

MINUTES
of the
WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING
Hard Rock Hotel & Casino Tulsa
Tulsa, OK
April 16, 2015

Table of Contents

Welcome and Introductions	3
Approval of Minutes	4
Proposed and Sunsetting Positions	4
Water Data Exchange (WaDE) Update and Demonstration	5
Federal Water Data Coordination	6
Corps' Short and Long-term Drought Response Authorities	8
WGA Drought Forums and Water-Related Activities.....	10
NOAA's California Drought Assessment Report.....	11
WSWC Drought Response Planning Survey	11
CDWR/WSWC Sub-Seasonal and Seasonal Precipitation Forecasting Workshop	12
ESA Issues in the Southwest	12
FY 2015-2016 Draft Committee Workplan/WestFAST Workplan.....	14
Other Matters	15

**MINUTES
of the
WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING
Hard Rock Hotel & Casino Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
April 16, 2015**

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

ALASKA	--
ARIZONA	Tom Buchatzsky Cindy Chandley
CALIFORNIA	Jeanine Jones
COLORADO	James Eklund Trisha Oeth
IDAHO	Jerry Rigby John Simpson
KANSAS	Tracy Streeter Chris Beightel Tom Stiles
MONTANA	Tim Davis Anne Yates (by phone)
NEBRASKA	Jim Schneider
NEVADA	Jason King (by phone)
NEW MEXICO	Tom Blaine Greg Ridgley
NORTH DAKOTA	Jennifer Verleger
OKLAHOMA	J.D. Strong
OREGON	Tom Byler
SOUTH DAKOTA	Kent Woodmansey
TEXAS	Robert Mace

UTAH

Walt Baker
Eric Millis
Norm Johnson

WASHINGTON

Stephen Bernath (by phone)

WYOMING

Pat Tyrrell
Sue Lowry
Chris Brown

GUESTS

Carlee Brown, Western Governors' Association, Denver, CO
Kevin Werner, NOAA (via phone)
Rudy Hermann, Oklahoma Water Resources Board, Oklahoma City, OK
Britnee Preston, Oklahoma Water Resources Board, DC Office
Mary Schooley, Oklahoma Water Resources Board, Oklahoma City, OK
Mike Mathis, Continental Resources, Oklahoma City, OK
Mike Abate, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa, OK
Andrew Hautzinger, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, SW Region, Albuquerque, NM
Daniel Fenner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Tulsa Ecological Field Office, Tulsa, OK
Paul Blanchard, Northwest Pipe Co., Vancouver, WA

WESTFAST

Patrick Lambert, Federal Liaison, Salt Lake City, UT
Becky Fulkerson, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, DC
Jean Thomas, USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC

STAFF

Tony Willardson
Nathan Bracken
Sara Larsen
Cheryl Redding

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Tim Davis, Chair, welcomed those in attendance at the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held in Scottsdale, Arizona on October 9, 2014, were moved for approval by J.D. Strong and the motion was seconded by Jennifer Verleger. The minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

PROPOSED AND SUNSETTING POSITIONS

Proposed Position

Integrating Water and Energy Planning and Policy

Tony Willardson asked Council members to look particularly at the “Now Therefore Be It Resolved” clause, and suggested that the Committee drill down with some examples to make some more specific recommendations. Chairman Davis asked if there were any questions either with the proposed position or the report to complete the work with the WGA. There were none.

James Eklund moved approval of the position in the Water Resources Committee. J.D. seconded the motion. The action was unanimously approved to be taken up by the Full Council at the meeting tomorrow.

Tony commented that he would appreciate any recommendations you may have on specific examples to be included in the report in the meantime.

Sunsetting Positions:

Position #338 was adopted in relation to legislation that had been introduced. That legislation has not been reintroduced. The staff recommendation is allowing Position #338 to sunset.

Position # 339 should be revised and readopted. The proposed revisions are included in the briefing book, and were discussed by the Executive Committee on their pre-meeting conference call.

Position #341 – was originally adopted to address proposed changes to Reclamation’s policy manual which raised concerns over the pricing of water related to urbanization of rural areas. They were going to define agricultural use as anything over 10 acres would fall under agricultural pricing policies. Given the policy was revised to remove the 10 acre threshold, and as the Committee did not raise any continuing issues with the policy, WSWC staff believes it should be allowed to sunset.

Jim Schneider made a motion to approve the staff recommendations to allow both positions #338 and #341 to sunset and to accept the revisions as proposed and discussed by the Executive Committee to Position #339. Pat Tyrrell seconded the motion. The Committee approved the motion unanimously. Position #339 will move to the Full Council, with the edits.

