

From: <Karen.Guz@saws.org>
To: <Vanessa.Escobar@twdb.state.tx.us>
Date: 1/28/2008 10:58 AM
Subject: FW: GPCD Workgroup 2 Teleconference

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Olson [mailto:MOlson@trwd.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 9:49 AM
To: Karen Guz
Cc: Linda Christie
Subject: RE: GPCD Workgroup 2 Teleconference

To clarify the industrial use and its influence on gpcd.

It should be included as a category, however I don't think it's something that can be used when doing apples to apples comparisons between cities. It should be reported but not used to compare municipal gpcd.

It will definitely skew city comparisons. Again look at Houston and Corpus, and various other communities that have an "Intel-type" or other intense water use corporation(s) in their backyard. The presence of those corporations is not shared equally among cities. It's a losing battle to try to incorporate industrial into the official gpcd mix, but it's an important way of measuring, as you pointed out, the overall trends in water use going forward. And it's also important for the purposes of regional water supply planning.

One thing that needs to occur though is consensus on what specifically should be considered industrial. Otherwise you might run into cases where entities might be tempted to classify some water use as industrial when it would be better classified as institutional or commercial.

The one category, at least for now, that can be used to compare one city to the next as pointed out in the infamous gpcd paper is residential.

Mark Olson | Water Conservation Coordinator Tarrant Regional Water District |
817-335-2491

-----Original Message-----

From: Karen Guz [mailto:Karen.Guz@saws.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 9:24 AM
To: Mark Olson
Subject: RE: GPCD Workgroup 2 Teleconference

Mark

Great input! I will incorporate it into the notes. I appreciate your view on the overall calc including industrial as I think that will be an issue of debate. That will change gpcd a lot but I don't agree that it makes a city look bad. I have asked Elliott to back industrial out of ours just to see the difference. It will be an interesting discussion and probably one to have face to face.

Karen

-----Original Message-----

From: "Mark Olson" <MOlson@trwd.com>

To: "Karen Guz" <Karen.Guz@saws.org>

Cc: "Linda Christie" <LChristie@trwd.com>

Sent: 1/16/08 5:50 PM

Subject: GPCD Workgroup 2 Teleconference

Karen,

Good discussion today. Here's some comments:

*How population is determined (which includes delineating service area vs. municipal boundaries) and how water consumption is categorized/classified will be the key to leveling the playing field.

*Despite some viewpoints, I agree with you that determining a global or total gpcd should be a part of the equation regardless of how much or how little usage is due to industrial. Total gpcd is a good starting point and crucial to balancing the equation. Besides as it stands right now, industrial use is already dropped out of the equation for municipal gpcd figures as reported by TWDB.

*Standardizing water use classifications and definitions is essential. Right now certain types of water use are categorized differently depending on the entity.

*Commuter influx is a problem for some cities - look at Plano, Richardson, Dallas, etc.? But can you really balance that out of the equation?

*Two other categories that weren't addressed today might add to the mess: wholesale and retail sales; and direct and indirect reuse.

Mark Olson | Water Conservation Coordinator

Tarrant Regional Water District | 817-335-2491