

**From:** "Gene Montgomery" <montgomerygene@gmail.com>  
**To:** <Karen.Guz@saws.org>  
**Date:** 1/29/2008 1:01 PM  
**Subject:** Re: GPCD Input

**Attachments:** Municipal Water Use Example.doc  
GPCD Example.xls

**CC:** <Vanessa.Escobar@twdb.state.tx.us>, <comer.tuck@twdb.state.tx.us>, <Elli...

Karen, I certainly did not mean to imply with my note that any water use should not be identified and ignored. My suggestion was simply that the metrics for measuring success for improvements in water management and conservation needs to fit the type of use so that the metrics will be meaningful in setting targets and goals and measuring success. I think some water use is clearly population dependent and for those uses GPCD is a good metric. However, some water use is not population related and for those uses some more relevant metrics need to be identified and applied. For most industrial and agricultural uses, I think some production related index is the right answer.

I have tried to come up with an example that I think illustrates my thoughts re the use of GPCD on a gross application that does not tell the true story. The city in my attached example has, I think, had some great success in their conservation program but the gross GPCD would lead one to believe just the opposite. I think we need to come up with the correct metrics to allow a water supply utility to evaluate their own success and also some way to normalize the data so they can benchmark their results against others.

Hope this helps clarify my comments. As you indicate, we need to break down industrial and agricultural use and clarify the metrics associated with various types of use. See you tomorrow.

On Jan 28, 2008 2:13 PM, <Karen.Guz@saws.org> wrote:

> Gene,  
>  
> Thanks very much for sending your input. Vanessa is posting input such as  
> this on the web site tracking our efforts.  
>  
> On a note for debating these issues, you and I agree on some of this. I  
> agree that we will need additional metrics for industrial water usage. That  
> is a very different animal to track for success in conservation and units  
> per production of some kind will be needed for each major industry.  
> Expecting simply a total reduction for industrial to show conservation  
> progress won't work.  
>  
> However, I also strongly believe that we will miss out on important  
> information if there is not a total gpcd calculation for each community.  
> The gpcd gives a total picture of the water need per capita for a given  
> community which includes their industrial output. It will certainly be  
> therefore higher in communities that have refineries, chip manufacturing or  
> other water intensive uses. But that water is necessary to the community  
> thriving and should be reflected in what it takes to keep them going. In  
> order to then make it clear where the water is being used, we should have  
> break-downs that report the specific measures like residential home use or  
> commercial business usage. This way we can respond to inappropriate finger

> pointing over the totals if a community can show they are making progress.  
> And communities that don't have industrial water usage, but have high  
> residential usage will be held to a standard for changing residential  
> consumption.  
>  
> Industrial usage can also be broken out and then further clarified with  
> other metrics. But the idea of not showing it as part of the total water  
> picture concerns me. Taking it out also does not acknowledge that  
> industrial water usage totals can and do change with conservation  
> initiatives. For example if Toyota Texas in San Antonio had not invested in  
> substantial water process improvements in order to use recycled effluent in  
> production, the San Antonio gpcd would be one higher than it currently is.  
> The same would be true if the Microsoft facility being opened were not using  
> that effluent for their cooling. Our power production is another major  
> water consumer in San Antonio. Some of the cooling water comes from treated  
> effluent, but we also sell a substantial amount of water for power  
> production. That is currently in our gpcd as water needed to keep our  
> community going. To ignore it would be to create an illusion that we could  
> sustain on less. We can't and therefore need to show it in our total.

>  
>  
> \*Karen L. Guz\*  
> Director  
> Conservation Department  
>  
> San Antonio Water System  
> 2800 U.S. Hwy. 281 North  
> San Antonio, Texas 78212  
> karen.guz@saws.org  
> phone (210) 233-3671  
> fax (210) 233-4783

>  
>  
> -----  
> \*From:\* Gene Montgomery [mailto:montgomerygene@gmail.com]  
> \*Sent:\* Monday, January 28, 2008 1:48 PM  
> \*To:\* Karen Guz  
> \*Cc:\* Vanessa Escobar; comer.tuck@twdb.state.tx.us  
> \*Subject:\* GPCD Input

>  
> Karen, I have tried to summarize the primary metrics that I believe  
> apply to each major category of water use (municipal, industrial, and  
> agricultural) in the attached Excel spreadsheet. In our last WG2 conference  
> call I think the discussion at times indicated that some industrial and  
> agricultural use of water might be affecting a utilities' water metrics. As  
> you pointed out, a manufacturing facility such as Frito-Lay needs to have  
> some method of measuring and comparing their water use but it certainly  
> doesn't make sense to do it based on any population based metric. It seems  
> to me we don't want to define GPCD such that this metric will be applied to  
> the entire water volume delivered by a utility. Instead, the volume of  
> water needs to be separated into the main water use categories and then  
> again into some sub-categories but the municipal GPCD should not include  
> water use by non-municipal groups where the water use is not population  
> dependent but instead better measured by some production related index.  
> Anyway, this is my idea on how we should address this issue. I look forward  
> to helping put something together that helps give some better guidance on

> this.

>

> I am sure you have probably already found a lot of info on the TWDB  
> website but I am attaching some FAQs I found on their site which I found  
> helpful and also Appendix A from some TWDB forms that contains some  
> definitions. I don't know if these are the official definitions but they  
> seem to be good but probably don't go far enough to address some specific  
> issues.

>

> See you Wednesday.

>

> --

> Gene Montgomery

>

--

Gene Montgomery