

The 2022 National Water Use Data Workshop Summary Report

October 31, 2022

Salt Lake City, Utah August 16-18, 2022

Compiled by: Adel Abdallah, Ryan James, and Tony Willardson Western States Water Council

How to cite the report: Abdallah, A., T. Willardson, R. James (2022). The 2022 National Water Use Data Workshop Summary Report, HydroShare, <u>https://doi.org/10.4211/hs.61025a06d0644d1abf407dc97394d664</u>









The 2022 National Water Use Data Workshop Summary Report

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Welcoming Remarks - U.S. Rep. Melanie Stansbury	4
Workshop Co-Sponsor Remarks	5
Future Vision	7
Water-Use Data and Research Grants - Lessons-Learned	7
Federal Water Use Data Collection and Modeling Efforts	8
Software Tools to Share, Visualize, Query, and Download Water Use Data	9
State Water Use Data Collection, Reporting and Sharing Alaska California Colorado Indiana Kansas Missouri Nebraska New Jersey New Mexico Oklahoma Oregon Texas Utah Virginia Washington Wyoming	10 10 10 11 11 11 12 12 13 13 13 13 14 14 15 15
Regional Water Use Data Collection, Reporting and Sharing Delaware River Basin Great Lakes Basin Potomac River Basin Susquehanna River Basin Commission	15 15 15 16 16
Breakout Sessions Summary Questions Take Aways	17 17 17
Post Workshop Survey Results	19
Agenda	28
Attendee List	33

The 2022 National Water Use Data Workshop Summary Report

Salt Lake City, UT August 16-18, 2022

Adel Abdallah, Ryan James, Tony Willardson Western States Water Council

Introduction

On August 16-18, 2022, the Western States Water Council (WSWC), in cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Interstate Council on Water Policy (ICWP), and Internet of Water Coalition (IoW Coalition), held a National Water Use Data Workshop, in Salt Lake City, Utah. This report summarizes the workshop, the key takeaways from breakout sessions, and the postworkshop survey results. The report also includes the agenda and attendee list.

Water use measurements, estimates, and reporting are important to water supply planning, drought response planning, mitigation, water project construction and operations, water policy, and water rights administration. Yet, States and USGS face challenges in estimating and reporting water use to make informed decisions.

The goal of the workshop was to: (1) provide a platform for state agencies' staff to learn from each other about the latest efforts related to water data management and sharing; (2) engage state information technology (I.T.) and water resources management staff with the USGS Water Mission Area staff (including the Water-Use Data and Research program- WUDR) and the WSWC Water Data Exchange (WaDE) Programs; (3) exchange the latest developments on water use data sharing methods and how States can benefit from them; and (4) identify challenges related to states' data sharing efforts and consider potential solutions.

Overall, the workshop drew some 100 participants, roughly half in-person and half virtually, from 32 states (Figure 1), representing 67 states, federal, private sector, non-profit, academic agencies, and organizations.

Thirty speakers covered topics of (1) programs and initiatives related to improving data collection, sharing, and access to water use data (2) data collection methods and models estimating and reporting surface and groundwater use for all categories of water use, such as agriculture, public supply, and thermoelectric and reporting; and (3) software tools to share, visualize, query, and download water use data. All workshop materials, including this report, are available online at https://westernstateswater.org/events/2022-national-water-use-data-workshop/



Figure 1: The distribution of workshop participants across the U.S.

Welcoming Remarks – U.S. Rep. Melanie Stansbury

U.S. Rep. Melanie Stansbury (N.M.) kicked off the workshop with a pre-recorded video welcoming everyone and highlighting the Water Data Act she introduced in the House of Representatives. She pointed to the important role of the participants in helping our communities better understand and manage our water resources, especially through the power of data through stakeholder partnerships. She has dedicated her career to working on water resources issues as a researcher and educator, working in the White House Office of Management and Budget, as staff to the U.S. Senate Committee on Natural Resources, in the New Mexico State Legislature, and now in the Congress. She emphasized that managing water resources sustainably into the future will require bringing stakeholders together, ensuring that everyone has a seat at the table, and ensuring people can access data and science.

Rep. Stansbury was proud to recently introduce the bipartisan Water Data Act, with the Western States Water Council's review and support playing an integral role. She thanked the attendees for all their feedback and support. The bill was not only introduced but also passed in the House just two weeks prior to the National Water Use Workshop. This bill is designed to unlock the power of big data to empower our communities to control their own water future and ensure that our water managers, ranchers, farmers, and communities have the tools and resources that they need to use data in real-time and manage water sustainably, especially as we're facing drought and unprecedented change. The bill was passed as part of the comprehensive Wildfire Response and Drought Resiliency Act, including the Rio Grande Water Security Act.

Rep. Stansbury shared her excitement that this bill aligns directly with so much of the critical work that the States are doing all across the West. The bill creates a comprehensive national framework to help address water data challenges at the national level in partnership with the state, tribal, federal, and local entities, as well as the non-profit and private sectors. She summarized that reliable and comprehensive data is crucial to tackling the biggest water challenges and that different stakeholders coming together, leveraging the power of data, will contribute to innovation that will help bring transformational change on the ground in how we manage water going forward. She asked for help to get this bill across the finish line in the Senate. Finally, Rep. Stansbury thanked the participants as the policy, technical experts, scientists, and researchers who make it possible every day for her to do this work in Congress.

Workshop Co-Sponsor Remarks

Tony Willardson, WSWC Executive Director, welcomed everyone and thanked Rep. Stansbury for her support as a champion for water data to help provide the resources for workshop participants to achieve some of the things they are working on. Tony also noted his appreciation of the hospitality of the Utah Department of Environmental Quality and the opportunity to use their boardroom and facilities for the workshop.

The WSWC was created by the Western Governors to advise them on water policy issues. He shared with the participants that earlier in the morning, he had heard Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior Tanya Trujillo call for the Lower and Upper Colorado River Basin States to reduce their water use, which is generally one of the primary reasons for the workshop. He remarked that much work had been done on the water supply side of the equation in developing water resources. The dams on the Colorado River have supplied users through the last 22 years of drought but are nearing levels that have not been seen before.

Tony recalled visiting Page, Arizona, with his father when he was eight years old and seeing the completion of Glen Canyon Dam. Lake Powell took 17 years to fill, and he hopes that 17 years into the future, it will be full again. He said that we have no control over the water supply (rain and snow), which leaves us only with control over water use and demand management. When the water supply is not there, water users are going to have to reduce their demands.

He suggested that there is a need to identify the ramifications of demand reductions and water use choices in many areas of the country, as they face challenges related to water for environmental uses, energy demands, and growing population needs. Tony also suggested water managers need to provide policymakers from the governor level down to the individual farmer with more information to make water use decisions.

Tony shared a historical overview of the WSWC Water Data Exchange (WaDE) Program over the last ten years. WaDE began with stimulus funding in 2009 through the Department of Energy, Sandia National Labs, and the Western Governors Association. At the time, the interest was in water needs related to hydroelectric power generation and transmission. The governors were interested and asked WSWC to look at the impacts on water use from energy development.

In 2004, the WSWC had asked its members, the 17 Reclamation States and Alaska, to share estimated water demands and whether the States had the supply to meet demand projections to 2030; if not, anticipated measures to close the gap. The survey uncovered that such information was not readily available or managed in a centralized system, and the long-range regional demand projections were hard to estimate due to a lack of data.

Finally, Tony introduced the co-hosts of the meeting: Mindi Dalton, USGS Coordinator, Water Availability and Use Science Program (WAUSP) and the National Water Quality Program (NWQP); Peter Colohan, IOW Executive Director, Center for Geospatial Solutions at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy; and Beth Callaway, Executive Director, Interstate Council on Water Policy (ICWP).

Mindi welcomed the participants and noted that USGS has recently kicked off a new strategic way of handling water use since the Water Use Data and Research (WUDR) stakeholder meetings, one of which was held in 2015 in Salt Lake City, Utah. One of the messages that came through loud and clear was a desire for people across the water-use community to get together much more frequently to talk to each other about the work that they are doing regarding water use at the state and regional levels. Mindi said that WUDR has a monthly open forum virtual meeting, but there is nothing like getting together in person to have these conversations. She noted the last meeting was in 2019 in Fort Collins, and the USGS is looking forward to continuing to support meeting every couple of years to help strengthen the water use community.

Mindi reiterated that USGS National water-use data collection efforts rely on what happens at the state and local levels. Therefore, the USGS must leverage data from the states and help support the development of new data sources through avenues like WUDR, which is really beneficial. Mindi shared her excitement to learn more about what is happening at the state level.

Peter Colohan was the Executive Director of the Internet of Water startup project at Duke University for three years. The goal of the IoW is to assist both federal agencies and state agencies in the modernization and digital transformation of water data so that we all share, exchange, and integrate that data more easily and arrive at more careful conclusions. Another goal is to foster the core technologies needed to modernize water data sharing in partnership with the federal government. Peter reiterated that a third goal is to foster their relationship with states so they can assist them and provide the tools and information to help improve the work that they are doing. He described the startup experience as addressing the need to bring technology and people together.

