

ICWP Stakeholder Listening and Input Session – Meeting Notes

Chicago, IL
October 27, 2015

States Attending (12): California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Missouri, Nevada, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Puerto Rico, Washington, and Wisconsin

Question 1: What are the most pressing needs, that if met, would greatly enhance your State's water use data collection program? (List your top 2 or 3.)

Wisconsin:

1. Agricultural consumptive use
2. Aquifer source data (including aquifer boundary delineation)

Washington:

1. Database needs
 - a. There is a sister agency with a different domestic metering reporting database. They need to integrate the two databases for the state.
 - b. The WA Dept. of Health could add source data/information connected to withdrawals.
2. Associate deliveries from public supply to other categories, such as industrial, thermoelectric, domestic, etc.

Nevada:

1. Eighty percent of their withdrawals are for irrigation/agriculture, so metering and consumptive use for irrigation is very important to them.
2. Surface-water availability vs. back-up supplies

Connecticut:

1. Database needs, electronic reporting, security issues related to public supply systems.
2. Understanding aggregate withdrawals from users withdrawing less than the reporting threshold of 50,000 gal/d.

North Dakota:

1. Urban water use
2. Effects of hydraulic fracturing—including the effects on urban areas with availability of water

Puerto Rico:

1. Complete well inventory
 - a. Merge PR/USVI dataset with the USGS well inventory
2. Quality and quantity in the north part of the aquifer vs. the south.
3. Salinity issues

Nebraska:

1. Eighty percent of their use is for agriculture, so consumptive use in areas where there are no permits required is important to them.
2. Public-supply/municipal water supply data

California

1. Groundwater
2. As described in the CA Water Plan Portfolio, they need:
 - a. Better data-management system with metadata
 - b. Quality control of the data

- c. Agency alignment (internal), including programs, sections, communication
- d. Funding for water resource projects – need stable and permanent funding.

Great Lakes

- 1. Consumptive-use coefficients

Illinois

- 1. Developing an electronic reporting tool
- 2. Funding dropping off – inventory, indexing historical data

Missouri

- 1. Database issues
 - a. Let users see their historical information
 - b. Improve reporting data out of the database.
- 2. Lack of compliance (Withdrawals greater than 100,000 gal/d are required to report).
 - a. Estimating domestic withdrawals
 - b. Thermoelectric has the largest withdrawals
 - c. Irrigation has the largest number of users
 - i. Irrigators do not comply with reporting, so need outreach/education
 - ii. IR is not metered, so need to improve quality of the data

Delaware

- 1. Need more resources (people, funding)
- 2. Database improvements
 - a. Merge allocation permits with reporting of withdrawals
 - b. Improve QA/QC of reported data

Rhode Island

- 1. Thermoelectric and Public Supply systems represent approximately 90% of the withdrawals.
- 2. Database improvements. Would like to improve QA/QC, and improve queries of the data.
- 3. Improve estimates of other 10% of withdrawals
 - a. Update coefficients for irrigation and domestic.

Question 2 – How do the research priorities identified by USGS align with State priorities?

- 1. HUC 8 water-use reporting
- 2. Water-tracking and interbasin transfer (between HUC 8 units)
- 3. System uses (internal and other non-revenue uses) and losses from public supply systems
- 4. Irrigation: sources and volumes (including golf courses)
- 5. Inventory of self-supplied industrial
- 6. Mining: withdrawals with source and commodity identified
- 7. Improvement of the domestic per-capita coefficients
- 8. Groundwater use: Identifying aquifer and HUC of withdrawal, and further refining the definition of saline/brackish water
- 9. Estimation of public-supply deliveries to customer groups or classes, such as commercial, industrial, and domestic
- 10. Public supply systems stratified by socioeconomic factors
- 11. Improved data collection and delivery

For this meeting, each state listed the numbers for the top three priorities for the state that were in the list above.

Wisconsin	8, 11 (mapping tools, etc.), 10
Washington	11, Domestic supply is biggest fight over least withdrawals, 9 8, 2
Nevada	4 (application of the IR data), domestic use, 7, 8, 3
Connecticut	11, 2, 3/9
North Dakota	9, 10, 11, 7
Puerto Rico	8, 11
Nebraska	4, 11, 1, 3/9
California	11, 1, 8, also self-supplied withdrawals, and agency alignment, 5
Illinois	11, 4 (inventory golf courses and irrigation of courses)
Missouri	4, 3, 11
Delaware	4, 9, 11 (hour meters vs. flow meters)
Rhode Island	11, 8, water use and availability by municipality.
Great Lakes	Thermoelectric consumptive use, a 0.5% change can have a huge impact. Tracking thermoelectric plants going off-line.

Additionally, the three items below were listed as priorities, but not on the list above:

1. Methodologies for water budgets. This might include mathematical computations in the database. It would also include a way to tease out a separation between use and loss.
2. Improved temporal data (monthly, seasonal)
3. Outreach – educating personnel reporting the data as to how to accurately report the data.

Question 3 – Does your state currently meet the baseline standard listed in the WUDR Guidance? If yes, what Tier do you think you state currently meets?

This question was skipped at this meeting.

Question 4 – For the FY16 competitive award, how do you think financial assistance should be prioritized among the Tiers?

- Equal priority
- A greater priority to assist states in meeting baseline standards
- A great priority to assist states in meeting the higher-level tiers

Some states thought that the funding should go mostly to higher tier levels. Others thought it should go more to meeting tier 1 requirements. Others thought they should get equal priority. Others thought it should focus on important categories rather than tiers. There was no consensus as to which of the three options listed above would be the best.

Question 5 – Given the maximum funding for FY16 (\$1.5 million – pending Congressional approval), what is the minimum level of award you would find to be helpful to your state?

The general consensus was that the minimum funding amount would be \$50,000 to \$100,000.

Question 6 – Is your state able to meet the requirements listed in the WUDR Guidance?

- All data must be stored in an electronic format.
- A description of methods used to estimate values, coefficients, and/or other data must be provided.
- A description of data quality assurance and control procedures must be provided.
- Non-sensitive data, that is available for export or download from the state agency database, must be accessible to the USGS
- The data must be made available to the USGS at the HUC8, county level, and aquifer (for groundwater sources).
- Interaction with USGS Water Science Center personnel is required.

This question was skipped at this meeting

Question 7 – Following an award of FY16 competitive funds, states will likely be required to periodically report their progress. What reporting frequency do you think is appropriate?

Several suggestions were made, including: every 6 months, email of quarterly reports, quick monthly check-ins. There was also a suggestion to build in time for collaboration with other states that received funding.

Question 8 – What would be most helpful in making the FY16 proposal/application process more clear/easier?

- The basics - executive summary, description of activities, budget, timeline, deliverables + page number limit
- USGS to provide an outline/template of application requirements – more prescribed
- Criteria for how proposals will be evaluated
- Just let us do our thing!

The general consensus was to include a basic outline, and the criteria that the proposals will be evaluated on.

Afternoon Discussion:

Case study presentation – Lessons learned from ongoing regional water use data collections efforts (State/Provincial Reporting Protocols and Water Use Database – Great Lakes Region) – *Presented by Peter Johnson, Deputy Director, Conference of Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Governors and Premiers*

Wrap-Up

The idea of a monthly water-use seminar series was well received. There was also discussion of quarterly regional topical discussions, and an annual water-use workshop. Others requested a clearinghouse for water use, a contact list for all attendees, and a list of which states already provide great data (these could be examples and resources for other states). A summary of QA/QC best practices was also requested.