

**Conference Call Meeting of the
Water Withdrawal and Use Inventory Subcommittee for
*A Water Resources Decision Support System for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence***

Friday, May 4, 2001

10:00-11:15 a.m. (EDT)

Summary Minutes

1) Welcome and Introductions

The meeting of the Water Withdrawal and Use Technical Subcommittee (TSC) was called to order at 10:10 a.m. (EST) by Tom Crane, Great Lakes Commission. Those present were Jim Casey, IL; James Hebenstreit, IN; Ron Van Til, MI; Sean Hunt, MN; Michael Holt, NY; Leonard Black, OH; Tom Denslinger, PA; Francois Godin, QC; Linda Talbot, WI; Carol Luukkonen, USGS; Tom Crane, Marilyn Ratliff and Dan Blake, GLC.

2) Call Objectives/Approval of minutes

Crane spoke about the importance of having regular conference calls and in-person meetings that will be scheduled at strategic times during the project. If there is a need for travel funds for these meetings, there may be some available, and individuals should let him know if there is a need for support. Crane informed the TSC that the Project Management Team met on April 5 at the Detroit Airport. The next two meetings of the PMT are scheduled for June 27 and September 20, most likely at the Detroit Airport. The PMT meeting in the fall will be approximately the half-way point of the project, and interim products are planned to be completed at this point. Crane explained that the conference call will cover items that need to be completed by the end of the summer in preparation for this September meeting.

Crane then asked for approval of the minutes from the March 30 in-person meeting of the TSC so that he can post them on the project web-site and make them available for the Stakeholders Advisory Committee. Plans are to post minutes from all TSC meetings and conference calls so that progress can be tracked by the project stakeholders. Crane asked for comments or proposed changes to the minutes to be by May 8, after which time they will be revised and considered approved.

3) Project Progress Report: Review of subcommittee workplan

Crane briefly reviewed the workplan and informed the group that the PMT had requested that the TSC add a component to the workplan looking at demand forecasting procedures that are used by the states and provinces to project future water uses.

4) Discussion of 1998 Water Use Data Submittal and Report: State and Provincial updates, recommendations on report format, decision on data submittal

There was a brief review of the water use data submittal process and the proposal for a tiered approach for different types of water uses that was made at the March 30 meeting. This was presented to the PMT on April 5, and they were fairly comfortable with it. The group agreed that for 1998 and 1999 data, there will be no changes to the past reporting procedures. This will allow for identification of needs and gaps in the data base system and will allow for jurisdiction adaptation to the new procedures. The tiered approach will be applied beginning with 2000 data. For the 1998 report, Pennsylvania, Quebec, and Ontario still need to submit data. Quebec should have final data by May 22. Pennsylvania should have the data within a month. Ontario's representative was not on the call. It was decided that if 1998 data is not available by the June 14 TSC meeting, the most current available data will be used in its place. In a case

where this alternate data is substituted, the group agreed on the need for explicit notation that describes the shortcomings of the data. There also may be a need to clarify differences between sets of alternate data to give a sense of how closely it might approximate real water use.

Action: Commission staff will have a draft report of water use prepared in time for the June 14 meeting.

5) *Consumptive Use Update: Use of coefficients, next steps*

For consumptive use, the decision was made at the March 30 meeting to use coefficients for estimating consumptive uses. Commission staff have not found detailed information that would improve upon the coefficients currently used. Carol Luukkonen, USGS has spoken with USGS staff and may be able to get some additional information. Crane said that if the group believes this would be an area where more research should be done, project funds can be diverted to this effort. There also needs to be some thought given to ways to provide information on consumptive use. Should data be compiled to make sure a regional approach is consistent? If there are state/provincial specific proposals for research, they should be sent to Crane.