The successful IoW startup attracted additional philanthropic funding that allowed them to expand and create a new initiative at the Center for Geospatial Solutions at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Kyle Onda is the IoW Associate Director. The Lincoln Institute is an operating foundation based in Boston, where they recently set up a new Center for Geospatial Solutions, which is focused on providing geospatial data for conservation, land management, and water resources management. The main purpose of the IoW Initiative at the Lincoln Institute is to sustain the development of IoW technology in support of public agencies

Peter is also now the Chair of the Internet of Water Coalition, formed in March 2022 from five organizations: Duke, the Lincoln Institute, the Western States Water Council, the Water Data Collaborative, which is a community science group, and the Consortium of Universities for the Advancement of Hydrologic Science, Inc. (CUAHSI). The IoW Coalition has grown to a group of about 20 non-profits and other entities, represented by individuals, that collectively act across jurisdictions in the public and private sectors. The IoW Coalition represents the philanthropic, public, private, and non-profit sectors working on getting society to a place where data are more modernized and easily shared.

Peter mentioned that the IoW Coalition is now partnering with federal agencies, including with Department of Energy, through Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The Coalition is also working with federal partners at the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and USGS and is collaborating with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). USGS is supporting the development of the Geoconnex software, which allows connecting data at the state level and across jurisdictions with

federal agencies. He also mentioned that the IoW is building a HubKit as a suite of open-source water data management tool. Peter concluded by sharing that he worked for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for about 20 years, and he knows how hard it is to change and modernize public agency datasets. The IoW is trying to help states create pathways so they do not necessarily have to wait for that change, though internal change is still needed.

Beth Callaway, ICWP Executive Director, welcomed everyone. ICWP is a national non-profit that represents interstate government agencies that work on water policy issues. ICWP also includes others interested in water law or policy issues, including industry, academia, and anyone who has a vested interest in learning and sharing information about interstate water policy issues. Beth noted that she took the job about three months ago. She worked before at the Wyoming State Engineer's Office and lately at the Office of the Wyoming Governor. ICWP is happy to help co-sponsor this workshop. She emphasized that the workshop's primary goal is to bring states together to share their water use data approaches, information, and findings, which is one of ICWP's core values.

Future Vision

Jaime Painter, USGS Water Use Program Manager, presented the Next-Gen Water Use Information. She stated that the USGS Water Mission Area (WMA) science priorities are grounded in the SECURE Water Act and a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report. She reported their goal is to develop an operational system for estimating and forecasting water use and water transfers nationally in collaboration with water users. She concluded by addressing the near and longer-term delivery of water use information at different specific geospatial and temporal resolutions.

Adel Abdallah, WSWC WaDE Program Manager, observed the unique contributions WaDE provides are standardized access to water rights and water use data for eighteen western states. WaDE's architecture is now in a "cloud" environment. WaDE's Data Analyst Ryan James maps and imports states' public data into WaDE, using a consistent data structure and terminology.

Adel emphasized the user-centered design that led to the upcoming release of the Western States Water Data Access and Analysis Tool (WestDAAT). WestDAAT's first phase will provide a wide range of filters to query and analyze over 1.6 million water rights across WSWC member states. He demonstrated possible applications of WestDAAT, which will eventually support accessing historic site-specific and aggregate water use data and streamgage and reservoir data collected by states. He concluded by suggesting that other states can participate in WaDE by making their data publicly available in a tabular format and by following the WaDE data reporting and data dictionary protocols developed in cooperation with USGS.

Water-Use Data and Research Grants – Lessons-Learned

Erik Smith, USGS WUDR Program Coordinator, led a discussion on the perceived or real obstacles to getting WUDR grants and ideas for regional grant strategies. He summarized the WUDR goals: first, improve the availability, quality, compatibility, and delivery of water use data that are collected and/or estimated by states to support the National Water-Use Assessments; and second, to integrate state water resource agency water-use or water-availability datasets into USGS databases. Erik summarized the history of WUDR, which states, and the types of projects that

received funding. Erik used a polling service called menti.com to facilitate answering questions for both remote and in-person participants.

Federal Water Use Data Collection and Modeling Efforts

Cheryl Dieter, USGS, shared a perspective on water use data availability and useability throughout the country. USGS is developing tools to improve these data. She noted that the two largest water uses across the country are thermoelectric power generation in the East and irrigation in the West. She stated that the most useful water use data for the USGS modeling efforts include daily, site-specific facility and systems data by water source with the timing, location, and quantity of water used, emphasizing the metadata. She also highlighted the need to understand and fill in data gaps, identify outliers (anomalies), and understand reporting differences.

In the last two years, USGS has incorporated more than 13,000 water-use sites and 14 million monthly and annual water quantity data values for 20 states into their USGS water-use database. Cheryl outlined issues that affect the usability of water use data, including (1) spatial variability; (2) relating water withdrawals to places of use; (3) data latency; (4) censored data; (5) limited time-data collection periods; (6) inconsistent or non-unique site names; (7) erroneous data values and outliers; and (7) aggregated values versus site-specific and permit specific data. She concluded with how others can collaborate with the USGS on improving their water use data.

Richard Niswonger presented the national water use models which are under development. He focused on the public supply and irrigation modeling activities at USGS. He first talked about a 20-year reanalysis effort for estimating irrigation water use and irrigation withdrawals. He also talked about the modeling of effective precipitation in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Rich then talked about water application and the total crop consumption for irrigated lands. He also talked about public supply water use and a machine learning model for water use to predict patterns in use. One conclusion he showed was that the national per-capita public supply water use had declined over the past 20 years. He concluded by talking about uncertainty in the quantification of per capita water use.

Forrest Melton, National Atmospheric and Space Administration (NASA) Western Water Applications Office (WWAO), provided an update on the Open Evapotranspiration (OpenET) initiative in Utah, California, and an Oregon pilot study. He described the value of OpenET data and how the project was founded on open science and well-established methods with an ensemble modeling approach. Forrest talked about OpenET use cases and partnerships to help rural communities, water managers, policymakers, and farmers. He focused on a recent collaboration with the California Department of Water Resources, the Colorado River Authority of Utah, and federal partnerships with USGS and Reclamation. WWAO supports OpenET activities in other areas, such as the Columbia River Bain and the Idaho Department of Water Resources. He discussed the accuracy of the OpenET approach through an intercomparison and accuracy assessment study. OpenET project's next steps include releasing their Application Programming Interface (API) in late 2022.

Finally, Forrest reflected on lessons learned and best practices. He suggested looking for win-win solutions that address the concerns of stakeholders, as open science and open data are not free. He concluded by giving credit to OpenET partners and their role in the project's success.

James Prairie, the Bureau of Reclamation, joined virtually and gave an overview of how water use reporting is occurring in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Water use reports come out in 5-year

increments. He outlined a long-term collection method at a HUC-8 level and demonstrated the Colorado River Simulation System model used for longer-term planning. It is used with the Natural Flow Records data set, which is an estimate of what flow would be with no human interaction. He outlined the eight major categories of use tracked, with irrigated agriculture the largest at 63.4%, followed by out-of-basin exports at 16.5%.

James talked about struggling with irrigated agriculture water use estimates that rely on older techniques (modified Blaney-Criddle crop E.T.). Acreage estimates come from state statistics and census data, which is not always accurate, and recent work is intended to improve estimates. Working with the Upper Colorado River Commission, Reclamation is starting to use the eeMETRIC remote sensing model for estimates of ET. Reclamation is also revisiting acreage estimates with a Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) approach. Lastly, he outlined efforts to improve other lower-priority water use reporting (exports, municipal and industrial use, etc.).

Software Tools to Share, Visualize, Query, and Download Water Use Data

Kyle Onda, Internet of Water Coalition, Center for Geospatial Solutions at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, provided an update on the Internet of Water Coalition and Geoconnex project using a New Mexico Pilot Study. He talked about the difficulty of searching for water data on the web. The Geoconnex project is a system for connecting water data from different data providers via geographic location. He demonstrated that using the Network Linked Data Index (NLDI) as part of Geoconnex allows users to query water diversion sites organized by WaDE and monitor locations as provided by USGS gages upstream of a location in the Pecos River Bain in New Mexico. Each water feature has an individual landing page with a persistent identifier providing consistent access across platforms. Kyle concluded by providing instructions on how data providers can participate and contribute to the Geoconnex project.

James Schneider from Olsson, a private firm, and Kathleen Elmquist, from Environmental Science Associates Sitka talked about "Real-time Groundwater Management with Big Data and the Internet of Things - Examples from the Twin Platte Natural Resources District Water Data Program (TPNRD)." Jim described the TPNRD outreach campaign and how they used Paige Wireless service and bandwidth to affordably communicate measurements of water use, using energy use as a proxy measure. Kathleen explained the next steps, learning from the collected data, to (1) integrate more sophisticated, automated analysis tools such as the Groundwater Evaluation Toolbox; (2) work with subject matter experts to define and build data visualizations such as tempetations, maps, and charts; and (3) continue to perform analysis using new data sources such as remotely sensed water usage and precipitation. She concluded by talking about their effort to build a family of open, shared software technologies.