WATER DATA EXCHANGE (WADE) UPDATE AND DEMONSTRATION

Sara updated the Committee on the status of the WaDE project. Three states are now “flowing data,” Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming. Utah and Colorado received grant assistance from the Western Governors’ Association (WGA). Many states are slated to begin the deployment process in the next few months. Six states over the summer and more over the course of the year will come online. Sara thanked WGA for their financial assistance. Sara will be performing quality assurance and quality control (QAQC), before releasing the information to the portal.

Many states are starting the deployment process in the next few months. WGA will roll out WaDE at their December 2015 meeting.

Since the October WSWC meetings, Sara has attended the American Water Resources Association and National Water Use Information Program conferences, as well as participated in the federally operated Open Water Data Initiative (ODWI).

An Exchange Network (EN) grant application partnership is underway led by California. We are waiting to hear whether we will get additional funding on a second EN grant. We have funding through 2017 on the first EN grant.

WaDE has some tremendous momentum. States are coming online and they have funding momentum. In the next two years, Sara would like to make WaDE the state agency portal for state agency data. This will require some sustained enthusiasm and participation. It will also require more datasets and reporting.

Demonstration (see [PowerPoint Presentation](#), available on the Council’s website)

Sara presented an overview of how to access the data. There is a tutorial. She started with Utah in the demonstration. Utah has provided about eight years of water use data for the catalog. You can also access their methodologies. There is a disclaimer at the top of the page as each state does things very differently.

In Wyoming, the Wyoming Water Development Commission is providing the information. There was a request to add a “methods used” section to the information. There is lots of different information.

The State of Colorado broke our “cloud.” For larger datasets, the cloud is a little slow. Sara wants to include a loading widget, so that people can see that something is happening. We may explore hosting the data on the University of California at Davis’ supercomputer.

There is some optimization to be done. In five years, we are trying to determine where this project will be. Hopefully by 2020, the goal is for WaDE to be the “go to” place. The real value is to be able to share your data. In your particular state, the information is “dark” data. It is only good for your own use. WaDE provides access to “dark” data, and then the data can be

used for unexpected purposes. The idea of “open” data is not going away. To be able to share that data with others makes it become much more valuable. The new cool thing or the new “metric” will be “how many apps are built on your open data,” rather than determining how many hits your website receives.

The value from the data may be how it will be beneficial to the states, although the real value will be in how others use the data. People want good quality data. If they can’t get it from you, they will make it up, so they might as well get it from you. The data information in WaDE can be incredibly valuable to a state and their staff. Over time, it will be very interesting to find out what other people do with the data. For people who care deeply, the sky is the limit.

Questions:

James Eklund: Are we moving forward our databases?

Sara Larsen: Most states have stuck with something really safe and reliable. Open source coding changes very quickly, and it is being made better over time. Right now, people are using SQL server and Oracle, until the open source coding catches up with its robustness.

Jeanine Jones: Would you talk about the relationship with USGS and their databases?

Sara Larsen: Yes. The WaterSMART folks are very excited. Our data dovetails quite well with the data they are gathering.

Jeanine Jones: This type of activity takes a lot of operation and maintenance, so ideally it would be helpful to have USGS help pay for WaDE or pick it up.

Robert Mace: You can create a translator program that can translate the native data into the open source. Even if WaDE went away, now that the data is available, people can access it. Our IT folks are not okay with changing the database, but they are okay with using a translator. This is the future, unquestionably.

FEDERAL WATER DATA COORDINATION

Pat Lambert, WestFAST Liaison, talked about how to bring data sets together to enhance and increase their usage. He used a [PowerPoint presentation](#) (available on the Council’s website).

Pat noted that information comes from a variety of different sources and is often difficult to compare. We have never had the ability to provide consumptive use. We see efforts like WaDE as being very useful. USGS is looking at WaDE as a way to catalog water information. There are inconsistencies in the way that water data is gathered. We are looking at a way to provide improvements to water-use data. The federal family wants to obtain better data and get back to understanding consumptive use.

One thing that is new is the USGS Water-Use Grants Program. State water resource agencies are vital entities and primarily responsible for collecting data on water supplies in support of water allocations and water rights. These grants will help the states to have funds to gather the data. There is not a lot of money, but the mechanism to get the money out to the states is in the works. Whatever funds come to the state in this first year will be the same equal funding in future years. More will be made available on this program in the coming months. Melinda Dalton in Atlanta will be heading up the grants program. It is possible that they could use the WSWC to pass the funds, as an option, rather than dealing with each state individually. That is yet to be worked out.