6) *State/Provincial Water Resources Management Programs: Compilation of information, How to present information, timeline for completion*

Commission staff presented a draft matrix for describing state/provincial water management programs. For project purposes, a narrow definition of water programs that refers to water use and water supply will be used. Information included in the first matrix includes each state/province and the following items: lead agency, other agencies, legislative authority, regulations, funding, staffing, data reporting frequency, data compilation methods, specificity to Great Lakes Basin, and Compliance with Great Lakes Charter. Discussion occurred on sources for the required information. Crane noted these might include surveys, phone interviews, extraction of information from websites, and in-person interviews, and a combination approach may work best. A narrative of some of the information may also be required to provide needed detail. Some subcommittee members felt they could quickly fill in the matrix, but to make sure all necessary information is gathered and to create some consistency, the information will be gathered through a survey and follow-up phone calls. Commission staff will develop a draft of the survey that will be available for review and comments for the May 25 conference call meeting. Once the survey has been determined to make sense, it will be completed by jurisdictions and Commission staff will compile information.

The second table has a more narrow approach than the first, with each state/province plotted against specific programs dealing with water uses as well as ground and surface water: public supply, self-supply domestic, self-supply irrigation, self-supply livestock, self-supply industrial, self-supply thermoelectric, self-supply nuclear, hydroelectric, other, groundwater, Great Lakes surface water, and other surface water. Crane noted that this may not be the right place for ground and surface water, but wanted some input. Ron Van Til, Michigan, said the categories seem reasonable, but more difficulties will likely arise in the second matrix in generation consistency of information. He also suggested that inclusion of the total number of facilities, the percentage of total registered/reporting facilities, and the percentage with estimated figures might allow for useful comparison. In this case, there may be a matrix for each category of water use. There obviously will need to be a balance on the amount of detail in the matrices so that it is useful but not overwhelming. The information in the matrices will be useful for the project and could also be used for the Great Lakes Protection Fund. Commission staff will get matrices out for review as information is gathered.

Action: GLC staff will create a survey and propose necessary changes to the matrices by the next conference call which is scheduled for May 25.

7) *Water Conservation Programs: Types of information available, difference between plans and programs, how to present information, timeline for completion*

The matrix approach may also work for these programs and could be mixed with the previous matrices, but Commission staff did not provide a draft. Crane mentioned the importance of differentiating between plans that get implemented at certain times, such as drought plans, versus programs that are continually run. No comments were made as to the presentation of conservation information.

8) *Other Business: Demand forecasting, next meetings*

Crane brought up the issue of demand forecasting, which also may be included in the survey. The PMT has asked that this issue be looked at. The amount of forecasting done by jurisdictions varies currently. Information could be added to the annual report, and it may be valuable to look at forecasts for the entire basin. Historical projections may also be valuable for comparison against real growth. The next conference call will take place at 10:00 a.m. (EDT) on May 25. The next in-person meeting will take place from 10:00-3:00 on June 14 at a location near the Chicago O'Hare Airport.

9) *Adjournment*

The conference call was adjourned at 11:15.

Minutes Submitted by:
Dan Blake
Great Lakes Commission

Conference Call Meeting of
A Water Resources Decision Support System for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence
Water Withdrawal and Use Inventory Sub-Committee

Friday May 4, 2001
10:00 a.m. (EDT) (9:00 a.m. CDT)

Conference Dial-in: Dial in #: **1-703-871-3712 followed by 520 8199#**

Preliminary Agenda

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | Welcome and Introductions | Tom Crane, Great Lakes Commission |
| 2. | Call Objectives | T. Crane |
| | a. Approval of 3/30 Meeting Minutes | |
| 3. | Project Progress Report | T. Crane |
| | a. Review of Sub-committee workplan | |
| 4. | Discussion of 1998 Water Use Data Submittal and Report | T. Crane and Marilyn Ratliff, Great Lakes Commission |
| | a. State and Provincial updates | |
| | b. Recommendations on Report Format | |
| | c. Decision on Data Submittal | |
| 5. | Consumptive Use Update | T. Crane; all participants |
| | a. Use of Coefficients | |
| | b. Next Steps | |
| 6. | State/Provincial Water Resources Management Programs | T. Crane; all participants |
| | a. Compilation of information | |
| | b. How do we want to present this information?
(e.g.,level of detail, format) | |
| | c. Timeline for completion | |
| 7. | Water Conservation Programs | T. Crane; all participants |
| | a. What types of information is available? | |
| | b. Difference between plans and programs | |
| | c. How do we want to present this information? | |
| | d. Timeline for completion | |
| 8. | Other Business | all participants |
| | a. next in-person meeting date | |
| 9. | Adjourn | |