We have identified some measures to improve the salinity of the water that is delivered to Mexico, and we are working together to try to solve this problem. We have projects that are being developed in Mexico in order to save water. That is a process that we're still working on. It's not easy to work with the farmers to develop this project. We have a bi-national water scarcity contingency plan, which means, besides the cuts that we already have, we could save some water

that could be used later once the reservoir level recovers. We are working with the variability in the flows that Mexico receives, which is a problem because sometimes some of the farmers don't receive the water that they need. So, we are trying to avoid this kind of problem and are looking for ways to solve it.

Finally, we included the potential use of the All-American Canal to convey Mexico's water. One of the main elements of Minutes 319 and 323 was the restoration of part of the Colorado River. We have restored more than 1,200 acres and have been very successful in this effort. I think that this is the first time that both countries have worked on this. This effort has resulted in a lot water for the environment in order to restore the Delta. Our flow in 2014 we released 105,000 acre feet of water in which we reconnected the Colorado River to the sea for the first time in many, many years. Right now, we are dedicating environmental flows in order to preserve the storage areas, and we have been very successful.

Tanya Trujillo, Deputy State Engineer, New Mexico mentioned that she loves the idea of being able to manage collaboratively and cooperatively with their international boundary neighbors. She has focused on projects with Mexico in the Colorado River system and on the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo, which are part of the same treaty even though they're very different systems and have very different legal and hydrologic requirements associated with both of those. It's great to be able to compare the successes and the challenges in both of those systems on our southern border, and to work with the International Boundary Water Commission and the counterpart in Mexico to try to work through the challenges. She has been fortunate to work on some of these issues going back probably close to 20 years now and observing the transformation of that relationship, particularly the one on the Colorado River system, where Jesús described the track record of successful Minutes that have allowed us to modify our operations in a way that helps benefit both countries. The lessons and the benefits that we've developed in the Colorado River system I think can be a model for what we can do on the Rio Grande-Rio Bravo. There are huge challenges in the Rio Grande system. I think the more we can do to share information and think collaboratively about how to manage a shared system, the better it will be for both countries.

When I was at Interior, I had the opportunity to work on some of our Canadian transboundary water issues, and that was a really good learning experience as well to see how the International Joint Commission (IJC) was set up. To see how the two countries could work together on issues that span across the national border, from water management issues in the Columbia River Basin and the treaty that's being worked on as we speak, and then some transboundary contamination issues and water quality issues that I know several of the folks in this group would have particular interest and expertise in, all the way over to the Great Lakes, where we have shared fisheries research. We have shared indigenous tribal issues that we're working on together. Of course, the energy issues that intersect both of those countries are a huge factor in transboundary relationships on the northern border. I'm happy to be participating on this panel and to dive into further details on any of these particular projects. It has been a very important part of the work from our New Mexico perspective to make sure we do have a solid relationship with our partners on our southern border in Mexico, and of course, the connection among our sister states as we work through some of these transboundary challenges.

Nicole Klobas, Chief Counsel, Arizona Department of Water Resources, said she was honored to be on a panel with Jesús and Tanya. They are both definitely leaders, especially in my experience with between the United States and Mexico on the Colorado River. I know that they have been very crucial to the success that we've seen by national collaboration, and I can only second everything that they have said. I have also had the privilege of working on the binational efforts and seeing how that relationship has grown particularly since 2007- 2008 when I started participating. The opportunity to have the state included in that process has been really crucial and has created more opportunities for us to develop relationships across the border and develop an understanding of how the system works on both sides, and how we can develop benefits for both countries in the way that we manage the system.

John Simpson, Partner, Marten Law, LLP, Boise, Idaho, talked about the difficulties Idaho has had being a part of the discussions between the U.S. and Canada on the Columbia River Treaty negotiations.