State Water Use Data Collection, Reporting, and Sharing

Alaska

Kevin Petrone, Alaska Department of Natural Resources, addressed (virtually), for possibly the first time at a national level, how water use is reported in Alaska. Kevin gave a brief comparison of Alaska and the Lower-48 states, with Alaska accounting for about one-fourth of the nation's land and precipitation, 7% of the evapotranspiration, about 80% of the surface water runoff, and 2% of total fresh water. He noted that there is an abundance of water flowing into the ocean, with precipitation greatest on the southeast and southcentral coast.

Kevin provided an overview of a WUDR grant program and a 2011-2015 water use report for Alaska. Hydroelectric water use is 90% of total use, followed by public supply and mining. Kevin went over how data flows into the Alaska Water Use Data System (AKWUDS), which was updated to include water user metadata, permitted rate, reporting interval/submittal frequency, and water source type. Data are user reported with an online form. Kevin finished by describing a case study on water use and availability during a recent drought.

California

Tara Moran's presentation was entitled "Advancing Urban Water Use Data Sharing and Reporting." She is with the California Water Data Consortium (Consortium), a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation formed in 2019 to help state agencies implement California's Open and Transparent Water Data Act (Act). First, Tara quoted an excerpt from the 2016 Act, which mandated that California agencies work together to make water and ecological data publicly available on open-access data platforms. The implementing agencies supported the creation of the Consortium to facilitate the non-state partnership. It has a board of directors and steering committee comprised of state agency representatives and non-state agency partners. California is facing ongoing and unprecedented water supply challenges related to climate change, population growth, and other stressors.

The Consortium is focused on urban water data reporting in partnership with the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) and the State Water Resources Control Board (Board). The Consortium is aligning urban water supply and use data to reduce reporting burdens, expand access to more timely data, and improve data use. Tara listed critical urban water policy questions and the project's approach to improving the understanding of several factors, such as state legal and regulatory requirements. She mentioned an urban water reporting workshop that was held recently in Sacramento and its recommendations. She concluded with the Consortium's next steps to meet its goals, including pursuing grants and other funding opportunities.

Colorado

Brian Macpherson, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB), presented "How Colorado's Decision Support System (CDSS) Hosts and Shares Water Data." He acknowledged that water use data for decision-making in Colorado is a joint effort between CWCB and the Colorado Division of Water Resources (DWR). Approximately 120 DWR water commissioners gather data and administer rights to the use of Colorado's rivers, streams, and groundwater. Brian talked about the CDSS history and then shared how the online tools query and visualize the State's water use data. He also described the input and output to and from their statewide water allocation model. Brian also explained how their HydroBase REST Web Services works to query the State's water data.

Indiana

Mark Basch, Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IN-DNR), Division of Water, explained "Indiana's Water Use Registration and Reporting Program." He provided a brief overview of Indiana's Significant Water Withdrawal Facility (SWWF) registration and water use reporting program. The Indiana Water Resources Management Act (Indiana Code 14-25-7), enacted in 1983, required registration of all SWWFs (both groundwater and surface water) defined as facilities with the capacity to use greater than 100,000 gallons per day (gpd). Approximately 4,270 SWWFs are currently registered. The 2021 state totals across SWWFs show that total annual withdrawals have declined significantly since 1985. Mark presented a new online tool to submit annual water use data for Indiana. With funding from the Indiana Geological and Water Survey (IGWS), they have identified potential unregistered SWWF sites. He concluded by talking about IN-DNR's approach and the next steps in estimating water use from these unregistered sites.

Kansas

David Engelhaupt and Andy Terhune from the Kansas Department of Agriculture gave a high-level overview of water use reporting in Kansas. The Kansas Water Appropriation Act of 1945 states that all water is dedicated to the use of the people of the State. Each year, Kansas sends out about 16,000 water use report forms to about 32,500 active water-right users, with the largest use being irrigation. There are penalties in the form of fines and suspensions for failure to report. The collected data is maintained in the Water Right Information System (WRIS), a restricted-access database. Kansas has recently implemented online form submission, which has resulted in a significant increase in compliance. They briefly discussed how the water use data could be accessed through the Water Information and Analysis System (WIMAS), an online database that is updated weekly with WRIS data and can be queried by the public. David and Andy finished by speaking about possible future WUDR grant projects to improve and modernize WRIS and streamline data collection

Missouri

Trevor Ellis, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, addressed "Missouri Water Use: A People-Centered Science." First, he described Missouri's groundwater resources across the Ozark plateau, Mississippi alluvial plain, and the central lowlands. Missouri has abundant groundwater in the South but limited groundwater in the North. He provided a water use breakdown across Missouri's counties, and categories of water use then talked about Missouri's water rights system, which is riparian.

Trevor talked about the Missouri Water Use Reporting System (WatURS) updates and concluded by summarizing their outreach efforts to help improve water use reporting. Water use is not regulated or permitted in Missouri, but it must be reported the following year. A lack of enforcement leads to varying compliance. He suggested a need to renew their purpose and goals and change their mindset, developing relationships and working with partners to promote water use reporting.

Nebraska

Jennifer Schellpeper, Nebraska Department of Natural Resources, described the history and future plans for water use data acquisition and sharing in Nebraska. Water use data gathering is built upon seven different models across the State, unique to each area. Data is shared via their Integrated Network of Scientific Information and Geohydrologic Tool (INSIGHT). Water supply and water demand data are shared. She described what they have done with WUDR awards. A 2016 effort made improvements to their database with a focus on their non-irrigated uses of water. She listed

a few products, including a template database structure for each water-use type, a process document for the compilation of the data, and a Lower Platte coalition reporting database.

New Jersey

Kent Barr, a research scientist at the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, shared that New Jersey does not deal with water rights, but does have water regulations. He described the State's water use database, the New Jersey Water Transfer Database (NJWaTr). The conveyance-based model represents water exchange activity between two sites, records transactions between sites, and creates a conveyance for a water network. The two primary conveyance network structures used are: (1) a basic one-way structure for withdrawal-to-discharge point for commercial, industrial, agricultural, or power water uses; and (2) a more complex interconnected structure used for potable water supply and wastewater.

Kent outlined some key points related to their data covering 53,000 withdrawal points and use areas and 32,000 one-way conveniences. Currently, there are 5.5 million monthly transfer records in their database from 1990-2020. The majority of water use in New Jersey is metered, but there are some exceptions where data must be estimated (agricultural withdrawals for irrigation and private domestic well use). He explained the New Jersey Water Supply Plan is the guiding document for NJDEP in its water supply planning and currently suggests the accuracy of agricultural data be examined. A 2019 WUDR grant has been used to try and address this directive by comparing metered irrigation data to the reported (estimated) use. A similar project is being conducted by USGS that looks at private domestic well use. Kent concluded by demonstrating how these data are being shared online and are available to download for aggregated municipal or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC 14) levels, with story maps and directions for how users can see these results.

New Mexico

Stacy Timmons, New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources, addressed the "New Mexico Water Data Initiative." New Mexico is facing numerous water challenges with a decreasing water supply due to less snowpack, less snowmelt runoff, less groundwater recharge, and more variable and extreme precipitation. Stacy talked about New Mexico's 2019 Water Data Act and how it directed state agencies to collaborate with regional and national efforts to share, integrate, and manage water data. She pointed out that current access to data requires expertise. She summarized a stakeholder engagement study that identified New Mexico water data needs. Stacy noted two paths for data sharing and access through a data catalog and a federated data model. She acknowledged the reality that water use data can be challenging to collect and then talked about successful outcomes using modern data. Stacy concluded by reiterating the State's current focus on integration and data connection and credited their collaborators and supporters.

Julie Valdez, New Mexico Office of the State Engineer, spoke virtually and gave a high-level overview of how water use data was gathered for the New Mexico Water Use By Categories 2015 Report. Irrigated agriculture is the largest use at 76.3%, followed by public water supply at 9.1%. Withdrawal data is gathered in multiple ways (e.g., metered, surveyed, and estimated). Due to data gaps, they use population data to help estimate water use in certain areas.

Julie summarized the challenges related to gathering data, including low compliance regarding the submittal of meter readings as required by permit conditions. Only 20% of water right permittees submit meter data, which is uploaded into a database, or paper reports are stored at different district offices. There are issues with water use estimates due to the population estimate difference between the U.S. Census and local county reports. Also, the majority of surface water and groundwater diversions for irrigated agriculture are generally not gaged or metered, therefore water

use is computed utilizing cropping pattern data. Accurate cropping pattern and irrigated acreage data are difficult to obtain. New Mexico has worked to improve its water use data collection. All new meters must include a meter reading tag, which helps track information with online reporting forms. Public Water Supply service area boundaries were created to improve census population data estimates. Lastly, an aerial imagery program was started to help identify irrigated and potentially irrigated croplands and to fill in missing cropping patterns data. Water use data reports are publicly available online.

