

From: <Karen.Guz@saws.org>
To: <montgomerygene@gmail.com>
Date: 1/28/2008 2:14 PM
Subject: RE: GPCD Input

CC: <Vanessa.Escobar@twdb.state.tx.us>, <comer.tuck@twdb.state.tx.us>, <Elli...
Gene,

Thanks very much for sending your input. Vanessa is posting input such as this on the web site tracking our efforts.

On a note for debating these issues, you and I agree on some of this. I agree that we will need additional metrics for industrial water usage. That is a very different animal to track for success in conservation and units per production of some kind will be needed for each major industry. Expecting simply a total reduction for industrial to show conservation progress won't work.

However, I also strongly believe that we will miss out on important information if there is not a total gpcd calculation for each community. The gpcd gives a total picture of the water need per capita for a given community which includes their industrial output. It will certainly be therefore higher in communities that have refineries, chip manufacturing or other water intensive uses. But that water is necessary to the community thriving and should be reflected in what it takes to keep them going. In order to then make it clear where the water is being used, we should have break-downs that report the specific measures like residential home use or commercial business usage. This way we can respond to inappropriate finger pointing over the totals if a community can show they are making progress. And communities that don't have industrial water usage, but have high residential usage will be held to a standard for changing residential consumption.

Industrial usage can also be broken out and then further clarified with other metrics. But the idea of not showing it as part of the total water picture concerns me. Taking it out also does not acknowledge that industrial water usage totals can and do change with conservation initiatives. For example if Toyota Texas in San Antonio had not invested in substantial water process improvements in order to use recycled effluent in production, the San Antonio gpcd would be one higher than it currently is. The same would be true if the Microsoft facility being opened were not using that effluent for their cooling. Our power production is another major water consumer in San Antonio. Some of the cooling water comes from treated effluent, but we also sell a substantial amount of water for power production. That is currently in our gpcd as water needed to keep our community going. To ignore it would be to create an illusion that we could sustain on less. We can't and therefore need to show it in our total.

Karen L. Guz
Director
Conservation Department

San Antonio Water System
2800 U.S. Hwy. 281 North
San Antonio, Texas 78212
karen.guz@saws.org

phone (210) 233-3671
fax (210) 233-4783

From: Gene Montgomery [mailto:montgomerygene@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2008 1:48 PM
To: Karen Guz
Cc: Vanessa Escobar; comer.tuck@twdb.state.tx.us
Subject: GPCD Input

Karen, I have tried to summarize the primary metrics that I believe apply to each major category of water use (municipal, industrial, and agricultural) in the attached Excel spreadsheet. In our last WG2 conference call I think the discussion at times indicated that some industrial and agricultural use of water might be affecting a utilities' water metrics. As you pointed out, a manufacturing facility such as Frito-Lay needs to have some method of measuring and comparing their water use but it certainly doesn't make sense to do it based on any population based metric. It seems to me we don't want to define GPCD such that this metric will be applied to the entire water volume delivered by a utility. Instead, the volume of water needs to be separated into the main water use categories and then again into some sub-categories but the municipal GPCD should not include water use by non-municipal groups where the water use is not population dependent but instead better measured by some production related index. Anyway, this is my idea on how we should address this issue. I look forward to helping put something together that helps give some better guidance on this.

I am sure you have probably already found a lot of info on the TWDB website but I am attaching some FAQs I found on their site which I found helpful and also Appendix A from some TWDB forms that contains some definitions. I don't know if these are the official definitions but they seem to be good but probably don't go far enough to address some specific issues.

See you Wednesday.

--
Gene Montgomery