Raquel Rancier, Deputy Director, Oregon Department of Water Resources, noted that the Columbia River is a bit different. Work is not being done in the same manner as in Mexico from these other systems between Canada and the U.S. It is really hard for our state to get updates, and that's in part because we aren't a part of the negotiation process. With that said, the information they are using for those negotiations comes from a lot of the work that was done prior to 2014, there was a lot of outreach by the State Department to the states and to other stakeholders. Once the negotiations started, there really hasn't been as much interaction with the states. We do reach out to the State Department and see if there's any updates periodically, but for the most part, the answer has been they're still negotiating. From our standpoint, it was a good thing to at least know that these negotiations were still going on. I think in terms of the agreement in principle, certainly as the states get more detail, I think we'll see how the process works. I think the Columbia system is also different. There is no interstate compact among states within the U.S. When we talk about how the Columbia is managed, a lot of it is driven by the federal power and flood control interests. It will be interesting to see as this agreement and the details of the treaty come out what that will mean and if the states want to have further conversations about the management system on our side of the border. Until then, there's really not a lot to report on. Like we said, we don't have to have a dedicated team, because really, this has been led by the State Department. I was glad to hear that Idaho's comments are very similar to ours.

Tanya addressed the question related to additional lessons learned or additional comments the panel might have relating to how the binational process has been going. I raised earlier the comparison and contrast between the Colorado River system and the Rio Grande system. Jesús, maybe you could talk to us a little bit about that comparison. I know it's very sensitive, but it's a good topic of discussion. Maybe another question for Jesús would be talking about your efforts to try to institutionalize some of the procedures of the of the Commission.

Jesús thanked Tanya. Right now, we are facing huge challenges, both in the Colorado and in the Rio Grande because we have over-allocated waters in both basins. We don't have enough water to deliver to the users. Besides the growing demand and not enough water, we have people asking for more water. Trying to convince the users that we need to use the water in other ways

in order to save water, to prepare ourselves for a future with less water is hard to make farmers in Mexico who had been receiving their full allocation for 75 years understand that there's not enough water. They don't understand how this has happened, and why nobody prepared them for this, but the time has come. We need to prepare ourselves. That's why Minutes 319, 323 and 330 are so important. Before I got into that, let me say that the Minutes are documents for which the Mexican and U.S. Commissioner, present recommendations to their governments and once the governments approve the Minutes, that's a binding agreement for the two countries. Through those minutes, we're trying to develop projects that prepare us for a future with less water. That's why the Minutes are so importance. Some of the users are not convinced that those are the measures you need to take. It's a hard process in developing or implementing the Minutes.

In the case of the Rio Grande, we're facing a big, big challenge, because we haven't been able to have a specific rule for the distribution of water on the Mexican side. That is affecting how Mexico could comply with its obligations in the 1944 Water Treaty. We are working really hard, trying to have this internal distribution of the water in the Rio Grande. We are hoping to reach an agreement once the new administration enters in this October. Once we have that clarity, the distribution of the water on the Mexican side, I think we will be in a better position to comply with the obligations under the 1944 Water Treaty. The challenges there are big and we have a lot of work to do still.

Andrea asked if there are any high-level opportunities, challenges. I know communication from the State Department has been brought up and really trying to make sure that states are fully engaged. Any information to share that we can collaborate on and bring back.

Tayna: I'll jump in on that point, because I think I heard some of the comments from Idaho and Oregon relating to the desire for further input, communication and a better level of updates in the process. That is exactly the challenge that we faced probably 10 to 15 years ago in the Colorado River Basin - trying to move to a system where we had shared information, shared ability to influence the outcome of some of these international agreements, and it is very complex process because of the diplomatic role of the State Department in guiding our national interests while simultaneously recognizing the interests of particular states. In the West, we know the states have that ownership of that water and that control in place. That's one of the arguments that we used on the state side to convince the State Department and the Interior Department to let us into the room for those discussions. What we knew was any agreement that was going to be developed at the binational level was going to depend on support and participation from the water users in the U.S. That's a different construct up in the northern boundary, but the spirit is still the same, like making sure that we can have input and participation from the states and the water users, which will benefit both countries. Even though it's difficult negotiating it's something that will have long-term benefits. I appreciate the opportunity to think about comparing experiences on both borders and in thinking through how to best utilize the models that we have developed.