Oklahoma

Jason Tutkowski, Oklahoma Water Resources Board, outlined water use reporting. He explained groundwater permitting for defined beneficial uses. Domestic use is exempt, including water used from an individual or family household well. Farm and domestic animals may use up to normal grazing capacities. Water use reporting is only required for long-term permits. Reporting is the best estimation with paper submissions only. There is no metered data. There are late fee penalties. Reports are delivered by mail and uploaded by hand into a database. Data is used to generate water use maps and reports.

Oklahoma received a 2018 WUDR grant to update its Water Use Information System, including adding monthly data and improving QA/QC warnings. USGS principal aquifer and HUC8 aggregated data are included. Dam identifications were added to track water storage. The challenges they face include issues with Oklahoma staff accessing the data, the small staff, the age and complexity of the database, and domestic use assumptions. Jason ended by describing future plans for increasing the penalty for late submissions, a better water use questionnaire and intent-to-drill database, as well as moving to an online water use reporting system.

Oregon

Jordan Beamer, Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD), presented on satellite-based evapotranspiration (E.T.) and updating Oregon's consumptive use data. Oregon has limited records of irrigation water use, although irrigated agriculture is the largest user of water in the State. Updated and accurate comprehensive water use datasets are needed for all users, with estimates of actual E.T. and potential E.T. from irrigated fields. This data is used for: (1) groundwater basin studies, (2) water availability analyses; (3) place-based planning and water development projects; and (4) water rights administration. He said that current estimates and approaches lack data and data quality. Oregon needs time series data for actual E.T. for every irrigated field in the State. He pointed out that recent federal and State funding has allowed OWRD to establish a statewide E.T. estimate program. Jordan talked about a five-step approach to (1) develop mapped agricultural fields; (2) identify irrigation source type; (3) assign whether a field was irrigated; (4) calculate E.T. and Net E.T. by field using OpenET; and (5) estimate field and HUC-12 ET summaries for 2016-2021. Jordan concluded by talking about the Columbia River E.T. Mapping Tool and its timeline and next steps.

Texas

Taylor Christian, Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), described the "Building of the Texas Water Data Hub." The project started in 2017 with the Aspen Institute Dialogue Series on Water Data. In 2018, TWDB hosted a workshop for the Texas water data community, followed in 2019 with further communication, outreach, and preparations. In 2020, the project began with a focus on Human Centered Design (HCD). She also talked about the process used to create an intuitive system to index, document, search, and access Texas water data.

Taylor summarized the findings of their initial HCD interactions, observing, "Data access is dependent on who you know." Successful data sharing depends on trust between producers and users. She suggested that Texas water data is fragmented and locked away, making it difficult to understand, value, and use. She concluded by listing the goals of the Texas Data Hub, which are: (1) provide a central location for data that reflects the entire landscape; (2) establish automatic and easy ways to share data and updates; (3) provide intuitive methods to efficiently search and download data; (4) emphasize clear communication and documentation to build trust and understanding; and (5) assist data interoperability efforts through standards and curated datasets.

Utah

Aaron Austin, Utah Division of Water Resources (DWRe), demonstrated "Utah's Open Water Data Website." Utah's interest in improving water use estimates and data sharing was motivated by a Utah State Legislature Performance Audit in 2015. Aaron explained the role of different state agencies in reporting and sharing water use data. He introduced the website, data offerings, and tools that support data queries, visualizations, and download capabilities. The water use information is reported online to the Utah Division of Water Rights (DWRi), within the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), which solicits feedback from DWRe, which flags potential errors, before water use data is validated.

The Division of Drinking Water within the Department of Environmental Quality is also working with DNR in a cooperative effort to obtain and update water supplier boundaries. DWRi collects annual water use data from public water supply systems, industrial users, and large private water users. This data is used for several state financial assistance programs, the preparation of basin water plans, and an assessment of water supply and water use in the state. Population and estimated gallons per capita per day (GPCD) are used to consolidate residential indoor and outdoor use, as well as use by parks, government buildings, schools, businesses, offices, and churches. For more detail and interactive web mapping applications, Aaron pointed to <u>water.utah.gov/opendata</u>.

Virginia

Ryan Green, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, presented "Virginia's Approach to Addressing Water Use Data Gaps." Since 1982, Virginia has required annual withdrawal water use reporting. Water use data is used for permit evaluations, water budgets, modeling, and water supply availability planning, in addition to other uses. Ryan talked about their work in addressing gaps in water use data to inform data-driven decision-making.

He noted that previous analysis indicates a potential for substantial unreported water use for agriculture in some localities, and with limited staff resources, Virginia is working to register farms and improve the consistency of water use data. With an increasing trend towards smaller farms, more and more fall under the reporting threshold. Agricultural water use is a significant proportion of total water use in some basins, which increases during drought and is largely consumptive.

Given limited resources for registering agricultural users for reporting, Virginia developed a 2020-2021 WUDR grant project, "Quantifying Unreported Water Use for Crop Irrigation in Virginia." Using U.S. Department of Agriculture data from an agricultural census that provides irrigated acres per farm with crop type and inches irrigated from USDA's Irrigation and Water Management Survey, the team developed unreported withdrawal estimates. Farms irrigating less than 10 acres were presumed to be below the reporting threshold. For larger farms, they took the estimated acreage, crop need, and PRISM precipitation data (deficit method) to estimate withdrawals. The results were highly variable, with estimates in some counties ten times the reported data. Lastly, he also talked about their approach to refining Virginia's cumulative impact analysis of surface water resources by developing better estimates of consumptive use for facilities withdrawing water. This approach uses matched discharge and withdrawal data in combination with literature estimates and other techniques to quantify consumptive use across use types.

Washington

Andrea Lauden, Washington State Department of Ecology, gave an overview of metering programs and water use. The largest use is agriculture at 59%, followed by public supply at 20%. Washington uses a prior appropriation water right system that is managed through a decentralized regional system. Water use data comes from metering programs. Under the Water Resources Act, a metered database was rolled out in 2009. Data is user submitted, and there is a quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) tool to help validate the data. Water use is linked to the water rights database. However, metered data is collected for less than 1% of users (only where it is required). She outlined challenges they face with self-reported data, as there is limited quality assurance, meter data collection is costly to scale up, and there is a lack of public access to data. The plan for the future is to improve the existing meter program and explore methods of water use estimation.

Wyoming

Melinda Fegler, Wyoming State Engineer's Office, talked about the growing need for water use data to be available in real-time for water users to best operate efficiently. While Wyoming takes an interest in data sharing for science and further interest in the incredible innovation that continues at a rapid rate because of science, it is important for the State to consider which set of tools will work best for Wyoming water users before committing resources. The major challenges Wyoming faces with building an appropriate tool for Wyoming are protecting water use permit information, acquiring program funding and time for staff to commit to acquiring resources necessary to implement projects. Most of the state's current water use data is shared through SEO FLOW, an Aquarius Search Engine Optimization that currently has site information for 2012 to the present. SEO FLOW is beneficial to water users familiar with the platform. Wyoming, in partnership with the Bear River Commission, also uses a MetriDyne Application Programming Interface (API) for Bear River Basin. Local water users highly accept this platform because of the capability to share local water use visually through real-time data for diversion rates, current stream flows, and relative reservoir elevations while offering automated, open data acquisition for data inquiry from any party.

Regional Water Use Data Collection, Reporting, and Sharing

Delaware River Basin

Michael Thompson, Delaware River Basin Commission (DCRB), addressed "Water Withdrawal and Consumptive Use Estimate for the Delaware River Basin (1990-2017) With Projections Through 2060." The Delaware River Basin drainage spans parts of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. There are no mainstem dams, but major exports to New York City and New Jersey under the 1954 Supreme Court Decree. The river provides drinking water for some 13.3 million people. The DCRB was formed in 1961, with five commissioners representing each of the States and a federal representative.

DCRB regulates withdrawals of greater than 100,000 GDP. DCRB gathers and "normalizes" state data into an integrated database from 1.6 million withdrawal points with metadata that includes

latitude and longitude, system categories, groundwater or surface water sources, interconnections, and transfers, as well as regulatory approvals. A DCRB project review section continually updates the list of actively approved withdrawals. Data is categorized by sectors that cover public water supply, power generation, industrial, mining, irrigation, and out-of-basin diversions. The latter include diversions from three New York City reservoirs and one diversion in New Jersey.

Great Lakes Basin

James Polidori, Great Lakes Commission (GLC), talked about the history and formation of the Great Lakes Regional Water Use Database. This is a bi-national effort to coordinate reported water use in the Great Lakes Basin between the United States and Canada. He gave a brief description of the water policy questions that led to the formation of the database, which started in 1987, and covered reporting protocols that were revised in 2009 and fully implemented in 2012. These called for accurate and comparable data acquisition to abide by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Sustainable Water Resources Agreement and the legally binding Great lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact. He went over the collection procedure for data, which are self-reported water users reports on monthly withdrawals, consumptive uses, and diversions submitted via paper or online forms. Users with the capacity to withdraw over 100,000 gallons per day on average over 30 days are required to report. Data includes the jurisdiction, the watershed, the use sector, the water source type, and the measurement method used. This data is publicly available online. The GLC also releases annual water use reports.

