

Summary of Minutes

Water Conservation Advisory Council Workgroup Conference Call
Workgroup:

Date: Thursday, 11 June 2020
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Location: Remote

<u>Members</u>	<u>Alternates</u>	<u>Interested Parties</u>	<u>TWDB Staff</u>
Anai Padilla	Eddy Trevino	Brandon Leister	Shae Luther
Karen Guz	Jennifer Walker	Jennifer Nations	John Sutton
Bill Hoffman		Christopher Charles	Temple McKinnon
Donna Howe			Yun Cho
Kevin Kluge			
Aubrey Spear			
Jennifer Allis			

**** 2020 WCAC Legislative Report Draft v. 1.5 can be found at:****
<https://savetexaswater.org/meeting/doc/2020-WCAC-Report-v.-1.5.pdf>

I. Introduction of Participants

The conference call began at 1:04 p.m.

II. Discussion on CI Metrics, Strategies, and Trends for Inclusion in the 2020 WCAC Legislative Report

Karen Guz began the discussion by noting there is a draft of the Council’s 2020 Legislative Report. Included in that draft are issues relating to definitions for CI accounts and how per capita or per day use can be difficult when it comes to expressing water efficiency. It was noted that it would be good to have benchmarks/metrics that could be used across the board, however there are some issues when it comes to metrics with CI users.

NAICS coding has made big strides in Texas, but challenges still exist when finding perspective for different building uses. Unique metrics would be needed to help identify unique water uses. Water user per square foot is often discussed, however this metric does not capture efficiency effectively.

Bill Hoffman noted that differences can also exist within the same water use, i.e. newer hospital buildings often use more square footage for outpatient procedures, making water use per square foot inaccurate when comparing similar facilities. Also noted was that buildings with similar square footage can have drastically different water uses.

K. Guz noted that there is a great start to the section in the current draft, but additions would be needed to explain issues with inconsistency.

Kevin Kluge asked if revisions would solely be additions? Perhaps just mentioning other metrics that might work better?

K. Guz noted that the last two paragraphs of the existing section would need revisions.

B. Hoffman noted that this issue is often referred to as the 'denominator dilemma.' There is a need to normalize how efficiency data is represented.

K. Guz noted that this is a time for research and exploration. There is not a clear understanding of what would be the best metric/denominator for water efficiency data. Texas is ahead of the game in the nation regarding coding commercial property. Another call could be held regarding coding and benchmarking with coding in utility systems.

B. Hoffman noted that some utilities are using the Energy Star Portfolio but those are transferrable.

K. Guz noted she believed El Paso was also doing some coding work.

Anai Padilla with El Paso noted that there is an effort going on, however continuing updates are needed to ensure changes in water uses are reflected in the coding used.

B. Hoffman noted that water uses can change over time.

K. Guz asked if there were any objections to explaining briefly why usage per square foot is not the way to go with CI benchmarking. No objections expressed.

K. Guz will draft some language regarding this.

K. Kluge asked if we have data on metrics by NAICS codes?

K. Guz noted that San Antonio as well as some other individual cities have done this but the data has not been combined. An effort could be made to see if cities who have undertaken this work would be willing to share their data.

B. Hoffman noted that many large cities are conducting coding. LA, Atlanta, and many others nationwide are coding but have not been put into a comprehensive framework.

K. Guz stated that sharing annualized data by NAICS code would be a good start.

Eddy Trevino noted that there is a similar dilemma from a state perspective. Measuring local governments reporting to SECO use the Energy Star Portfolio. SECO was not able to develop a common denominator as buildings and uses were all so different from one another. SECO ended up taking gross consumption, and using a percentage as a measure of efficiency. The data can be mined from the Energy Star Portfolio, but it is dependent upon the information input into the software.

Brandon Leister noted that SAWS found that the further one goes into detail on the NAICS coding, the harder it is to get to a common denominator, because there is some inability to determine a sites' usage from the number.

K. Guz noted nothing will be perfect but a large amount of progress has been made.

E. Trevino stated looking for outliers and asking questions is a good way to start in this effort.

B. Hoffman noted to the group that SECO has published the most recent version of the [Proposed Energy and Water Conservation Design Standards for State Agencies](#). Feedback on the proposed changes is due no later than June 28, 2020.

K. Guz asked if the City of Austin has done anything for their CI customers?

C. Charles with Austin noted that they have not done anything to date in terms of their billing system.

B. Hoffman noted that Austin has done some work on the energy side of things.

K. Guz asked Aubrey Spear if any work had been done in the Lubbock area.

A. Spear stated that they are in the process of implementing AMI but have not worked on coding at this point.

J. Nations noted that there have not been any improvements regarding benchmarking CI accounts in College Station. The city is beginning to look at data regarding cooling towers. The city is currently going through a rate restructuring study and should hopefully have a better idea of their CI customers in about three to six months.

K. Guz asked if there were any other topics for discussion.

B. Hoffman noted that industrial customers that report directly to TWDB have NAICS codes associated with them.

III. Additional Discussion
There was no other discussion.

IV. Adjourn
The conference call was ended at 1:40 p.m.