Nichol: I think Jesús has actually touched on one of the biggest challenges that we have, which is the changes in administration, or potential changes from elections - that uncertainty for a period of time. In Mexico, they cannot enter into any agreements for a certain period of time before an election, so it kind of puts a pause on certain negotiations even before the election comes.

Even in the U.S., we don't have a specific restriction, but there's generally a lot to do. Even if the administration might want to, some of the other parties, like the states that are crucial to implementing any sort of national agreement might be reluctant to do so, because they might want to see how the election turns out. Usually our elections are a little bit off between the two countries. The U.S. Presidential election is every four years and Mexico has elections every six years. This year they're aligned. Mexico just had its election, and the U.S. has one coming in November, and so it's made it very challenging over this past year and will in the months going forward. We're moving very quickly in some ways, but very slowly in others. There's much more significant involvement and interaction with Mexico in a lot of those discussions, because it will be critical to implementation of whatever happens after 2026. It has been very challenging to have those binational discussions with our respective election seasons lining up so closely together. That being said, I would also like to reinforce the message that it has been really crucial on the Colorado River. I think one of the best things that we ever did, as the seven states, was create that process where the states are directly involved in discussions with Mexico and also in finding solutions. I think that the states are critical, because we do have water rights, and we do control a lot of the water in that sense, but also it's invited a lot of opportunity for water users to contribute funds to projects that can benefit those countries, and that can provide a lot of efficiencies in Mexico and provide not just temporary benefits to the U.S., but long-term benefits. The funding doesn't typically come from the states. Certainly, the U.S. has been able to contribute funds, but the motivation from the individual water users and their funding capability has been crucial to that level of success as well. I think we've been able to capitalize on the opportunity to have pilot projects and starting small has allowed us to learn lessons and figure out how to improve that by national process. I think the biggest component of this is patience with the process. Frequently within the State of Arizona, have folks who want to try to go around the State Department and go around the International Boundary Water Commission or Sela, because they think that it moves too slowly. Our response - you think it's slow? When you try to go around them, you will slow it down even more because that creates setbacks. Sometimes those are setbacks because ultimately, IBWC, or Sela is going to have to be ultimately involved no matter what you do. Sometimes there are setbacks because there are inadvertent missteps that people make when they're not working with people who are experts at working with another country. You might think that you have this really great contact in that city or with that particular water manager, or contractor in Mexico, but then it turns out that there are seven other organizations that are involved. Just by partnering with this one person that you have contact with, you've actually upset those other organizations and so that creates setbacks on whatever project people are trying to move forward, even further because then there's general resentment and suspicion that you're trying to go around the rules and short circuit things. That's not necessarily people's intent. It's not that they don't want to follow the rules, they just feel like there must be a faster way to get there. I think you just have to have patience and work through what the process is. Once you establish that binational process, that is the path forward. It's never going to be done in two weeks, that's just how it is. You have to build that time into your project, and you have to make sure that you do it the right way, which means going through the diplomatic process that we've established.

Jesús: Another difference between the relationships at the U.S.-Canadian Border, Mexico has a historical situation that affects negotiations and relations. There is a perception in the minds of all the Mexicans that the U.S. stole from Mexico the health of its territory. That is something

that comes to mind in every kind of negotiation for many reasons. So, it's really hard to negotiate under these circumstances. Especially when we try to convince the Mexican users that we are working together with the U.S. side in order to prepare for the future. They don't completely trust us. I don't know if I'm explaining myself well enough, but this situation is something that we need to consider. The U.S.-Canadian border situation is probably smoother, but not on the other border of the U.S. It's something else we need to deal with in order to meet our objectives.

Raquel: I appreciated hearing your experience on the southern border. Obviously, you've heard today, our experience has been quite a bit different. Certainly though, some of the lessons that we've heard are things that we should be thinking about in the future. Certainly, there are very different systems, although they do have similarities. I think that as we move forward, it's important for us to learn from the southern border, and also to make sure that we are taking steps necessary to meet the needs of the watersheds in Oregon

Andrea thanked everyone for their time to be on the panel.