Potomac River Basin

Stephanie Nummer-Fantozz, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin (ICPRB), participated virtually and reported on their water use and withdrawals database. She gave a quick history and covered key points related to the Potomac River Basin. The Commission was created in 1940 to manage water resources in the Basin, which is a mix of tidal lands and water from the Atlantic Ocean (roughly 8,045 km²) and non-tidal lands (29,950 km²). The predominant land use is forests, followed by irrigation. Stephanie outlined the challenges of managing five different jurisdictions and datasets.

Stephanie noted two 2015 studies were used for early versions of the database: (1) Ducnuigeen et al. 2015 Geospatial Analytics Tool for Estimating Watershed-Scale Consumptive Use -- Potomac River Basin study; and (2) Ahmed et al. 2015 Washington Metropolitan Area (WMA) Supply Study – Demand and Resource Availability Forecast for the Year 2040.

In 2018, ICPRB released the Potomac River Basin Comprehensive Water Resources Plan, which identified four challenge areas with 14 recommended actions. The goal was to ensure sustainable water use and supplies basin-wide, addressing water uses, projected demands, and consumptive demands. This led to the more modern database, which includes 2015-2019, 2020, and quality control measures to ensure all available data.

Susquehanna River Basin Commission

John Balay, Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC), gave an overview of cumulative water use and availability study. The Commission is comprised of representatives from Maryland, New York, and Pennsylvania, with a federal representative [currently the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers North Atlantic Division Commander]. The study looked at cumulative water use to determine water capacity, sustainability, and availability basin-wide for future planning and regulatory decision-

making. Data includes permitted and daily quantities reported at the HUC10 basin level, as well as consumptive use, surface water withdrawals, and groundwater withdrawals. Integrating all the data together is challenging as each member state reports data in different increments (annual, monthly, weekly), and SRBC checks for double-counting records between agencies that share boundaries. He finished describing a hydrologic analyses report to define new water capacity estimates and create new water availability estimates. These results are available online with a GIS-based assessment tool and web map.

Breakout Sessions Summary

The workshop included two breakout sessions with five series of questions for the participants to address. The questions are listed below with a bullet-point summary of the key takeaways. The first session was on Wednesday, August 17, 2022, and was composed of four groups that discussed the first two series of questions. The second session was on Thursday, August 18, 2022, with three groups of four-to-six that discussed the remaining three questions.

Questions

- 1. What are ways your state has improved its capability to share water data such as tools/databases/APIs or others?
- 2. What can we do to improve data sharing or make it easier? What hinders states from sharing data? How can we encourage data sharing?
- 3. What data-related assessments (QA/QC) do you use, such as identification of gaps, ways/tools for evaluating data, analysis to identify outliers, or overcoming data latency issues? What are the challenges in getting the data you need to meet your water rights regulatory needs, water planning, and other obligations? Do you have adequate information/data on surface/groundwater uses to make more informed decisions? If not, do you have plans for a solution to those challenges? What data are missing now?
- 4. What are your state's water use reporting systems, and are there gaps in technical support, and methods? What future updates/plans for data collaboration, models, and data services do you have? If water use data are reported voluntarily by water users, does your agency provide guidelines for reporting?
- 5. What can WaDE (WSWC), WUDR (USGS), ICWP, and IoW do to help your state meet its challenges?

Key Takeaways

- States have improved their data collection, management, visualization, and sharing process over time, and the Water-Use Data and Research (WUDR) grants were a great help.
- Staffing, budget limitations, or the lack of legal requirements to report water use are all major challenges to improving the quality of water use data.

- Structural limitations such as legislation or laws that mandate specific water use data collection
 or sharing remain the key factors restricting the collection and processing of water use data in
 each State. Reporting and contrasting such differences and capabilities across each state could
 help benchmark and compare states' progress over time.
- Staffing limitations, training, and turnover remain significant challenges that affect water use reporting. It is not easy to find water resource professionals who also understand I.T. and vice versa. Hiring contractors on a year-by-year basis is often limited to specific short-term projects and grants. Water data-sharing priorities are affected when a state moves toward a central I.T. system.
- There was a consensus that more states would apply for WUDR grants, but current restrictions on applicants and caps on total funds available to each state, in addition to other issues, are a hindrance to some states applying for WUDR awards. Allowing any state agency to apply for grants and removing the \$250,000 total limit per state would make a difference. Such changes would require congressional approval, and the states would appreciate WSWC and ICWP advocacy in that regard.
- The Water Data Act that was introduced by Representative Melanie Stansbury (D-NM) and passed by the House was praised with the hope it would become law and states would receive more funding to improve water data management.
- Each state has a different method of validating water use data, through Quality Assurance (Q.A.) checks before the data is entered into the database and Quality Control (Q.C.) checks after the data has been documented. Automated QA/QC procedures exist in a few states, while others plan or hope to incorporate them in the future.
- Some states, such as Colorado, are introducing mobile phone applications or digital online forms that allow water users to report their water use while they are out in the field. Others, such as Oklahoma, still have difficulty processing reported water use data because it is submitted on paper forms that need to be digitized, which is time-consuming and may introduce errors.
- Providing easy-to-follow instructions to water users was identified as a necessary and useful tool for improving water use reporting.
- Voluntary reporting can be challenging to verify.
- There was a concern that the U.S. Census is not publishing some population data due to privacy reasons, which affects the accuracy of per capita water use estimates.
- States use different reporting systems and technologies (e.g., ArcGIS, R, Python, SQL) to query, QA/QC, and visualize the data. One suggestion was to summarize the different software tools that are being used by the states as an online repository and guide for other states.
- Coordination between multiple state agencies within a single state, where each has a different role in administering water use, managing data, and conducting planning studies remains challenging in many states.
- There was a suggestion that the WSWC WaDE program may play a greater role in standardizing water use data management across the states.
- Required real-time diversion measurements or reporting is often limited to basins with compact obligations, not statewide.

- Data privacy issues with water use data were raised. It was suggested that water rights and use under the West's Prior Appropriation Doctrine are about permitting the use of the public's water, and while users have the right to divert it, this information should be public as it is in the public interest.
- Some still have questions about the value of tracking and sharing water use data. Handling data requests is time-consuming. How can the states know if people care about data sharing? Some states have metrics to track data downloads but don't know how the data is being used and what types of decisions may be informed by the data. What difference does it make?
- Facilitating long-term and transparent planning was cited as one good reason for sharing.

Note: Most of the challenges reported were also identified during a 2019 Workshop held in Fort Collins, Colorado. See https://westernstateswater.org/events/2019-wims/ page 4. Further, see: "Factors that inhibit collecting and disseminating accurate and timely water-use data. Successful data collection and sharing initiatives must overcome these barriers," TABLE 2 in this journal article: <u>Water-Use Data in the United States: Challenges and Future Directions - Marston - 2022 - JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association</u>

Post Workshop Survey Results

In a post-workshop survey distributed through email using a Google Form Survey, 43 participants provided valuable feedback about their experience and shared many insightful suggestions and comments. The overwhelming majority highly valued the workshop and indicated that they "will likely" or "very likely" participate in a future workshop in 2024. This feedback will inform the next workshop planning. The survey questions and summary answers are provided below

- How did you attend? 43 responses • Remote • In-person (at least for one day)
- 1. How did you attend?





3. Overall experience of the workshop (1 poor and 5 great)





4. How would you rate the structure of the breakout sessions (1 poor and 5 great)

5. How would you rate the structure of the breakout sessions (1 poor and 5 great)





6. Would you participate again if the workshop held in two years in 2024?

7. Would like to participate in a workshop follow up virtual forum? if yes, how often?





8. For remote participants: how do you rate the audio and visual quality of the webinar?

- 9. What did you like the most about the workshop? Was it worth the time / and travel (for inperson participants)?
 - ✓ I enjoyed hearing from a multitude of different states and entities. The breakout sessions were a great way to hear some specific concerns and successes from each participant. It was definitely worth the travel time (I had a wonderful time in SLC!)
 - ✓ That it focused exclusively on water use data and approaches employed by agencies and organizations across the country. Was definitely worth the time and travel!
 - \checkmark The variety of presentations on both Water Use and Evapotranspiration.
 - The workshop was amazing and so useful for everyone to get together. I think focusing more on the workshops and less on the presentations. I think the travel is more than justified.
 - Hearing all updates from USGS, WaDE, and the council especially learning about all the efforts USGS has been making. Also, talking to other states learning about their programs and sharing challenges.
 - \checkmark Yes, I hope that there will be another conference like this in the coming years.
 - ✓ Great presentations and perspectives from people across the US doing this important work.
 - ✓ I enjoyed the entire workshop, I got a lot out of the presentations and the breakout sessions were great for being able to connect with other attendees.
 - ✓ States' work & strategies to share data with water users. Meeting people in person is always conducive.
 - ✓ I liked connecting with other attendees and the opportunities to ask questions and learn from each other during breakout sessions and breaks. I do think that it was worth the time and travel for that reason although I wish that there had been more Covid safety precautions.

