

Summary of Minutes

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

Date: June 26, 2019
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Location: The Meadows Center for Water and the Environment

<u>Members</u>	<u>Alternates</u>	<u>Interested Parties</u>	<u>TWDB Staff</u>
Karen Guz Anai Padilla* Valerie Miller* Jennifer Allis* Tim Loftus	Dustan Compton* Mark Froelich*	Zoey L * James Foutz* Molly Morris* Heather Dalrymple* Ryan Skrobarczyk*	John Sutton Shae Luther Josh Sendejar Travis Brice Laurie Gehlsen

**joined by phone*

** Documents can be found at: **

The meeting/conference call began at 12:36 p.m.

I. Introduction of Participants

After the introduction of participants, Josh had a few announcements for the workgroup:

- The first round of BMPs the Municipal Workgroup submitted last June has been approved through TWDB and the Municipal BMP Guide has been updated.
- The nomination period for the seven interest groups up for nomination is open until **July 8th**. Information regarding nominations can be found on the Council's website (www.savetexaswater.org).

II. Discussion on Alignment of BMPs, Conservation Measures found in the TWDB Conservation Planning Tool, and TWDB's Conservation Annual Report

T. Loftus began the discussion by stating that he and one of his graduate advisees were conducting a project with a municipality's conservation program in relation to the Texas Living Waters Project's Water Conservation Scorecard.

In using the TWDB's Municipal Conservation Planning Tool to help quantify the municipality's conservation program, it was discovered that the Conservation Measures within the tool do not align with the existing BMPs. Although the tool has measures for single-family, multi-family, and ICI customers, the measures are not easily associated with some of the municipal BMPs. Based upon previous discussion, there is interest in aligning the two.

K. Guz stated that from a utility standpoint, SAWS has not felt limited by the BMPs offered from TWDB.

TWDB staff brought up that the Conservation Scorecard is one thing, but TWDB reporting is another and if the measures could be categorized by the applicable BMP. It was noted that it could be possible but the relationship between the Conservation Measures and BMPs would need to be better defined.

K. Guz asked what happens to the data put into the free form text boxes found in the Water Conservation Annual Report?

A: If value is entered in an appropriate value box, it should be captured, while free form text is still aggregated when running certain queries, but numbered totals may not be tabulated if input into the wrong field.

One solution may be to include instructions in the Annual Report form.

T. Loftus wanted to express the educational value for utilities on BMPs they could implement.

It was then stated that there is a difference between Conservation Measures and BMPs, with several Conservation Measures potentially fitting under one BMP.

Example: The Showerhead, Aerator, and Toilet Flapper Retrofit BMP would serve for several of the tool's conservation measures (i.e. Bathroom Retrofit, and the Showerhead and Aerator Kit.)

It was brought up that there may have been some confusion on the differences between BMPs and Conservation Measures. K. Guz mentioned that if the workgroup was uncertain on the differences, then outside stakeholders are also likely uncertain.

K. Guz also brought up that there is a need to update/create additional BMPs to fully capture current technologies and methods for water savings. One such BMP is the Home Water Reports, which T. Loftus had previously mentioned. K. Guz mentioned that when SAWS implemented a Home Water Report service (akin to Drop Counter or Water Smart), they saw a considerable amount of water savings given the needed time/cost needed to implement the service.

M. Martin brought up that the City of Lubbock did not see the same results when implementing Water Smart. K. Guz brought up that it could be a difference of culture and behavioral response will be hard to normalize across the state. With that said, it would be useful to have different perspectives involved in the creation of a Home Water Reports BMP.

T. Loftus also mentioned that a change in messaging could affect water savings with the home water reports.

K. Guz brought up that it may be as simple as creating a table outlining BMPs & what Conservation Measures would fall under them. Instructions could also be included to provide clarifying information.

TWDB staff noted time would be needed creating and understanding the connection between the measures and BMPs. The workgroup was asked to help cultivate this understanding for development of these documents.

T. Loftus asked what if fleshing out the difference between Single-Family and Multi-Family use.

K. Guz noted that utilities should be able to differentiate between Single-Family, Multi-Family, Industrial, Commercial & Institutional, and Agricultural use. In her experience, the problem is often the billing system, which is unable to accurately distinguish the accounts of different water users. She also noted that TWDB had put out a guidance document on upgrading your billing system, which outlined ways to ensure proper parsing of the billing data, it may be useful to have the Council amplify the reach of that guidance document.

J. Foutz asked if there was guidance on NAICS coding.

A: The TWDB Guidance and Methodology document does reference NAICS codes as well as links to the federal page.

K. Guz brought up that it would be interesting to see what utilities have upgraded their billing system. It was mentioned that the Water Science & Infrastructure office of TWDB should have some information on that.

K. Guz asked if there were any workgroup members present who would be interested in looking at how the Conservation Measures and BMPs could be aligned. Several members in the room and on the phone offered to take look at aligning the two.

T. Loftus mentioned that what happens at TWDB has the potential to influence TCEQ and the Regional Water Planning Groups.

III. Other Discussion

K. Guz brought up two additional topics for the workgroup's discussion. The first topic was that of [H.B. 2439](#), which restricts a governmental entity from directly or indirectly prohibiting or limiting the use or installation of a building product or material if the product or material is approved by a national model code published within the last three code cycles.

H. Darymple noted that Austin was concerned about this bill as well, but they were hopeful that the Health & Safety Code Ch. 372 would take precedence over H.B. 2439.

A few questions came up with this discussion:

- Does the International/National building codes define what a building material is?
- Do any individual municipalities define building materials in their ordinances?

Upon reading the analysis for the bill, the bill is concerned with building materials in the construction or alternation of a residential or commercial building, which several workgroup members did not feel that would extend to fixtures within such a building.

The second issue brought up was what BMPs are missing or need updating within the BMP Guide.

T. Loftus brought up the Home Water Reports, with several workgroup members supporting this effort.

K. Guz also mentioned that the Fixtures Update BMP is in need of updating.

IV. Adjourn

The meeting/conference call was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.