

04/26/10

Time Start: 10:05 am

Time Stop: 12:00 pm

Meeting and Conference Call:

Work Group 2 Metrics & Trends

~ Monitor Trends in Water Conservation Implementation & Monitor Target & Goal Guidelines

Council Members , Alternates & Interested Parties

Spokesperson Karen Guz

CE Williams Ken Kramer

Denise Hickey Scott Swanson

Carole Baker Nora Mullarkey

Gene Montgomery Carole Davis

Dan Opdyke Stacey Pandey

Cheri Vogel Karl Fennessey

Jennifer Brown Stephen Densmore

Lindsey McCall

TWDB Staff

Vanessa Escobar

Laila Johnson

John Sutton

Kevin Kluge

Linda McCall

The meeting was called to order with introductions from the group. There was a review of discussions from the previous workgroup meeting . A Meeting Outline was provided to the workgroup as a supplement to the agenda.

Some workgroup discussion points relating to the goals of a proposed Gallons Per Capita per Day (GPCD) Tool are noted below:

- The tool provides a sector based analysis which allows for a more in depth analysis of water usage.
- It is ineffective for a system to implement conservation programs if they are not able to organize data about their system usage. This tool provides them an opportunity to organize data and interpret data so that the system can better develop and implement their conservation programs.
- The method for calculating the population component would be a process that uses census data to establish meter to customer ratios. These ratios would then be used to modify the population figures each year as service population grows.
- As a tool the calculator is designed for interpretations and analysis that looks at the water that is currently being used. This type of data and analysis can be very useful for a provider in their own internal planning purposes.

There was some emphasis on the fact that GPCD data generated by TWDB Water Resources Planning Division is used for the purposes of planning; and in Texas water supply planning is done on a water user group level, not necessarily a water provider level. Additionally, it was emphasized that Conservation Division program development and implementation occurs on a provider level. GPCD generated by a tool such as the NMOSE GPCD Calculator would primarily be used at a provider level for the purposes of internal planning and conservation.

A comment was made that the Council should consider what would be the ultimate goal of a standardized GPCD methodology in Texas? Would it be for regional planning purposes, or provider water conservation planning purposes? The purpose and use of the metric would influence how the methodology is designed.

A comment was made that a GPCD such as New Mexico's would be a great replacement or inclusion to the TWDB's current Water Conservation Annual Report Form. A comment was made that if that were to be the recommendation, that the TWDB would need to consider if it would be appropriate to consider including use of the GPCD reporting tool into the utility profile as well. Incorporating into both the utility profile and annual report would ensure more consistency.

There was some discussion about using terminology such as "Use" and "Consumed". There were also some concerns about how reuse would be accounted for in the calculator. There were also some concerns about who will keep the data and will there need to be a database for record keeping purposes. It was suggested that because the population component of GPCD is a primary concern, that it would be important to develop a standardized method for determining population.

The meeting closed with discussion on incorporating the workgroups findings and suggestions in the overall Council Report.

The workgroup adjourned at 12:00 pm.