- ✓ It was great to be able to follow with folks during the breaks after their talks to learn more and connect. I think it was worth being in person. The grouping of the talks on themes were intentionally and helpful.
- I enjoyed hearing about how other state water resource agencies handle water use data.
- ✓ It was great. It was wonderful to see everyone in-person. Definitely worth traveling to.
- ✓ Variety of interesting topics
- ✓ I liked the deeper dive into the WaDE data tool.
- ✓ I enjoyed hearing what other states were doing and how they used WURD grants to get there.
- It put our work and data in perspective and gave me ideas on how to better processes. It was worth it, for sure.
- ✓ Great to hear challenges faced by other water managers in lower 48 which are similar to our challenges in Alaska
- ✓ different state perspectives on water use and water data. valuable to see federal agencies work with states to understand and fix gaps. yes, it was worth my time and travel.
- ✓ The breakouts were good to force folks from different states in a room to discuss. I got to know new people in the breakouts. Yes, it was worth the travel and time.
- \checkmark Discussion of available water products and other
- ✓ Having all water use experts in one room!
- ✓ There were a variety of talks from academic and utility stakeholders.
- ✓ Gaining knowledge of where other states are at with their process.
- ✓ Hearing different states' approaches, funding mechanisms, and mandates related to water use reporting
- ✓ The interaction with attendees. Definitely worth the time and travel.
- The content of the workshop was really interesting, and the structure made it engaging. I thought all of the speakers were excellent. Yes, it was definitely worth attending inperson.
- ✓ As someone who works for a state agency tasked with collecting water use data, it was very interesting to hear about what water use data other states are collecting, and how, and why (statutory responsibilities; funding; etc.). As someone from a state that has used up most of the available WUDR project funds, I also enjoyed getting to provide feedback to the USGS and see what obstacles other states have encountered.
- ✓ Yes, very much so. It helped with ideas on technology
- Yes, it was useful to learn about activities related to water use by other state and federal agencies
- In-person was valuable both for participation in the breakout sessions and for networking.
- The Kansas presentation about measuring groundwater pumping was worth the conference
- ✓ The field trip was informative, and the chance to visually see an example of ASR in progress made the travel worthwhile.

- 10. What was your least favorite aspect of the workshop. What would you like to see different next time?
 - ✓ Organized networking events/dinners would have been worthwhile. There was simply not enough time during the workshop to get to know everyone.
 - ✓ There were a lot of presentations packed into the first two days. It would be helpful to have a few less presentations and some more time devoted to focused discussion on challenges and opportunities for improving water use data collection, sharing, and analysis.
 - ✓ The location. Would have been nicer to be closer to downtown/walkable areas.
 - ✓ I think we are all working in water use so focusing less on how the states are reporting in presentations and figuring out more areas where we can learn from each other in breakout sessions could be helpful. maybe before hand states can submit a one pager on their program so participants are familiar and then breakout sessions and presentations could focus more on where we could come together.
 - ✓ Not much time to ask questions between presentations.
 - ✓ I do not have any issues with the workshop.
 - ✓ I was confused about if I should have had more of my team participate. I would have like to give the zoom link to several people at my office, but it seemed like each state was only supposed to have so many representatives? Maybe we just wanted to limit and diversify the presenters but not the participants?
 - My only suggestion is minor... would be to vary the presentation topics throughout all three days. It felt like all the topics around innovative techniques were clustered at the beginning followed by individual States reporting how they address water use data. I think it would be nice to have these shuffled throughout to provide some changes of pace.
 - ✓ It was an intense amount of info shared. As valuable as each presentation was some were very detailed in methodology and undermined translating the over arching accomplishments.
 - ✓ The workshop was well done. The only think I would change is building some more time into the day for more informal conversations
 - At first I was pretty excited about hearing about water providers from around the country, but so many of these talks were so similar to each other and full of water policy jargon that I found myself tuning out after a while.
 - Coming from a state that has not really use the WURD grant, it would be interesting to maybe have a break out session for states in a similar situation to go over the application process and have time to talk to USGS more about what programs may or may not be accepted by them for the grants.
 - ✓ I think the breakout sessions needed more structure or someone assigned beforehand to proctor the questions/discussions.
 - ✓ Venue location relative to hotel was inconvenient, but some of the challenge was the construction.
 - ✓ nothing comes to mind
 - ✓ listening to states with that are lagging behind in technology. I want to here about the premier states who are ahead of the pack.
 - ✓ Maybe some states with similarities could be grouped as actual panels with a moderator instead of just presentations.
 - ✓ Favorite aspect was the richness of the presentations; would like to see more time for group discussion.

- I attended remotely. The majority of topics included surface and groundwater datasets. I expected some talks on household drinking water usage data or advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) data and discussions on opportunities and challenges in that area.
- ✓ The remote speakers. Very hard to hear them some of the time.
- ✓ Nothing
- ✓ Some state presentations were not very dynamic.
- ✓ I think the workshop would have been sufficient without the third day.
- ✓ It was a bit difficult to participate in the group discussion sessions remotely (though what we were able to listen in on - and especially hearing other people's perspectives was enlightening).
- ✓ no virtual presenters
- I don't think there was necessarily anything I didn't like. Getting into the weeds on evapotranspiration was interesting, but not that applicable to water rights in Oklahoma. I most prefer discussions on modernization efforts such as online water use reporting or autonomous data collection, instream flow, metering efforts, trials and tribulations, etc.
- **11**.Comments, suggestions, or complaints to the planning committee. Things to improve.
 - ✓ Maybe schedule a local field trip or dinner the first night of the workshop.
 - ✓ I would like to see more discussions/presentations on on municipal water use (GPCD calculation), commercial and industrial water use data collection and estimates.
 - ✓ Make it available to lots of people to tune in and learn.
 - ✓ The workshop was well organized.
 - ✓ I'm not sure how to answer the previous question. It would significantly depend on the objective of the workshop follow-ups. 'Maybe' more accurately defines the likeliness of future participation.
 - ✓ I think that we are still struggling to speak the same language sometimes. I wonder if more targeted meetings, ex. for state agency work developing irrigation ET estimates, or database developers, might help build the most useful connections.
 - ✓ The breakouts could be a little bit more organized or intentional on how to split up, but otherwise they worked pretty good.
 - \checkmark Thank you for providing a virtual option.
 - ✓ I think a few more break out session could be useful. Give non-presenters a chance to talk more about their situations and maybe get tips and tricks from other entities in those breakout sessions.
 - Possibly including a section of the agenda focused on who is using the data stories or challenges.
 - ✓ needed more emphasis on the need for ecological flows and why data use is so important when trying to determine proper ecological flows
 - \checkmark I'd try to hold the meeting in a more vibrant district, so walking around was easier
 - ✓ I attended virtually the first day and the audio quality in the room was not great. It was very difficult to hear the in-person presenters. I listened to a few of the remote presenters, which I could hear better. I didn't attempt to connect to the meeting the remaining days.
 - ✓ If possible, include talks on AMI data acquisitions and analyses. There are several researchers in the States and Europe working on that data.
 - ✓ Interested in follow up virtual forum but not as often as choices in question above. Perhaps yearly
 - ✓ Thank you so much for organizing!

- ✓ If there will be a significant number of remote attendees again next time, perhaps plan to have virtual discussion groups for them to talk in?
- ✓ I thought it was really a good conference. I appreciate the effort everyone put into the conversations and presentations.
- "I know the size of the party might be a constraining factor, but next time it might be worth gauging interest on an evening get-together/dinner for socializing and drinks. You'd likely have a venue in-mind and people would have to sign up well in advance if a reservation is needed. Maybe even an extra fee to cover some of the cost might be appropriate.
- ✓ A virtual forum (which you have a survey question about) might be interesting. I'd appreciate more specifics though."
- ✓ YouTube videos of presentations would allow others to view the conference with little expense to Western States Water Council.
- ✓ Well organized, thank you!

Agenda

2022 National Water Use Data Workshop

August 16-18, 2022

Salt Lake City, Utah

Utah Department of Environmental Quality Building

195 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City





What are water use data?

Water use data represent reported or estimated site-specific water withdrawals or consumptive use at daily, monthly, or annual scales for the USGS use categories of public supply, domestic, irrigation, thermoelectric power, industrial, mining, livestock, and aquaculture from surface or groundwater sources.

Workshop Goals

- Provide a platform for state agencies' staff to learn from each other about the latest state and federal efforts related to water use data management and sharing.
- Engage state I.T. and water resources management staff regarding the USGS National Water Use/Water Use Data and Research (WUDR) Program and the WSWC Water Data Exchange (WaDE) Programs.
- Present the latest technological developments on water use data collection, storage and data Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable (FAIR) sharing methods and how States can benefit from them.
- Identify challenges related to States' data collection, storage and sharing efforts and potential solutions to consider
- Share strategies for enhanced data quality assurance and quality control.

