03/20/08
Time Start: 2:05 pm
Time Stop: 3:00 pm

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

Council, Alternates & Interested Parties		**TWDB Staff**
Spokesperson Karen Guz w/ Elliot & Juan	Phil Johnson	John Sutton
Vivien Allen	Denise Hickey	Dan Hardin
Greg Carter		Laila Johnston
Bill Hoffman		Vanessa Escobar
Donna Howe		Aung Hla
Ken Kramer		Kevin Kluge
Cindy Loeffler		
Gene Montgomery		
Jim Parks		
Ken Petersen		
C.E. Williams		
Comer Tuck		

Karen Guz called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm and began by reviewing the work session that took place on 1/30/08 at the Water Conservation Advisory Council meeting. The following three questions were reviewed:

1. Is it desirable to measure GPCD by city boundary as well as service area boundaries?
2. Is it desirable to breakdown GPCD and define the various types of GPCD using subgroups?
3. Is it necessary to have other metrics to measure sectors where GPCD may not be appropriate?

In response to **question one**, the workgroup agreed that measuring GPCD by service area as well as city boundary would be appropriate.

In response to **question two** it was stated that a global metric measuring total usage as opposed to total GPCD could be a more appropriate tool. For example a water provider could look at a total usage and then break down that total usage into categories. A total usage divided by population does not seem correct when not every one of those categories is population dependent.

However, it was also stated that it is important that this workgroup define that the total or global GPCD is a good metric for a community to have as a reflection of how much water they are using to function and for planning purposes. However, for purposes of comparing one category of community to another there would need to be a different metric. It was pointed out that this group should also keep in mind that one of the

functions of the Advisory Council is to educate people as to what the metrics are used for.

It was stated that this workgroup needs to focus on developing a useful way of analyzing total system usage so that entities are able to understand how that usage is broken out across the subgroups. Such a tool should then be used as device to measure performance or accomplishment in the direction of conservation.

A comment was made that a water provider would not use GPCD, with its current definition, as a planning tool. What they need to be able to do is measure how effectively and efficiently their various users are achieving conservation. It was stated that there needs to be a metric that will allow a user group to measure, compare and understand the effectiveness of their conservation efforts.

A comment was made that Total GPCD can indeed be used as a planning tool. The total is a planning tool for calculating how much water a community is going to need in the future to serve a predicted population.

Once again, it was stated and agreed with by some workgroup members that a number (representing total consumption) divided by a number (representing population) is not a useful number.

A comment was made that if we are going to have the data on how much water is being pumped for everything and if we are going to have the data on population numbers then people are going to do that math on their own. It was pointed out that what we want to do is recommend a proper procedure for making those appropriate analyses.

An observation was made that there is going to be an on going debate and discussion over the calculation and use of a metric such as Total GPCD. What we really need to focus on as an advisory council and workgroup is how we can get the other breakdowns of data and provide that to utilities. We need to focus our time, attention, and resources on how we best calculate the breakdowns.

It was suggested that this workgroup should move forward with some discussion on breakdown data, and come back at the next meeting with some descriptors about why some metrics are more useful for some things than others. It is an important step towards educating peoples, to explain why we as a council feel some metrics units are more appropriate than others.

In response to **question three** the workgroup agreed that it is necessary to have other metrics to measure sectors where GPCD may not be appropriate.

The workgroup moved into discussion about water demand categories. One of the first efforts that need to take place is to define categories AND find out what can be reported. Also, we would like to see entities work towards getting their systems set up so they can report these breakdowns. It would be a good goal to develop a list of category breakdowns and provide that to entities.

A question was asked if San Antonio Water System (SAWS) gets their breakdown numbers from their treatment plants or their billing systems. At SAWS as someone signs up they are designated as one of six meter types. Across the state there are some entities that breakdown into only 3 categories and then there are entities that breakdown into 20+.

The workgroup discussed some desirable subsets of user categories. It was stated that the more divisions you can outline in each subset the better it will be to measure levels of conservation.

The question was asked, if it was our desire to have these GPCD subsets to be all inclusive of all water use? A comment was made that it is important to differentiate that some water use categories would probably not work with the term GPCD because they can not be accurately measured against population. It was suggested that instead of saying desirable GPCD subsets that we just refer to them as desirable subsets. Another comment was made that it will be necessary to include rural or agricultural water uses in these subsets of which can be broken down further. If we defined these larger encompassing subsets then we can define a further breakdown into categories.

A comment was made that the oil & gas well production industry is a rapid growing significant water user; the workgroup was encouraged to incorporate that user group in their subsets and categories. A comment was made that institutional water use is a significant user group as well.

A comment was made that if we ignore the metric GPCD, and just decide how we want to subdivide water use into subsets and categories, then we can go back and place the appropriate metrics beside every type of water use.

There was some discussion as to what the difference was between municipal and commercial. It was stated that city parks, city golf courses, fire protection, line flushing would all be considers municipal or public uses of water. It was also stated that municipal and institutional can easily get mixed as well as municipal and commercial. It was suggested that the term municipal be replaced with a more descriptive term.

It was suggested that this workgroup form a 3-4 person subcommittee to work toward further details on defining subsets, classes, categories.

It was discussed that there are some very specific user types that would need to be listed under these categories. A good place to start would be the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) because they have a list system of codes. An observation was made that it is a very lengthy detailed list but that it would be a good place to start to incorporate aspects. The Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system is another resource that may be useful to look at.

The workgroup was asked to start thinking about what they would like to see included in the list, and where certain water user groups would fit in the subset and provide that feedback to Karen.

The group decided that Bill Hoffman, Jim Parks, Karen Guz, and Dan Hardin would participate in a subcommittee. They would try for the goal of touching base before the April 1st meeting so that they could possibly provide a handout at the meeting.

It was suggested that there was not going to be enough time to have discussion on measuring total water consumption. San Antonio Water System (SAWS) provided an outline on some of the issues they have encountered on measuring total water consumption, however, it was agreed that this topic really needs more time to have a meaningful discussion. Karen asked the workgroup to take the time to review the below issues in preparation for the next conference call:
- Where to measure total production?
- How do you measure total production?
- How confident are you with the data?

It was suggested that the workgroup also take a look at two other references for the next conference call: 1. TWDB materials on water use survey and 2. Water Audit worksheet available on the agency website.

It was brought up that one of the action items for the last Council Meeting 1/30/08 was that each workgroup would present their 'roadmaps'. It was stated that this was a good point to bring up and that this workgroup's road map is to end up with definitions of subcategories of water use some of which will use GPCD and some of which will have other metrics. We also want to be able to come up with a methodology so that in the future it is easier to measure GPCD by boundaries other than city boundaries. Those are the goals for this first report.

It was suggested that the title Trends, Targets, & Goals be a name for this workgroup. After discussion, it was decided that Metrics &Trends would be the proposed name.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Immediate Actions	Long Term Actions
The workgroup was asked to start thinking about what they would like to see included in the list, and where certain water user groups would fit in the subset and provide that feedback to Karen.	
Subcommittee will work in further detail on defining subsets, classes, categories.	
It was suggested that the workgroup also take a look at two other references for the next conference call: 1. TWDB materials on water use survey 2. Water Audit worksheet available on the agency website.	
Karen asked the workgroup to take the time to review the below issues in preparation for the next conference call: • Where to measure total production? • How do you measure total production? • How confident are you with the data?	