The National Ground Water Monitoring Program (NGWMP) addresses issues of groundwater monitoring networks. There has been no way to access that data in a way that was easy to understand. This program aims at providing a network, not just a repository of the data, and pulls it together by meaningful categories. The Advisory Committee on Water Information (ACWI) saw this need and directed development of this network. The network was revised in 2013. It now helps states and other entities to populate the data. It is a voluntary cooperative. The funds will come through the Department of the Interior. The details of the agreements are still being worked on.

The Water Quality Portal (WQP), is a cooperative service sponsored by the EPA, USGS, and the National Water Quality Monitoring Council (NWQMC) that integrates publicly available water quality data from the USGS National Water Information System (NWIS); the EPA STORage and RETrieval (STORET) Data Warehouse; and the USDA's Agricultural Research Service (ARS) Sustaining The Earth's Watersheds -Agricultural Research Database System (STEWARDS). This is one example of the federal family working to make this data more useful. The Portal is scheduled to serve biological data records in 2015.

Pat related that these are examples of the types of efforts that the states may want to integrate into their management plans and management schemes.

Questions:

J.D. Strong: Who is eligible for those grants?

Pat Lambert: It is states right now. But they are interested in perhaps working with entities, such as the WSWC.

J.D. Strong: Is it actual funding in both the water use data and the groundwater data or water quality data?

Pat Lambert: In the NGWMP would probably go to the local science center, and then that funding will flow to your department. The states will get the money to develop the plan, and will have to also implement this plan. There will be matching dollars in some cases.

Jim Schneider: In the Water Use Program that USGS has done since 1950, has there been any discussion on how this info should be continued, or perhaps done in a very different way, to take into consideration the issues of use or diversion versus consumption.

Pat Lambert: Knowing that the documentation does not get into the newspaper along with the map, the Water Census is looking at both programs, so we do not fall back, but rather move forward and try to include consumptive use.

Robert Mace: I would echo that. We likewise get skewed information presented to the public, and then it cannot be taken back. We try to explain and document the information, and the limitations. We will not get away from folks misusing and/or misinterpreting the data. It just forces us to do a better job of documenting the data and our definitions.

Tony Willardson pointed out good data was one of the problems that the WSWC faced as they dealt with the energy-water report for WGA. The WSWC came up against a lack of data and information. There is not a good means of regionally looking at consumptive water use, or even municipal use. In order to get more precise water budgets, we need to get the answer to this part of the equation. As a western group, we need to have better information than we have now. As a Council, we can try to determine how we can make that data available. WaDE is real time access to data, but it is not real-time data.

Tim Davis remarked that the WSWC is fortunate to have Pat as our WestFAST liaison. Tim will likely tap the Subcommittee as the work plan is discussed.

CORPS' SHORT AND LONG-TERM DROUGHT RESPONSE AUTHORITIES

Mike Abate, Chief, Civil Works Branch, Tulsa District addressed the Committee, and presented using a PowerPoint presentation available at this [link](#) on the Council's website.

The Civil Works Branch has under their purview water supply, water quality, hydroelectric power, flood risk management, navigation, and recreation, among other things.

The Corps believes each Corps lake should have a specific drought management plan. When the Corps' conservation pool reaches 75%, they let folks know how much of their allocation is left. Every reservoir is unique. Different levels of conservation storage percentages trigger different actions.

Mr. Abate spoke generally, as the uniqueness of each reservoir determines how water accounting is handled. The Corps' promotes conservation at drought level 1. Their processes are not always hard and fast, as it depends on how quickly a reservoir may recover. Many entities are involved in the discussion. The planning efforts are to avoid having a reservoir go empty, but it can happen. They begin planning priorities of usage for the inactive storage. There are no hard, fast rules. It depends on the situation, and the groups discuss and identify how to get the water out of the inactive pool. The Corps notifies contract water users of an impending need

to arrange for emergency water needs. They also contract emergency water supplies, if available.

With respect to reallocations, if a reservoir has a water supply already as a purpose, they can look at changing the authorized purpose. Of course, this would have to go through Congress. Corps Headquarters is looking at costs of supplies right now. It could be quite expensive for the customer, especially if hydropower is involved. In any event, it may be less expensive than building a new reservoir.