Focus Areas

- Programs or initiatives related to improving FAIR data collection, sharing, and access
- Historic annual/monthly/weekly/daily site-specific water withdrawals and use data reporting and sharing efforts.
- Data gaps and ways that have been developed to fill them. Present on metadata for water use information.

Day 1: Tuesday, August 16, 2022

12:30 pm: Workshop Registration and Refreshments

1:00 pm – 1:30 pm: Welcoming Remarks

• WELCOME AND THE WATER DATA ACT: U.S. REP. MELANIE STANSBURY (N.M.) (video)

Workshop Co-Sponsor Remarks:

- Tony Willardson, Western States Water Council (WSWC)
- Beth Callaway, Interstate Council on Water Policy (ICWP)
- Melinda Dalton- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)
- Peter Colohan Internet of Water Coalition (IoW Coalition), Center for Geospatial Solutions at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

1:30 pm – 2:00 pm: Future Vision

- USGS Water Use Vision: Jaime Painter, USGS Water Mission Area (virtual)
- WSWC Water Data Exchange (WaDE) Program Water Use Data Sharing: Adel Abdallah, WSWC

2:00 pm – 2:30 pm: Water-Use Data and Research (WUDR) Grants – Feedback, Discussion, and Lessons-Learned

• Erik Smith, USGS: Discussion on the obstacles, perceived or real, to getting WUDR grants, and regional grant ideas and strategies

2:30 pm – 2:45 pm: Break

2:45 pm – 3:45 pm: National, Regional, and State Water Use Data Collection and Modeling Efforts Moderator: Tony Willardson

- USGS Water Use Modeling: Richard Niswonger, USGS
- OpenET Update (Utah, California, and Oregon pilot study): Forrest Melton, NASA Western Water Applications Office
- Oregon's Statewide E.T. project to Update Irrigation Consumptive Use Data: Jordan Beamer, Oregon Water Resources Department

3:45 pm – 4:00 pm: Break

4:00 pm – 5:00 pm State Water Data Initiatives Moderator: Tony Willardson

- California Water Data Consortium: Advancing Urban Water Use Data Sharing and Access: Tara Moran, California Water Data Consortium
- New Mexico Water Data Initiative: Stacy Timmons, New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources
- Developing the Texas Water Data Hub: Taylor Christian, Texas Water Development Board

5:00 pm: Wrap Up and Adjourn

Day 2: Wednesday, August 17, 2022

8:00 am: Refreshments

8:30 am – 9:50 am: Software Tools to Share, Visualize, Query, and Download Water Use Data Moderator: Nancy Barber

- Internet of Water Coalition Geoconnex Update New Mexico Pilot Study: Kyle Onda, Internet of Water Coalition, Center for Geospatial Solutions at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
- Utah's Open Water Data Website: Aaron Austin, Utah Division of Water Resources and James Reese, Utah Division of Water Rights
- Real-time Groundwater Management with Big Data and the Internet of Things Examples from the Twin Platte Natural Resources District Water Data Program: James Schneider, Olsson, and Kathleen Elmquist, Environmental Science Associates Sitka
- How Colorado's Decision Support Systems (CDSS) Hosts and Shares Water Data: Brian Macpherson, Colorado Water Conservation Board

9:50 am – 10:20 am: Break

10:20 am – 12:00 pm: States Data Collection and Sharing Efforts Moderator: Erik Smith

- USGS Data Insights: Cheryl Dieter, USGS Water Mission Area
- New Jersey's Methods in Estimating Water Use and Sharing Data: Kent Barr, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
- Wyoming Data Sharing Efforts: Melinda Fegler, Wyoming State Engineer's Office
- The Great Lakes Regional Water Use Database Data Collection, Analysis and Reporting Protocols: James Polidori, Great Lakes Commission
- Reported Water Uses in the Potomac River Basin: Stephanie Nummer-Fantozz, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. (virtual)

12:00 pm – 1:30 pm Lunch (Boxed Lunch)

1:30 pm – 3:00 pm: Data Collection and Sharing Efforts Moderator: Beth Callaway

- Kansas Water Use Data Collection and Database Migration: David Engelhaupt and Andy Terhune, Kansas Department of Agriculture (virtual)
- Alaska Water Use Data System: Kevin Petrone, Alaska Department of Natural Resources (virtual)
- New Mexico Water Use Data: Collection, Reporting, and Sharing: Julie Valdez, New Mexico Office of the State Engineer (virtual)
- Susquehanna River Basin Cumulative Water Use and Availability Study: John Balay, Susquehanna River Basin Commission
- Upper Colorado River Basin Consumptive Use and Loss Reporting: James Prairie, Upper Colorado Region Office, Bureau of Reclamation (virtual)

3:00 pm – 3:15 pm Break

3:15 pm – 4:00 pm Short break out session

Prompting questions

- What are ways your State has improved their capability to share water data such as tools/databases/APIs or others?
- What can we do to improve data sharing or make it easier? What hinders states from sharing data? How can we encourage data sharing?
- What are the two biggest takeaway?

4:00 pm – 5:00 pm States Water Use Data Collection and Reporting Moderator: Tony Willardson

- Washington Data Sharing Efforts: Andrea Lauden, Washington State Department of Ecology
- Water Use Data Improvements for Nebraska: Jennifer Schellpeper, Nebraska Department of Natural Resources
- Water Use Reporting in Oklahoma and Future Goals: Jason Tutkowski, Oklahoma Water Resources Board

5:00 pm: Wrap Up and Adjourn

Day 3: Thursday, August 18, 2022

8:00 am: Refreshments

8:30 am – 9:30 am: States Water Use Data Reporting and Sharing Efforts Moderator: Beth Callaway

- Major Water Users in Missouri: Trevor Ellis, Missouri Department of Natural Resources
- Indiana's Water Use Registration and Reporting Program: Mark Basch, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water (virtual)
- Water Withdrawal and Consumptive Use Estimates for the Delaware River Basin (1990-2017) With Projections Through 2060: Michael Thompson, Delaware River Basin Commission (virtual)
- Virginia's Approach to Addressing Water Use Data Gaps: Ryan Green, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (virtual)

9:30 – 9:45 am Refreshment Break

9:45 am – 11:15 am: Breakout sessions 3 or 5 groups (see prompting questions below)

11:15 am – 11:30 am Break

11:30 am – 12:15 pm: Breakout Session Reporting

12:15 pm: Wrap Up and Adjourn

Questions to consider answering during the talks and breakout sessions:

- 1. What data related assessments (QA/QC) do you use such as identification of gaps, ways/tools for evaluating data, analysis to identify outliers or overcome data latency issues?
- 2. What are the challenges in getting the data you need to meet your water rights regulatory needs, water planning and other obligations? Do you have adequate information/data on surface/groundwater uses to make more informed decisions that are not here now? If not, do you have plans for a solution to those challenges? What data are missing now?
- 3. What is your State's water use reporting systems and are there gaps in technical support, and methods? What future updates/plans for data collaboration, models, data services do you have? If water use data are reported voluntarily by water users, does your agency provide guidelines for reporting?
- 4. What can WaDE (WSWC), WUDR (USGS), ICWP, and IoW do to help your State meet its challenges?

2022 National Water Use Data Workshop Planning Committee*

- Adel Abdallah, Western States Water Council
- Tony Willardson, Western States Water Council
- Beth Callaway, Interstate Council on Water Policy
- Amy Shallcross, Interstate Council on Water Policy
- Peter Colohan, Internet of Water Coalition, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
- Lucas Stephens, Internet of Water Coalition, Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions at Duke University
- Kristin Linsey, U.S. Geological Survey
- Erik Smith, U.S. Geological Survey
- Nancy Barber, U.S. Geological Survey
- Dieter Cheryl, U.S. Geological Survey
- Jaime Painter, U.S. Geological Survey
- * In no particular order









2022 National Water Use Data Workshop

Salt Lake City, Utah August 16-18, 2022

Pre-Registrants List

(Green Font Color = Attending Remotely)

Adel Abdallah WaDE Program Manager Western States Water Council adelabdallah@wswc.utah.gov

Mohsen Aghashahi

Research Engineer Texas A&M Institute of Data Science aghashahi@exchange.tamu.edu

Klaus Albertin

Water Resources Engineer Division of Water Resources North Carolina Dept. of Environmental Quality klaus.albertin@ncdenr.gov

Cory Angeroth

Deputy Program Coordinator Groundwater/Streamflow Information Program U.S. Geological Survey angeroth@usgs.gov

Hannah Arnett

Environmental Quality Analyst Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy <u>arnetth2@michigan.gov</u>

Ashley Atkins

Executive Director NSF West Big Data Innovation Hub <u>ashleyatkins@berkeley.edu</u>

Aaron Austin GIS Manager Utah Division of Water Resources aaronaustin@utah.gov

Linda Davis Water Resource Information Section Manager Idaho Department of Water Resources <u>linda.davis@idwr.idaho.gov</u>

John Balay Manager, Planning and Operations Susquehanna River Basin Commission jbalay@srbc.net

