

01/16/08

Time Start: 2:05 pm

Time Stop: 3:25 pm

Teleconference Call:

Work Group 2 ~ Monitor Trends in Water Conservation Implementation & Monitor Target & Goal Guidelines

Council & Other Participants

Spokesperson Karen Guz

Vivien Allen
Greg Carter
Kelly Hall
Donna Howe
Cindy Loeffler
Gene Montgomery
Jim Parks
Wilson Scaling
C.E. Williams
Phil Johnson
Nora Mullarkey
Comer Tuck

Dan Strub
Jennifer Walker
Dan Odpyke
Denise Hickey
Tom Gooch
Scott Swanson
Carole Davis
Amy Hardberger
Myron Hess
Ryan Biggs
Mark Olson
Elliot Fry

TWDB Staff

John Sutton
Dan Hardin
Laila Johnston
Vanessa Escobar

Karen Guz called the meeting to order at 2:05 PM and began by stating that the Water Conservation Council (Council) encourages interested party participation in the activities of the Council workgroups. It was pointed out that this workgroup has complied with the open records rules and posting requirements. For future activities of this workgroup the TWDB staff will assist in the exchanging of documents, via electronic posting. Karen gave a brief overview of the agenda and the items that would be discussed in today's teleconference.

The question was brought up about whether the first agenda item included trying to get information out to communities across the state which may not be aware of Council activities yet may have an interest. Karen clarified and gave the example that surveys may be conducted in the future and that Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) staff would assist in disseminating and collecting the information. It was also brought up that TWDB does have the capability of posting comments to the website so that correspondence can be tracked and shared.

The group moved on to review the accomplishments of the Water Conservation Implementation Task Force (Task Force) regarding the topic of Gallons Per Capita per Day (GPCD). There is interest in making sure that there is a common methodology on how GPCD would be calculated and reported, as well as the different kinds of GPCD. The Task Force proposed a goal for a state wide average of 140, but when it came to the calculation and estimates of individual entities there appeared to be many variables.

It was suggested that the first step that needs to be done is to figure out how to calculate GPCD before looking at how to benchmark. Part of the problem is the standardization that is currently in place. For example, amongst agencies the terminology and definitions are not even the same. Perhaps we should consider asking entities how they define their customer classes. If we were to divide GPCD into these customer categories, there would need to be a universal definition for residential, commercial, industrial, etc. It was suggested that before the next workgroup meeting, that the group comes up with a series of definitions that could eventually be adopted.

A question was brought up about how urban and traditional agriculture fit into this. The point was brought up that GPCD came about specifically for setting the goals of whole sale, retail, and municipal systems. Suggestions were made that perhaps agriculture needs to be separated from GPCD. It was mentioned that it should be recognized that in terms of GPCD we are trying to come up with a standardized benchmark in terms of population. However in the case of agriculture or other sectors, perhaps there would have to be different measurement units in place of per capita. It was stated that this workgroup is charged with looking at all sectors not just municipal.

It was suggested that the workgroup define what constitutes municipal use and also identify the variables that can affect municipal use. In the Task Force discussions the difficulty was in not having a better understanding of the variables that go in to calculating the GPCD number. A comment was made that a Total GPCD should be broken down into different categories. At this point there is not enough information on how entities are breaking their own user categories down.

It was stated that there are many fundamental decisions and adoptions that need to be made before we can move forward. It was suggested that more focus needs to be put on entities larger than 3,300 connections because the larger entities is where more of the conserving will be taking place. It was agreed that for the next workgroup meeting we should work on drafting up a survey to send out to representative utilities of different sizes and varying geographical areas of the state. The purpose of the survey would be to find out what customer categories the entities are using and how they break it down. It was pointed out that the TWDB has considered revising the water use survey and perhaps it may prove useful to ask some of this GPCD information through that avenue. If that was the route taken, there would be a period of time before results could be collected, compiled, and analyzed.