“Surplus water” is a definition that is being clarified at the Headquarters level. Surplus water is basically any purpose that hasn’t yet been realized. Normally this is for a very short period of time -- usually no more than five years. If, for some reason, they can take some of the storage from another use temporarily, without impacting the use, they may also be able to use that surplus water. This can be fuzzy, because there are questions about what is “temporary.” If they have uncontracted water supply, they can use this to enter into an emergency contract for drought purposes. This is particularly possible if they have un-contracted water supplies.

On seasonal operations, the Corps can ask for deviations from their water control operational manuals for three years. It requires authorization for a permanent change to the water control operation. Mike provided an example of one situation in Sperry, Oklahoma at Skiatook Reservoir.

There is a Seasonal Pool Plan on Lake Texoma, a hydroelectric lake on the Oklahoma-Texas border, that is a massive economic generator for the region. Everyone came together and developed a seasonal pool plan, and that way they do not always have to go into the flood control pool. The requests can be made, and then it goes up the chain to the regional and district levels.

P.L. 84-99 is the Corps’ Drought Assistance or disaster operations law. The Corps does not pay for the water. Under this law, the Corps has the authority to provide support. Drilling water wells is completely reimbursable – you have to pay the Corps. You also have to come up with the water. This is not for irrigation. It is purely for health and safety and consumption by humans. The qualifying requirements are critical. There are certain rules. Reasonable rationing and conservation measures must have been implemented.

Questions:

Nathan Bracken: What about surplus water rulemaking? Where it is at Headquarters?

Mike Abate: I can’t respond or provide information on the rulemaking. They are working on it. The pricing is part of the challenge.

Jeanine Jones: That was good. It was helpful to hear how the various levels of the Corps are able to deal with the issues.

WGA DROUGHT FORUMS/WATER RELATED ACTIVITIES

Carlee Brown gave an update on the Western Governors' Association's (WGA) work with respect to drought. She noted that it seems like the work is "all drought, all the time." WGA has been trying to get a lot of input from the states. Carlee suggested that if any of the Council members wish to have more to input into the process, to let her know.

WGA is preparing summaries of the various drought meetings. They have included quotations from each of the meetings in the hope of making the summaries more interesting. The webinar series wrapped up last week. WGA is trying to find case studies and best practices to include. They hope to keep the final report very brief, yet have it feed back into the information on their website, which will include all the information gathered. The WGA will share the report with everyone involved, including the WSWC. The report will focus on four key categories: (1) data; (2) reuse, produced, and brackish water; (3) communication; and (4) collaboration.

WGA has held five regional workshops focused from an economic standpoint. They try to capture the high points mentioned, and put them in "posts" from each of the speakers at the workshops. On average there are about 150-175 people on the webinars. There are a number of webinars.

A Drought Forum Wrap-Up meeting will be held on June 23rd. It will be a half-day event in Lake Tahoe, Nevada. It will be videotaped and put on the website. WGA's workplan is to go forward with drought for the next two years.

The WGA Annual Meeting will be held on June 24-25. They are hoping to get a good number of governors attending. The meeting will include a drought roundtable. They are working with NOAA on getting drought leaders and state foresters to attend.

With respect to activities in the WGA, Washington, D.C. office, they are banging the drum on state authority within the context of the Waters of the United States "WOTUS" rule and the U.S. Forest Service directive. WGA Executive Director Jim Ogsbury testified on April 14, 2015, on behalf of the WGA before the House Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Power, and Oceans. He shared the perspective of the Western Governors regarding recent federal water-related regulatory proposals, including the U.S. Forest Service's (USFS) proposed directive on groundwater resource management and the proposed rule from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps) to redefine their jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. WGA is also working on EPA's "treatment of states" (TAS) rulemaking. A letter was recently sent to EPA requesting direct consultation with the states in the development of the rule.

Carlee noted that a question raised often is what is WGA going to do about leadership going forward? The Governors are going to elect a new Chair and Vice Chair at their June meeting. Governor Mead of Wyoming has indicated his interest in running for Chair. Governor

Bullock of Montana is considering running for Vice Chair. WGA is trying to maintain bipartisan leadership.

WGA has just released a sage grouse inventory. They have put together a list of non-regulatory conservation measures for sage grouse. There will be a transition of the Crucial Habitat Assessment Tool (CHAT) to the Western and National Associations of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

Lastly, with respect to the renewable energy project siting – RAPID Toolkit. This was developed with partners. It creates a Wikipedia type environment to help folks as they navigate through these efforts.