Nancy Barber Hydrologist U.S. Geological Survey nlbarber@usgs.gov

Kent Barr Research Scientist New Jersey Dept. of Environmental Protection john.barr@ncdenr.gov

John Barr Environmental Specialist North Carolina Dept. of Environmental Quality kent.barr@dep.nj.gov

Tom Bassista Natural Resource Program Coordinator-Aquatics Idaho Department of Fish and Game tom.bassista@idfg.idaho.gov

Jordan Beamer Hydrologist Oregon Water Resources Department jordan.p.beamer@water.oregon.gov

Nora Beck Sr. Planner Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning <u>nbeck@cmap.illinois.gov</u>

Philip Blankenau Evapotranspiration Analyst Idaho Department of Water Resources philip.blankenau@idwr.idaho.gov

Beth Callaway Executive Director Interstate Council on Water Policy beth@icwp.org

Yun Cho Manager, Water Use and Planning Data Texas Water Development Board <u>yun.cho@twdb.texas.gov</u>

Taylor Christian Water Data Scientist and Coordinator Texas Water Development Board taylor.christian@twdb.texas.gov

Brian Clark Deputy Program Coordinator U.S. Geological Survey brclark@usgs.gov

Peter Colohan Chair, Internet of Water Coalition Lincoln Institute of Land Policy pcolohan@lincolninst.edu Jessica Correll Water Resources Geologist Oklahoma Water Resources Board jessica.correll@owrb.ok.gov

Mindi Dalton Program Coordinator U.S. Geological Survey msdalton@usgs.gov

Alexa Davis Water Specialist Nebraska Department of Natural Resources <u>alexa.davis@nebraska.gov</u>

Linda Davis Water Resource Information Section Manager Idaho Department of Water Resources <u>linda.davis@idwr.idaho.gov</u>

Cheryl Dieter Hydrologist U.S. Geological Survey cadieter@usgs.gov

Jill Doughtie Owner LA Native Plant Connection jillslivingroom@gmail.com

Trevor Ellis Groundwater Monitoring Unit Chief Missouri Geological Survey trevor.ellis@dnr.mo.gov

Kathleen Elmquist Product Owner Environmental Science Associates kelmquist@esassoc.com

David Engelhaupt Professional Civil Engineer Kansas Department of Agriculture david.engelhaupt@ks.gov

Joaquin Esquivel Chair State Water Resources Control Board joaquin.esquivel@waterboards.ca.gov Mel Fegler Wyoming State Engineer's Office mel.fegler@wyo.gov

Erica Gaddis Sr. Policy Advisor Western States Water Council egaddis@wswc.utah.gov

Christopher Estes Aquatic Resources and Habitat Scientist Chalk Board Enterprises, LLC <u>christopher@chalkboardllc.com</u>

Ryan Green Water Supply Planning and Analysis Team Lead Virginia Department of Environmental Quality ryan.green@deq.virginia.gov

James Halgren Assistant Director of Science Alabama Water Institute jshalgren@ua.edu

Skye Hawthorne Data Analyst AQUAOSO skye.hawthorne@aquaoso.com

Elizabeth Hickman Engineering Associate Kansas Department of Agriculture, Division of Water Resources Elizabeth.Hickman@ks.gov

Katie Hoeberling Director of Policy Initiatives Open Environmental Data Project katie@openenvironmentaldata.org

Emiko Hori Environmental Resource Specialist III West Virginia Dept. of Environmental Protection emiko.hori@wv.gov

Mellony Hoskinson Hydrologist Oregon Water Resources Department mellony.d.hoskinson@water.oregon.gov

Erin Huang Discipline Lead/Project Manager Jacobs huangerin477@gmail.com

Ryan James Data Analyst Western States Water Council rjames@wswc.utah.gov

David Jones Engineering Manager I Utah Division of Water Rights <u>djjones@utah.gov</u>

Kendra Kaiser Research Faculty Boise State University kendrakaiser@boisestate.edu

Yaser Kishawi Environmental Engineer Nebraska Department of Environment and Energy yaser.kishawi@nebraska.gov

Andrea Lauden Compliance Specialist Washington State Department of Ecology andrea.lauden@ecy.wa.gov

Kristin Linsey Hydrologist U.S. Geological Survey kslinsey@usgs.gov

Joel Lisonbee Drought Information Coordinator National Integrated Drought Information System joel.lisonbee@noaa.gov

Yifan Luo Research Assistant University of Michigan <u>yifanluo@umich.edu</u> Lauren Mack Geologist Missouri Geological Survey lauren.mack@dnr.mo.gov

Brian Macpherson Decision Support System Specialist Colorado Water Conservation Board brian.macpherson@state.co.us

Rafael Maestu Chief Data Scientist/Economist California State Water Board rafael.maestu@waterboards.ca.gov

Landon Marston Assistant Professor Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Imarston@vt.edu

Forrest Melton Program Scientist NASA Western Water Applications Office forrest.s.melton@nasa.gov

Kim Menke IT Manager Nebraska Department of Natural Resources kim.menke@nebraska.gov

Craig Miller Hydrology and Modeling Manager Utah Division of Water Resources craigmiller@utah.gov

Bonnie Moats Environmental Program Specialist IV Oklahoma Water Resource Board bonnie.moats@owrb.ok.gov

Caitlin Moore Sustainability Data Partnerships Manager Protocol Labs-Filecoin Green <u>caitlin.moore@protocol.ai</u>

Tara Moran CEO California Water Data Consortium tmoran@cawaterdata.org Andrea Nagel Environmental Scientist Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin <u>anagel@icprb.org</u> Courtney Nichols Data and GIS Manager AQUAOSO Technologies courtney.nichols@aguaoso.com

Richard Niswonger Hydrologist U.S. Geological Survey rniswon@usgs.gov

Stephanie Nummer-Fantozz Post-Doctoral Researcher Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin <u>snummer@icprb.org</u>

Rachel O'Connor Manager, Water Program Environmental Defense Fund roconnor@edf.org

Kyle Onda Associate Director Internet of Water Coalition konda@lincolninst.edu

Lia Ovelar Owner/Engineer Cor Environmental lia@corenvironmental.com

Jaime Painter Geographer/Water Use Program Manager U.S. Geological Survey jpainter@usgs.gov

Linwood Peele Water Supply Planning Supervisor Division of Water Resources North Carolina Dept. of Environmental Quality linwood.peele@ncdenr.gov

Kevin Petrone Hydrologist 4 Alaska Department of Natural Resources

kevin.petrone@alaska.gov

James Polidori Water Quality/Infrastructure Program Specialist Great Lakes Commission jpolidori@glc.org James Prairie Research and Modeling Group Chief Upper Colorado Basin Region Bureau of Reclamation jprairie@usbr.gov

Jim Reese Assistant State Engineer Utah Division of Water Rights jreese@utah.gov

Mitch Russo

Supervising Water Resources Engineer California Department of Water Resources <u>mitchel.russo@water.ca.gov</u>

Jennifer Schellpeper Water Planning Division Head Nebraska Department of Natural Resources jennifer.schellpeper@nebraska.gov

Jim Schneider

Scientist Olsson jschneider@olsson.com

Malia Scott Hydrologist

U.S. Geological Survey mhscott@usgs.gov

Jennifer Shourds

Hydrologist U.S. Geological Survey jshourds@usgs.gov

Austin Siedleck

Hydrogeologist Olsson <u>Austin.Siedleck@dnr.mo.gov</u>

Todd Stonely Assistant Director Utah Department of Natural Resources toddstonely@utah.gov

Erik Smith Hydrologist U.S. Geological Survey easmith@usgs.gov

Kellie Smith Technical hydrologist Idaho Department of Water Resources kellie.smith@idwr.idaho.gov

Tim Stagnitta Hydrologist Rhode Island Water Resources Board <u>timothy.stagnitta@doa.ri.gov</u>

Andrew Terhune Environmental Scientist Kansas Department of Agriculture andrew.terhune@ks.gov

Michael Thompson Water Resource Engineer Delaware River Basin Commission michael.thompson@drbc.gov

Stacy Timmons Associate Director, Hydrogeology

NM Tech/N.M. Bureau of Geology stacy.timmons@nmt.edu

Jason Tutkowski Water Rights Specialist Oklahoma Water Resources Board jason.tutkowski@owrb.ok.gov

Julie Valdez Water Use and Conservation Bureau Chief New Mexico Office of the State Engineer julie.valdez@state.nm.us

Allison Vincent Remote Sensing Analyst Idaho Department of Water Resources <u>allison.vincent@idwr.idaho.gov</u>

Steven Vu Environmental Protection Specialist U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Vu.Steven@epa.gov

Jo Ann Weber Water Resources Manager County of San Diego joann.weber@sdcounty.ca.gov

Cameron Weller

GIS Analyst II Idaho Department of Water Resources cameron.weller@idwr.idaho.gov Tony Willardson Executive Director Western States Water Council twillardson@wswc.utah.gov



Word-cloud representation of state and federal agencies, academic, and non-profit groups participating in the workshop