**Water Information and Data Subcommittee**

**Data Exchange Template Workgroup (Workgroup #3)**

Minutes – February 27, 2012

**Attendees**: Steve Tessler (USGS), Laura Paeglis (NE), Dave Cole (UT), Steve Malers (Riverside), Molly Maupin (USGS), Sara Larsen (WSWC), Dwane Young (WSWC-WestFAST)

**Next Call:**  3/23 or the week of March 26th, look for a Doodle Poll

**Administrative:** The minutes from the prior call were approved. Action Items #8 (provide SWUDS data model) and #9 (Develop draft data elements list) were closed.

**Draft Data Elements:** Dwane led a discussion regarding the draft list of data elements. He discussed how following the WSWC visits to NM, OR, and UT that he feels that the schema needs to separately handle summary and site specific data. The previous data model was trying to accommodate both under the same model. Summary level data would be organized around a ‘reporting unit’. A reporting unit would represent whatever spatial scale a state is using to summarize their data. It could be an 8-digit HUC, a county, or a state specific reporting unit. As part of the original plan, the WSWC had planned on summarizing everything at the 8-digit HUC scale. However, after talking with some of the states, this now seems impractical. The states are using a number of different scales to summarize their data. Another issue that the WSWC has discovered in speaking with the states is that in some cases, the reporting units nest within each other, with the downstream reporting units accumulating the summary information of the upstream reporting units. Steve Malers stated that CO takes a similar approach when determining water availability. There still would be a need for being able to summarize data a common scale throughout the west. This is why it would be important to capture the point data in addition to the summary data. With the point data, we could assign the data to whatever scale we needed to report at. However, it would still be important to show what summaries the states are generating.

There was some discussion on consumptive use. Nebraska uses a gridded model to determine consumptive use. As such, in many cases, consumptive use wouldn’t be represented by a point, but rather a polygon. Steve Malers suggested that the group look at Reclamation’s Consumptive Uses and Losses Report. **Action Item: Get a copy of the Consumptive Uses and Losses Report and Share with the Workgroup.**

Another thing that the WSWC learned in state visits is that all of the reporting information need to have start date/end date component, and that the summary level data should have a timeframe associated with it. For example, water availability would be broken out by month. Water could be available in February, but not in June. Withdrawals may only be allowed for certain time frames. This needs to be captured in the schema. The workgroup agreed with this approach. Steve Malers stated that some of the water availability estimates that CO does are on an hourly timeframe. Dwane proposed that for the purposes of this project, a monthly timeframe would be sufficient.

Dwane asked if states were tracking rates (CFS), volumes (acre feet), or both. In the states that the WSWC has visited so far, it has been a mix. The workgroup states agreed that their data also is mixed. They said that it is possible to do the conversion, but it may not accurately reflect what’s going on. Dwane proposed that the schema capture both pieces of information (both rate and volume).

Dwane mentioned that one of the challenges in having point data is the security of the drinking water intakes. In many cases the points of diversion for drinking water uses would be the drinking water intake locations. From a federal perspective, these locations are never made public. However, states can take a different approach if they want. Some states do show their diversion points for drinking water. Others may not. Molly Maupin stated that there may also be some Personal Identifiable Information considerations as well.

Dwane asked the group if it were possible to have a consumptive use without an allocation. The workgroup felt that this scenario would be unlikely.

Dwane asked about how states dealt with interstate compacts. Steve Malers stated that in CO, they manage the resource to deliver an agreed upon amount of water downstream to fulfill the compact. They don’t assign specific allocations to the compact, but rather manage the diversions to ensure that the compact is being met.

Dwane asked about instream flows. They may not be definable as a point, but rather a reach. Would it be appropriate to define them as allocations? However, the diversion model may not fit them properly. Dave Cole stated that in UT, instream flow allocations may be defined as between two facilities.

Steve Tessler asked about what is meant by water availability. Dwane said that this is a question in the survey that was sent to the states. Steve stated that it would be valuable to delineate between resource constraints on water availability versus legal constraints.

**Call Schedules:**  Dwane proposed the March 23rd or the week of March 26th. Dwane will send out a Doodle poll for times during those weeks.

**Other Items:**  None