

Summary of Minutes

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

Date: Monday, December 16, 2019

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Location: LCRA Redbud Center – 3601 Lake Austin Blvd. Austin, TX 78744

<u>Members</u>	<u>Alternates</u>	<u>Interested Parties</u>	<u>TWDB Staff</u>
Karen Guz Ken Kramer Bill Hoffman Anai Padilla Kevin Kluge	Jennifer Walker	Dan Strub Patrick Shriver Michael Choate Tommy McClung Isabel Martinez Shannon Fraizer James Foutz Dorothy Young Perry Fowler Jennifer Nations	John Sutton Shae Luther Daniel Rice Travis Brice Laurie Gehlsen 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 10:36 a.m.

II. Update From TWDB

a. water loss auditor training

Between 2017 – 2019, TWDB has conducted 43 workshops which have educated:

- 524 PWS entities
- 992 individuals

TWDB is planning 23 workshops for 2020 which will:

- Discuss data flow from the Water Use Survey, the Water Loss Audit, and Water Conservation Plan.
- Provide a holistic approach on conservation and water loss.

b. water loss audits submissions

For 2019, the Water Loss Audit currently has a 95% submittal rate out of 684 total number of required submittals.

c. definition of ‘connection’

Discussion was brought up at the November 19th WCAC meeting, a question was brought up on a potential change in definition to the term ‘connection’. After discussion with TCEQ water supply staff, no change in the definition has occurred. TCEQ released a document (found at the link above) to clarify the practical application of ‘connections’ vs. ‘population served’.

A question was asked why the term 'connections' was used in this context, as from a water loss perspective, 'connection' refers to a connection to a meter ('metered connection'). It was discussed that perhaps it was used to provide a level of consistency on submitted data.

III. Discussion on Potential Legislative Recommendations

a. potential Legislative Recommendation on Level 1 Validation Pilot Program

i. case studies

Georgia and California have both implemented validation programs state-wide. Georgia's program requires an outside individual to conduct the validation, while California does allow a utility to perform its own validation. In both states, training is required in data validation. For the development of the training in both states, consultants were contracted to develop the training programs.

It was stated that should a recommendation of a pilot program be moved forward, the timeframe to implement lessons learned from the pilot program would take several legislative sessions. It was also stated that the efforts of Georgia and California provide an adequate pilot study, as Georgia began its program in 2012 and has some good data on its implementation.

Another topic discussed was initiating a step process. This would allow a faster implementation with a targeted subsection of the utilities. As discussion continued, it was agreed upon that starting this requirement with larger utilities.

Discussion was brought up about AWWA's Water Audit Data initiative (WADI). This was a voluntary initiative where participants would open their records for review. This initiative was brought up as another model that could potentially be explored.

The workgroup decided that further discussion and finalization of a potential recommendation.

IV. Discussion on updating water loss thresholds

Current TWDB water loss thresholds are based on 2010 data. TWDB is in the process of updating the thresholds using 2015 data. Additional updates will use number of connections rather than population served.

VI. Adjourn

The conference call ended and the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.