NOAA’S CALIFORNIA DROUGHT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Kevin Werner, Director of the Western Region, reported that NOAA has developed an assessment of the 2014 drought in California. The report will be released in May. The findings focus on different sectors, such as agriculture, fisheries, cross-cutting themes, internal NOAA coordination, etc. NOAA realized that it can improve internal collaboration. There is a need to better match NOAA investments in science and other areas. There does seem to be a disconnect between the service that is being provided and what is needed. The most common request is what the next winter’s precipitation will be like.

Jeanine Jones thanked Kevin for all of the effort he and his team put into the report and for their collaboration with the state.

WSWC DROUGHT RESPONSE PLANNING SURVEY

Tony Willardson noted that the WSWC surveyed its member states to get a sense of what states are doing in terms of drought response planning. Only one state responded that it does not have a drought plan. Most states felt that their plans are useful but there is a sense that they can be more effective. Only about one-third of the states have any type of socio-economic assessments after a drought. The Council has been proactive in discussing the need for socioeconomic data. Drought is just as damaging as other disasters. It would be a useful exercise to quantify those losses.

Jeanine Jones commented that Carlee Brown of WGA has expressed concern about an academic article from Scripps which found that most state water managers felt their drought plans weren’t good. Much of this is due to the fact that some plans are triggered by hydrological conditions and indices. For certain data measures that trigger drought, we generally lack good quantification, and the result is that not much effort is put forth towards drought conditions. A WSWC workshop was held on this topic last year. This information would be helpful, and could also be useful to WGA. Obviously, there is a difference between these types of triggers and when a governor declares a drought emergency.

Carlee Brown then stated that WGA intends to take the results of the survey and look at them in conjunction with the state drought task forces. This effort should be done this year.

CDWR/WSWC SUB-SEASONAL AND SEASONAL PRECIPITATION FORECASTING WORKSHOP

Jeanines Jones passed out a preliminary agenda. There are opportunities to improve seasonal forecasting that no one at the national level has looked at because they are focused on bigger picture issues rather than digging in to look at things that have an impact at regional scales, such as atmospheric rivers, monsoons, etc. In California, had we known that this year would have been quite dry, we could have held some water in reservoirs. We need to take advantage of the tools and technologies in order to improve these forecasts.

The WSWC will develop a report after the meeting to push NOAA to put more emphasis on regional forecasting, particularly for things like reservoir operations. We really want NOAA to “own” this improvement. We have to work very closely with federal agencies. Jeanine commented that they have had excellent cooperation with NOAA at the western regional level. The difficulty seems to be in working with NOAA at the headquarters level.

Kevin referenced the National Marine Fisheries Service during his remarks. That can hugely affect water forecast operations. NOAA Fisheries is not going to rely on experimental forecasts.

Jeanine expressed the hope that some Council members may be able to attend the workshop.

ESA ISSUES IN THE SOUTHWEST

Andrew Hautzinger, Supervisory Hydrologist with the Southwest Regional Office and Daniel Fenner, Biologist, with the Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS), addressed Council members. Andrew noted that the FWS has worked and collaborated closely with the WSWC and the WGA. The FWS wants to be an effective partner. Their major partners are the state wildlife agencies, but they also work closely with the state engineers and other state agencies. They want to breakdown the barriers of information and avoid duplication.

Daniel Fenner works out of Oklahoma’s Ecological Services Office. Daniel reviewed the purposes of the Endangered Species Act, which are to conserve the ecosystems on which the species depend; implement conservation; and to take the appropriate steps to achieve the purposes of the treaties and conventions in subsection A.

Daniel noted that Section 4 of the ESA which covers listing, critical habitat designation, recovery, and monitoring allows anyone to petition the FWS to list or delist species of plants or

animals. On a 90-day finding, is there substantial information? For a 12-month finding, is the listing warranted?

From the period of 1994-2006, the FWS received on average about 17 petitions covering 20 species per year. By 2010, that program went to 20 petitions covering 439 species per year. The number of species proposed for protection has increased dramatically, which is overwhelming the agency.

Section 11 of the Act allows for citizen suits. The FWS entered into a settlement agreement with environmental associations to make determinations for 251 candidate species. Much of their effort was on listing actions. The listing program efforts were focused on making determinations and putting together proposed and final rules. In the early 2000s, the agency was sued on critical habitat listings. Under the Act, one of the requirements is for the FWS to designate critical habitat when it delists a species. In a lot of these cases, the FWS did not identify habitat. Their efforts and focus have shifted since that time.

In Regions 2 and 6, of the candidate species, the FWS has had 10 withdrawals, listed four species as threatened, and five were considered endangered. They hope to complete 15 more petitions in 2015-2016.

