

Summary of Minutes

Water Conservation Advisory Council Meeting

Date: Wednesday January 30, 2008
Time: 10:00 AM – 2:00 PM
Location: Center Conference Room, Robert E. Johnson Building
1500 North Congress Ave - Austin, TX

Meeting called by: C.E. Williams, Presiding Officer
Meeting Facilitators: TWDB support staff

Council Members in attendance are listed below:

Bill Billingsley	Comer Tuck	Greg Carter	Karen Guz	Ken Petersen*	Vivien Allen*
C. E. Williams	Donna Howe	H. W. Bill Hoffman	Karl Fennessey*	Luana Buckner	Wayne Halbert
Carole Baker	Gary Walker *	James Parks	Kelly Hall	Richard Egg	Wilson Scaling *
Cindy Loeffler	Gene Montgomery	Jim Oliver	Ken Kramer	Steven Bednarz	

* Indicates Council Members Not Present at January 30, 2008 Meeting

Alternates in place of Council Members:

Phillip Johnson for Vivien Allen	Ben Love for Wilson Scaling
Kelley Stripling for Gary Walker	Lara Zent for Ken Petersen

At 10:05 am the council meeting was called to order by the Presiding Officer C.E. Williams. The Presiding Officer welcomed the Council, the alternates, the audience and then opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment and the floor was turned over to Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) representative Bill Billingsley for his report.

The TCEQ report reviewed the status of new rules pertaining to water conservation plans:

- Any entity submitting a water conservation plan to the TCEQ, must also submit one to the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB).
- Any entity with 3,300 connections or more must now develop a water conservation plan and submit it to both the TCEQ and TWDB. The effective date for that is May 2009.
- Any entity with a water conservation plan must submit an annual report on a yearly basis. The effective date for that is May 2010.

The floor was then turned over to John Sutton from the TWDB for his update on water conservation activities at the Board. John reiterated the three points that were previously mentioned by Bill Billingsley. He also described that funding priority will be given to “those applicants who demonstrate significant water conservation or will demonstrate water conservation savings through the funding of the project they are applying for”. It was emphasized that TWDB will use a ranking system to fund projects included in the 2007 State Water Plan.

The Presiding Officer then turned the floor over to Judy London, with the Sandy Land Underground Water Conservation District, for her presentation on public awareness and outreach. Ms. London coordinates this program for four groundwater conservation districts in the southern high plains region. The focus of the program places emphasis on awareness of the water conservation districts in order to deliver a water conservation message. The program entailed public awareness, youth awareness, and the staging of community events. More information can be seen at www.groundwatered.org

The next presentation was from Anita Haiduk and Jennifer Wright, with the Panhandle Groundwater Conservation District, for their presentation on public awareness and outreach. They gave an overview of their elementary education programs, community events, rainwater harvesting programs, xeriscaping program, precipitation enhancement program, their agricultural loans and metering program and more. More information can be found at www.pgcd.us

The Presiding Officer then moved on to a discussion on the format and content of the Council's report to the Legislature due December 2008. The Council reviewed the tasks as written in the statute and agreed that it would be difficult in this first year to present the Legislature with any actual data or research results. The Council decided that it would be best, in this first year, to begin to lay a long term 'road map' for the direction of where the Council will be heading with their tasks. The Council also agreed that in this first report that they would make some recommendations for funding to start some of their tasks. The Council was reminded that there was one task that needed to be completed this year, which entails a recommendation about water conservation training facilities and programs. The Council discussed some due dates for drafting a plan of work and the workgroup reports; both documents to be used in forming the legislative report.

The Council also requested that the workgroup minutes be sent out to the entire Council on a regular basis and/or be posted on the website. It was stated that the TWDB is looking into applying for a domain name so that the Council would have a web location resource of its own. A point was brought up that the website should focus on the concept of water conservation, and not just the Council. Therefore, the web address should be something related to water conservation in Texas. Jim Oliver from Tarrant Regional Water District (TRWD) shared with the Council that they had reserved a web address that they will not be using, but the Council could use it www.SaveTexasWater.org .

