

**Summary of Minutes**

Water Conservation Advisory Council Workgroup Meeting and Conference Call  
Workgroup:

Date: Wednesday, January 8, 2020  
Time: 11:30 a.m.  
Location: 505 East Huntland Dr., Suite 485 Austin, TX 78752

<b><u>Members</u></b>	<b><u>Alternates</u></b>	<b><u>Interested Parties</u></b>	<b><u>TWDB Staff</u></b>
Karen Guz Kevin Kluge Anai Padilla	Jennifer Walker	Dan Strub Jennifer Nations Patrick Shriver Scott Swanson	John Sutton Shae Luther Travis Brice Laurie Gehlsen Daniel Rice Josh Sendejar

\*\* Documents can be found at: <https://savetexaswater.org/meeting/workgroup/waterloss.html>\*\*

I. Introduction of Participants

The meeting and conference call began at 11:38 a.m.

II. Discussion on Potential Legislative Recommendations

a. Level 1 Validation Pilot Program

Staff from TWDB began the discussion by stating that some funding has been identified in the amount of about \$128,000. These funds were remaining after the Averitt project and were previously used to create the Municipal Water Conservation Planning Tool. TWDB would seek an RFQ, seeking to work with a contractor on a Level 1 Validation study. The goal of this study would be to determine what it would take to implement Level 1 Validation in Texas and would include utilities of varying sizes. TWDB will be seeking feedback by the end of next week.

The question was then asked how this new effort would impact any potential recommendations from the WCAC. It was then commented that perhaps that the initial study could be used to guide an expanded pilot program. An expanded pilot could serve as a test case for the learnings of the initial pilot. Discussion shifted to who the pilot should target. A comment was made that perhaps the pilot should be mandatory for larger utilities. Another comment was perhaps certain reporting criteria could be used to determine participants. It was then commented certain reporting criteria may not be accurate. It was then commented, that the contractor should make clear how a utility can use validation to improve. Another stakeholder stated that once indicating factors are identified, the contracted report can make recommendations on how those factors can be addressed.

Another stakeholder stated that national reports indicate we are experiencing higher loses over the last decade than previously thought. Validation would guide investments for the individual utility. Another comment brought up that a voluntary effort would

bring those who are motivated for change. A clarification was also made that water loss may get worse at the beginning of the validity process.

Discussion was then brought up that validation does not increase validity scores but increases confidence in the audit data. It was then commented that level 1 validation is a step, but there are many more steps to be taken.

Another comment brought up was that personnel will be needed to validate audits. In California, certification is required for validation auditors.

A final comment regarding TWDB's study was that a roadmap on how to move forward should be a requirement of the contractor.

Discussion then focused on what should the Council's recommendation be? One comment was a phased in validity program made mandatory for utilities taking out financial obligations with TWDB. Another comment focused on an expansion on the proposed TWDB study, which would be voluntary, to have data validity services for up to 80 utilities. This would serve as a proof of concept for TWDB's initial pilot study.

Dan Stub will draft language for the recommendation on mandatory validation.

### III. Adjourn

The meeting and conference call were adjourned at 12:53 p.m.