

Summary of Minutes

Water Conservation Advisory Council Workgroup Meeting and Conference Call
Workgroup: Municipal & Water Loss

Date: August 24, 2021
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Location: Remote (GoToMeeting)

<u>Members</u>	<u>Alternates</u>	<u>Interested Parties</u>	<u>TWDB Staff</u>
Karen Guz Valerie Miller Anai Padilla	Jennifer Walker	Allen Berthold* Christopher Charles Dan Strub Jennifer Nations Kevin Kluge Patrick Shriver Timothy Crosswhite	Josh Sendejar John Sutton Temple McKinnon Yun Cho Shae Luther Travis Brice Daniel Rice Mark Mathis

*Present for Municipal portion only

Documents can be found at: www.savetexaswater.org/meeting/workgroup/municipal.html

Municipal: 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

I. Introduction of Participants

The meeting began at 3:08 a.m.

Karen Guz began discussion by providing a few updates on previously discussed projects/topics.

AMI:

The national study from AWWA’s Technical Education Council regarding AMI is currently underway, with four main focus areas:

- Experimental Design & Customer Behavior
- Literature Review
 - o What do we know
 - o Goal to produce a BMP document based on findings

K. Guz noted that the workgroup could spread the message of AWWA’s work and encourage any who are currently undergoing any AMI projects to get involved.

It was also noted that this study could be used as a baseline for what is happening in Texas.

Land Use Planning:

Karen Guz noted she will follow-up with Kevin Kluge on a presentation on the intersection between Land Use Planning and Water Planning.

Conservation Webinar(s):

Karen Guz noted that TAWWA's Conservation and Reuse Division is considering hosting a series of webinars. One idea Karen had was looking at per capita trends in Texas through Flume, who was scheduled to present at the September 9th WCAC meeting, which has been postponed. If there are other ideas for webinar topics, please let Karen know.

II. Discussion on Municipal Targets & Goals

Discussion began with the notion that the 140 GPCD target recommended by the Water Conservation Implementation Task Force in 2004 is still used by some entities in their Water Conservation Plans and in Regional Water Planning even though many retail water suppliers have surpassed that target in their water conservation efforts.

TWDB Staff noted that there are those consultants and firms that use the 140 GPCD target.

Discussion then shifted to the [2020 WCAC report](#) regarding submitted Conservation Annual Report data. Trends from this data show a steady decline in Total GPCD, all below the 140 GPCD target (2020 WCAC Report, Page 12, Table 2). It was also noted that Residential GPCD could be an easier metric to compare for cities.

Karen Guz noted that there is a unique opportunity with Flume to look at data that has not been available before.

A question was raised if there could be a self-selection bias with the Flume data. Karen Guz noted that in San Antonio many Flume users are higher water users who are more likely to have automatic irrigation systems. While the Flume data is not perfect, it provides a good insight.

Jennifer Walker noted that in her experience with Regional Water Planning Groups, RWPGs generally use the 140 GPCD target because it is a form of provided guidance, although it is over ten years old.

TWDB Staff noted that GPCD Targets can be compiled from the Regional Water Plans, in addition to the narratives on the regions' methodologies for their targets. Staff requested a written data request with some clarification on what is needed would be helpful to query data.

The workgroup noted the following action items:

- Gather Water Conservation data that has been used in RWPs by region.

- Gather Annual Reporting data and sort by region.
- Send a written request to TWDB Staff (Conservation Staff and Planning/Projections Staff).
- Compare data sets and further discuss how this data can be used to make a recommendation or support the RWPGs in developing robust conservation water management strategies.

III. Other Discussion
No other discussion held.

IV. Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Water Loss: 4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

- I. Introduction of Participants
The meeting began at 4:00 p.m.
- II. Continue Discussion & Refinement of Workgroup Initiatives & Activities for 2021

Validation:

Jennifer Walker began discussion by asking for an update on the Water Loss Validation Study from TWDB Staff.

TWDB Staff gave the following update:

- 10 utilities were identified for the study who had at least 3 audits on file during the past 5 years.
- Some utilities had difficulties given the winter storm and complications with the pandemic.
- 2 utilities were able to be included in Level 2 Validation components.
- Cavanaugh and Associates, the contractor for the study, made recommendations regarding water loss measures and state water planning:
 - There is a need to ensure accurate data for planning purposes.
 - Continue the validation study at a regional level.
 - Setup a certification program for water loss validators.
 - Continue to align with AWWA’s water loss audit form.

TWDB Form vs. AWWA Form:

TWDB Staff gave an overview of the differences between the AWWA Form and the TWDB Form.

It was noted one of the largest differences is how the two forms handle assessment scores. TWDB’s form utilizes a table describing conditions to meet the appropriate

assessment score that can be subjective, while the newest version of AWWA's form asks objective questions to determine the assessment scores.

III. Other Discussion

No other discussion was had.

IV. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.