LANDSAT NEXT

Tim Newman, Program Coordinator for the National Land Imaging Program, USGS gave an update on Landsat Next and the super spectral triplets story. This is our exciting new concept for Landsat next. It's not just a single satellite replacing Landsat 9, but three smaller satellites, which will be built together, launched together, and operating with a six-day revisit to any place around the world. We're excited by the 15 extra spectral bands that are going on board, including five thermal infrared bands that will be used for assessing water use and quality and a number of other applications. These are user driven needs, user driven capabilities that folks have wanted for many years. The spatial resolution will be better, from 30 meters today down to 10, so you'll be able to see much finer targets, farm fields, forest streams and so forth. We're still going to continue the radiometric quality that we've had with previous missions that is the hallmark of Landsat.

NASA just recently awarded a Landsat Next imaging instrument contract to Raytheon (\$500M) to build three instrument suites for the next three missions, plus an option for a fourth. We're really excited by that development. Of course, nothing is real until someone starts building the hardware. Raytheon is just kicking off this contract and so we'll be learning more in the coming weeks about the design.

You all know the history. It tends to be tough to get missions started. While good news on the instrument, for the spacecraft bus, request for proposals were going to go out to industry to get feedback from vendors to potentially build the spacecraft buses that each of those instruments will ride on, but that has been delayed due to updated resource planning at NASA, which is concerning on the ground system side.

On the FY25 President's budget, the House came back very strongly for USGS. They gave us the plus up that we sought for FY25 and so we're excited by that. The Senate came through actually yesterday and they added \$6M to our budget. They have to meet in conference to

determine what the ultimate increase will be for the ground segment side. On the NASA side, NASA was seeking \$150M, which the House was not clear about whether that \$150 was provided or not. They actually reduced the overall NASA Earth Science Division budget by about \$200 million from today's level. The Senate, however, did provide the \$150 million for Landsat Next with specific language supporting that mission. We're at kind of this weird point where some things are locked in, and some things are still in deliberation, but it does appear that both the House and Senate language is supportive of Landsat Next as we go forward.

Back in June, Chavonda Jacobs-Young, Under Secretary of Agriculture, USDA sent a letter to Mike Brain, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, DOI and Pam Melroy, Deputy Administrator, NASA in support of Landsat Next. The letter lays out the history of USDA with the Landsat program and why Landsat Next matters. This type of letter really does make a difference. When these letters come in, folks listen. These are political figures with the DOI and NASA that received the letter. There is always room for more! The WSWC has been a strong supporter for Landsat for decades and so this would be a great time for such a letter to come through to help bolster the case for Landsat Next as we transition through these kinds of crazy times before we get everything on contract. Thank you again for your continued support.

Questions/Comments:

Tanya complimented Tim and the folks at the USGS for their leadership on the Landsat program and volunteered to work with the WSWC to try to put together a support letter, or otherwise figure out how to help continue the momentum. She mentioned if Tim has already shared the USDA letter with the WSWC staff, if they could circulate it around as that would be very helpful to use with our particular constituencies.

Tim stated that he had shared the letter with Tony and Andrea. He thanked her and Andrea for their support of the mission during their time with the DOI. Both were very supportive of Landsat and Landsat Next in their 10 years there. It speaks to the joint appeal of this mission across administrations.

FUTURE COUNCIL MEETINGS

Jon Niermann announced that the WSWC's 2024 Fall Meetings will be held in Lawrence, Kansas. During 2025, Spring meetings will be held in Nebraska; Summer in Utah; and Fall in California.

STATE REPORTS

Due to unforeseen difficulties with the audio quality during the meeting, significant portions of the state reports were unintelligible.

SUNSETTING POSITIONS FOR 2024 FALL MEETINGS

Tab XYZ of the briefing materials contains sunseting positions (459-#467) for the 2024 Fall meetings. Please review them and get any proposed changes to staff.

OTHER MATTERS

The meeting was adjourned.