Another issue is with customer data and the difference between how much water is pumped versus how many people are served. TWDB gets their non-Census years population estimates for cities from the Texas State Data Center. However, areas with rapid migration growth can leave a gap for population that is not accounted for. Some entities like MUDS or WCIDs don't do population estimates so that may be an issue.

San Antonio Water System (SAWS) gave the example that they use a methodology where they calculate a meter-to-person ratio once every ten years. As meters are added, the population number will go up proportionally. This is not the most accurate, but is the best estimate during the years between the censuses. It was suggested that varying methodologies be shared so that it can be compiled and shared with the entire group.

The question was raised on how you would break out a multi-family GPCD unless you knew how many people lived in residential units and how many in multifamily units. It is definitely a discussion item for down the road to figure out if you need to breakout apartments from residential use.

Someone brought up the fact that water loss, un-metered water use, and a municipality's own usage of water for public purposes may be issues to take into consideration when developing a GPCD calculation.

Some of the following questions were brought up:

- Is a global GPCD, where no customer categories are removed, preferred?
- Why the metrics only measured against population?
- Why call it GPCD and related it back to per capita alone?
- Why measure it against population when a global GPCD, by its very nature, includes so much more than what is dependent upon resident population?
- Does total volumetric use have any relation to population when you look at industrial, commercial categories?
- Is there a plan to define/redefine what municipal use is?
- Is there a plan to define/redefine what industrial use is?

It was stated that the group needs to be able to:

1. Identify those variables that are population related.
2. Define how to measure those variables.
3. Define how to use them in the calculation.

Someone pointed out that people seem to be more in favor of having definitions of specific categories of GPCDs rather than a Global GPCD that includes everything in it. What we really want to do is define and create these tools so that it will help entities make fair comparisons.

A suggestion was made that the Council should look into coming up with a recommendation for other metrics. It appears that GPCD will not be the catch all number to make fair comparison measurements across the board. It may prove necessary to come up with other metrics for different categories of usage i.e. *Residential=Gallons Per Capita per Day, Industrial=Gallons per Unit of Production, Power Production=Gallons per Kilowatt Hour of Production, Agriculture=Acre Feet per Acre etc.*

TWDB staff shared that over several years they have been gathering total usage of varying categories for the purposes of planning. The type of information gathered did not necessarily include a means to measuring conservation or a means for comparison. They offered to do a presentation demonstrating how they calculate GPCD.

There was some desire to have an in person workgroup meeting to workout the definitions relating to GPCD. This will be scheduled at a later date.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 pm.

Task	Steps included in task
Before January 30 th , review information available from TWDB on variables for gpcd and how clarification could fit into surveys and data collection work already planned.	Through surveys obtain information from communities and purveyors to determine what categories of consumption can be reported and by what size of user. This will help answer questions such as: should there be a difference in reporting for larger communities vs. smaller ones due to data limitations that may exist?
Define our task. Importance of a global or total gpcd and potential subcategories of gpcd that could help demonstrate differences between communities.	Obtain more feedback on these categories, how information should be presented and used. Schedule a meeting to refine task definition to include end result reports that are desired. *This task definition appears to be a point of potential debate.
Draft a series of definitions of water use categories (municipal, industrial etc.) and schedule a meeting to hash out final draft of definitions.	Schedule a time to review definitions that already exist and determine if they need to be edited and clarified. Finalize definitions of usage.
Review options for calculation of population.	Schedule a time to review the various methods that have been used to obtain population figures. Determine how to get reasonable population figures given challenges such as differences between service areas and census track data. Review issue of commuter populations.
Create draft proposal for standardization of gpcd calculations to include definition of gpcd and potential subcategories, definitions of usage, format for data collection and calculation methods to be used for population.	Review data collection/reporting timelines of TWDB, propose data formats, formalize methodologies to be used for population and who will do this calculation (TWDB?) and create implementation schedule if proposal is accepted as part of conservation plan reporting.