The next steps are to address the petitions. The agency will prioritize which species to look at first, and which they can work on in later years. They are going to work to improve communication with states and other partners on the need for status assessments. They are reaching out to the states and gathering information from the states to make status assessments, which will help the FWS determine how to prioritize their efforts. The Species Status Assessments (SSA) build the scientific foundation to inform listing or recovery. The FWS looks at the viability of the species to help determine planning and conservation endeavors.

The Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCC) effort is more proactive than the listing assessments. The LCCs were established in 2010 using applied science and technical expertise to affect conservation on the ground. The idea is to work with multiple state partners to identify science needs. Steering groups lead the LCCs. Twenty-one LCCs have been identified in the United States. The Great Plains LCC has identified priority habitats: grasslands; playa wetlands; non-playa wetlands; saline lakes; prairie rivers, stream and riparian corridors; and savannahs, shrublands and sand dunes.

Daniel noted three case studies. One on the Arkansas darter showed that the more complex the habitat, the greater the diversity. Diversity was driven by fragmentation, less fragmentation equals greater diversity. They also looked at propagation efforts and found that fish are likely surviving, but weren't reproducing. This information was helpful in determining whether those types of efforts in that specific area were worth it. There are some conservation programs for playa lakes.

Under Section 7, which requires FWS interaction with other federal agencies, the FWS is working on more programmatic approaches. It wasn't an efficient process. They are working on more programmatic approaches.

Daniel reviewed Section 10 exceptions which are for federal permits that do not have a federal nexus. Under this section, the FWS may permit, under such terms and conditions, any taking that is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity. One example is on a federal highway project with a Habitat Conservation Plan for oil and gas activities in Oklahoma. The FWS is working with the Oklahoma Department of Transportation. If it does not reach a jeopardy opinion, they will not change their processes.

With respect to long-term conservation efforts, they are providing protection for the Muddy Boggy and the American Burying Beetle.

FY2015-2016 DRAFT COMMITTEE WORKPLAN/WESTFAST WORKPLAN

Pat Tyrrell and Tim Davis want to coordinate with their federal partners, and improve communication between states and federal agencies. Tim Davis, Committee Chair, said the goal is for the Committee to adopt a new workplan at the July meeting. Tim asked for volunteers on the various subcommittees.

On the M3 Initiative, Tim specifically asked for volunteers for a Subcommittee. Jeanine Jones suggested bifurcating some of the issues out from this particular item. Maybe take out A & B, and make them separate from the others.

Tony Willardson then talked about Landsat. Because of the Council's success in getting Landsat 8 launched with the thermal imager, we have become almost famous. I've had several calls and communications about the proposals for Landsat. The hope now is to expedite Landsat 9, if at all possible.

On workplan item #2, J.D. Strong suggested the committee continue to track western water and infrastructure, but wondered if a subcommittee is important at this time for this item. Tom Byler asked if the WSWC would be interested in focusing on private-public partnerships. Nathan noted that Sentry Financial in SLC is looking for water projects to work on. Tony commented that private equity is interested in being involved, but is concerned about regulations and litigation, which create uncertainty.

Eric Millis and James Eklund agreed to participate in the Energy subcommittee.

Tim proposed expanding the scope of the Corps surplus water subcommittee to also look at drought planning. Jennifer Verleger agreed to be on that subcommittee. Tim agreed to develop an additional focus on drought authorities.

Tom Byler asked about the border water issues subcommittee. Tony remarked that a subcommittee had been created in the past, but was not active.

Tim proposed that the committee take up the infrastructure topic for further discussion at the next meeting. He asked that members share any concerns or suggested revisions to the workplan with he or Tony before the Summer meetings.

Pat Lambert then reviewed WestFAST plans and future eirections. The WestFAST team sees three overarching tasks for their work plan: (1) Conducting case studies of the most efficient and productive collaboration practices between state and federal agencies.; (2) better enabling the exchange of federal and state water data, potentially through such programs as the National Water Census and the Open Water Data Initiative (ODWI); and (3) enhancing the visibility of WestFAST and WestFAST member agency water resource programs that support WSWC resource management goals. For the latter, monthly webinars have been initiated. Some are internal for the federal family, while others are opened up to include others. It is hoped that through such efforts, WestFAST can enhance the lines of communication with WSWC committees and leadership.

WestFAST wants to see what comes out of the WSWC Committee work plans, and then they will be able to understand where they can best plug in.

OTHER MATTERS

There being no further matters, the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.