A couple of Council Members shared information about a few upcoming events:

- Water Conservation Plan Workshop ~ AWE/ SAWS event March 13th 2008 in San Antonio, TX.
- Statewide Water Conference on Water Conservation ~ Sierra Club, Environmental Defense, National Wildlife Federation event in April 2008 in Austin at Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center

It was suggested that on the Council's webpage, that there be an events tracking for water conservation type events.

There was a brief lunch break at 12:30 and the Council resumed at 1:00pm.

After lunch the Council focused their efforts on the tasks at hand for Workgroup 2. Spokesperson Karen Guz wanted to get some feedback from the Council regarding the Gallons Per Capita per Day (GPCD) issues. The following questions were presented to the Council:

1. Is it desirable to show GPCD by city boundary as well as service area boundaries?

Karen clarified that this question was raised because current GPCD is available only by city boundaries due to available population data. If the metric is to be used for water service providers to track progress in their programs, should it be measured by their service boundaries? This can be done but it will take an additional task to come up with methodology to estimate population by service area.

2. Do we want to breakdown GPCD and define the various types of GPCD?

Karen clarified that this question was raised because a total GPCD or even municipal GPCD as it is reported by the TWDB may not be the only useful GPCD measure. Residential single family GPCD for example could be a very useful measurement to track.

3. Is it necessary to have other metrics to measure sectors where GPCD may not be appropriate?

Karen clarified that this question was asked to keep in mind that once we finish the task of coming up with a GPCD methodology, there should be other metrics for water usage not tied to population. The most common example is industrial water usage which could be measured against units of production rather than population.

For question one, information was shared about how SAWS and LCRA calculate their population using the methodology of overlaying service area on top of census tracts. A point was brought up that rural entities may not have the information or tools necessary to accomplish such a task. The larger metropolitan areas would be the entities most likely able to use such methodology now or in the near future. The Council could recommend that there be a consistent uniform methodology of calculating population, keeping in mind that the overlaying approach is a technique focused more toward the larger urban entities. It was agreed that having such methodology would be desirable. The workgroups will need to include this in a plan for review.

For question two, there was some discussion amongst Council members suggesting that the terms GPCD and Total GPCD are not very useful because they don't accurately capture what they are trying to measure. A point was brought up that there needs to be population parameters, industrial parameters, institutional parameters etc. It was argued that the residential sector is truly the only sector where GPCD can be used

accurately for measurement purposes. It was agreed that as of right now Total GPCD, is not an appropriate measurement of conservation success or failure, however it is a good tool for planning. If the goal is to measure conservation success or failure, the metrics are going to have to be broken down further for each sector. Although there were still concerns over the definition of Total GPCD and making sure it is not used inappropriately to compare cities, agreement was reached that additional GPCD metrics will be desired from the workgroup.

For question three, it was suggested that the workgroup needs to identify who can make those breakdowns already, how they make those breakdowns, and how the methodology can be uniform enough to multiply those same efforts throughout the state. It was suggested that the workgroup start by defining some terms and that they involve specialized areas as they do so. It was agreed that GPCD should not be the only metric to track conservation success.

The Presiding Chair ended on that note and recapped a basic timeline for the next few months to come:

April 1 st :	Council Meeting. The workgroups will present their 'Road Maps'. This will be a plan of work revealing what might be seen in their First Draft Workgroup Reports.
May 14 th :	Council Meeting.
July:	Council Meeting. The workgroups will present their First Draft Workgroup Reports.
September 1 st :	First Draft of Council's Legislative Report Due to TWDB.
October:	Council Meeting. The Council will approve the Final Draft of the Council's Legislative Report.
December:	Submit Council's Legislative Report.

Council Meeting adjourned at 2:00pm.