**Water Information and Data Subcommittee**

**Combined Workgroup 3 and Workgroup 4 call**

Minutes – April 25, 2012

**Attendees**: Steve Tessler (USGS), Laura Paeglis (NE), Steve Malers (Riverside), Sara Larsen (WSWC), Dharhas Pothina (TX), Levi Brekke (Reclamation), Dwane Young (WSWC-WestFAST)

**Next Call:**  Week of May 7th

**Administrative:** The minutes were approved.

**Data Schema Discussion:** Dwane walked the group through the current draft schema. The draft schema was sent out in the invite. The draft schema has also been posted to google docs. Dwane mentioned two documents that have been shared. The first is the Data Exchange Template (DET). This document provides the list of data elements, their definitions, whether or not they are required, and the relationship between the elements. Dwane described the sort order column in the DET and how that can be used to infer parent and child data elements. He gave the example of OrganizationIdentifier (sort id 1.0.1) being a child of Organization (sort id 1.0). Child elements increment at the next decimal point.

The second set of files contained the XML schema for the water use data exchange. It is defined as a series of .xsd files that describe the schema. Dwane used XMLPad to walk through the schema. During the process of explaining the schema, a number of questions and discussion ensued, the highlights of which are described below:

* In discussing the Report data element Dwane mentioned that this is a means of grouping the data. A question has come up in the states as to what time frame this grouping occurs. Some states may report by Water Year (October-September) others may report by Calendar Year. Some additional examples, included “Irrigation Year” from Colorado, and “Contract Year” in the Central Valley Project.
  + Molly asked if we could do both, or all.
  + Dwane said that we could, we would just need to add another data element
  + Dwane suggested that we perhaps add a start date/end date to describe the time period that the report applies to.
  + Levi suggested that the date be moved down to the summary data level, which would allow for each of the summaries to have their own dates.
  + Steve Malers asked if that would create problems for aggregating the data across states if they were reporting at different time scales
  + Dwane said that we already don’t really have that expectation of being able to compare across states very well.
  + Later in the call, Steve Tessler raised a point that if each of the summaries had their own time frame, then it would be hard to compare the various summaries even within a state.
  + The group conceded that this was an excellent point
  + Molly stated that USGS is currently tracking the data by Calendar Year, but this requires a lot of manipulation of the state data because they report everything by Water Year.

**Action Item: WSWC will consider alternatives and provide to the Workgroup and then possibly to the Water Information and Data Subcommittee for a final decision.**

**-**In discussion of the availability summaries, Steve M. asked a question about which states were using the Metric to define water availability. Dwane stated that Oregon was using a metric of sorts (number of months for which water was available).

- In discussion on the ‘TimeFrame’ data element throughout the schema, the group agreed that it would make more sense to break this data element up into a ‘StartDate’ and ‘EndDate’ elements.

**Change: Change TimeFrame throughout the schema to StartDate and EndDate**

* In the discussion on AllocationSummary, Steve T. asked how the allocation amounts were associated with each use, and if you could identify how much water was associated with each irrigation method.
  + Dwane responded that the current schema would only allow one total irrigation number, and that you could identify the various irrigation methods, but not specifically how much water is allocated for each.
  + Molly asked about the need for different time frames for different uses
  + Dwane said that at the summary level that this was too complicated, but did need to be captured at the detail level.
  + Molly asked about how to deal with situations where an allocation is for multiple uses, but the amounts aren’t specified for the individual uses, but rather are combined across several uses. An example would be where you have an allocation for irrigation and stockwater, but it’s not specified how much water is allocated to each use.
  + Dwane said that there would be three ways to deal with that at the summary level:
    - 1) Report the amount for both uses (which would give you a duplicate amount)
    - 2) Pick one use to report for (in this case irrigation)
    - 3) Use a ‘combined use’. For this example, report a use of ‘combined agriculture use’
  + Molly stated that this raises the issue of needing to start identifying the various uses in the states and compiling them into one list.
* Steve M. asked what the term ‘Availability’ means.
  + Dwane responded that it would be defined as legal water availability, meaning how much water is available after all other considerations are taken into account. The reality would probably be that there would not be many basins in the west with water availability.
* Steve T. said that it would be helpful to have some example data. Dwane agreed. Our next step is to design the database. Following that, we will populate it with some example data to see how well it fits.
* In the discussion about the detail data, Molly asked about the definition of consumptive use (which is water used that is not available for reuse in the system). She also stated that not very many states will have this information. Dwane agreed that this is what the WSWC has found in conversations with the states.

**Open Question: Should we soften what we mean by Consumptive Use? If not very many states have this data, what are we really going to collect. Should we instead focus just on withdrawals?**

* Steve T. mentioned that it would be helpful to have a glossary of terms. Dharhas agreed. Dwane pointed them to the DET and asked if that sufficed. Steve T. said that he was more looking for the larger picture terms like ‘Consumptive Use’, ‘Report’, and ‘Availability’. The group felt that this would be a good thing to have.

**Action Item: Develop a glossary of terms used by the Water Use Data Exchange.**

**Call Schedules:**  Next call will be the week of May 7th

**Other Items:**  None