

ICWP Stakeholder Listening and Input Session – Meeting Notes

Salt Lake City, Utah

September 17, 2015

States Attending (9): Arizona, Idaho, Kansas, North Dakota, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Wyoming

**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.)

Arizona:

1. Complete and accurate reporting
2. Enforcement/timeliness of filing
3. Irrigated acres to withdrawals and crop type
  - a. Possibly use remote-sensing data
  - b. Also need more information in unmanaged areas

Texas:

1. Irrigation withdrawals by well: monthly data.
2. Well-specific withdrawals
3. Service boundaries
4. Water source for hydraulic fracturing

Oregon:

1. Change reporting requirements
2. Crop irrigation methods
3. Conduct survey to capture unreported information
4. Integration of multiple data systems

Utah:

1. Make sure public knows reporting is important
2. Educating those reporting to the program
3. Create a reporting form that is easy to understand, and also makes it easy to report
4. The program in Utah is volunteer, so there is a huge challenge to get reported data.
  - a. Approx. 50% use the online portal to report
5. Inaccurate data – there is no funding to QA/QC the data
6. Improve the form
7. Create relationships (with reporting agencies?)
8. Meter irrigation wells, rather than estimating values for groundwater withdrawals for irrigation
9. Legislative audit

Idaho:

1. Better reported data
2. Irrigation withdrawals split by source (surface water and groundwater)
3. Use LANDSAT for consumptive use

Kansas:

1. Updating water rights database system with quality assurance and quality control features
2. Integrate multiple databases

Wyoming:

1. (Tracking) flows to other states

2. Estimates of consumptive use
3. Better estimates of crop type and irrigated acres for agricultural withdrawals
4. Groundwater withdrawal information
5. Groundwater control areas

North Dakota

1. Disaggregation of urban supply water – deliveries for commercial, industrial, and domestic
2. QA/QC process improvements for 3000 water use reports

New Mexico

1. Metering requirement – compliance and better enforcement
2. Create own crop data layer. (NM has found the CDL to be inaccurate in NM)
3. Crop type information

**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, hands were raised, and a quick, estimated, count was made. The general results below indicate the number of hands raised for each of the corresponding priorities listed above:

1. 1
2. 1
3. 5
4. 7
5. 3
6. 2
7. 4
8. 6
9. 6
10. 1
11. 10

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

New Mexico

- PS (Public Supply) – Tier 1 (T1) except annual withdrawals, not monthly. Not HUC-8. No SW/GW split. Some interbasin transfers (T2), and some exchange (T3).
- TE (Thermoelectric) – only annual withdrawals, no return flows
- IR (Irrigation) – T1 and T2, no return flows (T3)

#### North Dakota

- PS – T1, No monthly withdrawals, no HUC-8, and no interbasin transfers.
- IR – annual withdrawals T1
- TE – monthly with return flows

#### Wyoming – this involves 2 different agencies

- PS – not a huge category for WY. T1, annual withdrawals
- IR – T2 to T3, very important category, especially consumptive use. No HUC 8 or 12.
- TE – T1? (Hydrographers report)

#### Utah – this involves multiple agencies, water budget process to T3

- PS – T2, monthly withdrawals by source (T2), some T3 (annual deliveries)
- IR – T1, have ways to estimate.
- TE – T2, TE is considered Industrial in UT. Monthly reporting with consumptive use.

#### Kansas

- PS – T2 to T3, annual meter readings
- IR – T2 to T3
- TE – T2 to T3

#### Idaho

- PS – includes diversions for domestic
- IR – T2 to T3, site specific location, max use, but not metered
- TE – not sure

#### Oregon

- PS – T1, monthly by point of diversion. Could get withdrawals by aquifer for groundwater withdrawals. No estimates on quantity purchased/sold. No estimates of deliveries to commercial/industrial, etc.
- IR – T1, monthly by point of diversion
- TE – T1, withdrawals, but not power generation, consumptive use, or return flows.

#### Texas

- PS – T3
- IR – T1
- TE – T2, with exception of return flows

#### Arizona

- PS – T3, annual withdrawals
- IR – T1, cannot ask for acres irrigated, method, or crop type.
- TE – T2

**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 greater priority to assist states in meeting the higher-level 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 \$25,000 to \$30,000. A few states thought the minimum should be \$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.

Most of the above items did not seem to be an issue; however, the reporting at HUC-8 may be an issue.

**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: biannual, semi-annual, and only a final report.

**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:**

Sara Larsen, from Western States Water Council gave a presentation titled, "Lessons learned from ongoing regional water use data collections efforts (Water Data Exchange (WaDE))."

### Survey Discussion

Much of the afternoon of this meeting included a discussion of the survey that was subsequently sent out to the State Water Resource Agencies.

### Wrap-Up

There was some general discussion of the meeting.

New Mexico shared with the group that they have 750 Public Water Systems, and they get 30% return on reporting with no follow-up; after calls, they end with approximately 90% reporting. They have 200 mining systems and they get 60% return on reporting with no follow-up; after calls, they end with approximately 90% reported. They have 15 power plants, and have 100% reporting. For the remaining 10% of PWS and mining systems, they estimate the withdrawals.

The attendees thought that a national conference was a good idea, or perhaps regional conferences would work better as out of state travel is very difficult for state agencies; closer travel is easier to get approval for.