

Georgia Department of Natural Resources

Environmental Protection Division, Watershed Protection Branch
4220 International Parkway, Suite 101, Atlanta, Georgia 30354
Linda MacGregor, P. E., Branch Chief 404/675-6232
FAX: 404/675-6247

December 20, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council Members

FROM: David Ashley, JIG/Jacobs
Tai-Yi Su, JIG/Jacobs
Charlotte Weber, JIG/Jacobs

SUBJECT: CM#9 Meeting Summary
Middle Ocmulgee Water Planning Council Meeting

CC: Kevin Farrell, GA EPD
Ted Hendrickx, GA EPD

Georgia Comprehensive Statewide Water Management Plan Regional Water Planning

CM#9 Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: December 13, 2010
Location: Go Fish Education Center
Perry, Georgia

1) Welcome and Introduction

Chairman Elmo Richardson welcomed the group. Michael with the Go Fish Education Center welcomed everyone and provided a brief summary of the Go Fish Education Center and its mission to the group.

2) Plan Schedule Extension

Chairman Richardson asked Kevin Farrell to provide an update on the schedule extension for developing the Regional Water Plan.

Farrell summarized the November 24, 2010 memo by Director Barnes that provides a three-month schedule extension for the development of Regional Water Plan. He postpones the beginning of the 45-day public comment period from February 7th to May 9th, and the submission of the final draft plan to EPD no later than September 30th, 2011. The additional time will allow for additional Resource Assessment information to be incorporated into the draft plans. Farrell mentioned that the Upper Oconee Council plans to use the additional time to meet with the local elected officials in the region and brief them on the draft plan.

Q: Jim Ham asked about plans for local government involvement.

A: Farrell responded that there is no set way to conduct local government outreach. The Upper Oconee Council is planning three different public meetings to engage the local governments in their region.

Comment: Ham recommended that the Council have meetings for clusters of 3-4 counties at a time so that the meetings are closer to attend. The County Commissioners and City Councils should be invited. A written invitation was recommended so that there is a record.

Comment: Elmo agreed that the lack of participation by local governments was a concern. Butts County and the City of Warner Robins have been consistently attending meetings, but many others have not attended.

Comment: Adrienne Wood with Department of Community Affairs (DCA) recommended that involving the Regional Commissions will help engage the elected officials. Su mentioned that an invitation to this meeting was sent to all city and county officials based on an updated post-election list that Wood and the Regional Commissions helped put together.

Comment: Ham stated that the counties and the city elected officials need to be invited in addition to the Regional Commissions, which only includes some representation from local elected officials.

Comment: Chairman Richardson offered to attend local meetings to help with the information process.

Q: Co-Chair Copeland asked if there was an update on EPD's revised groundwater yield analysis for the Cretaceous Aquifer.

A: Tai-Yi Su and David Ashley replied that the revised results are anticipated for December 23rd.

3) Recent Meeting Update

November 18th Technical Committee Meeting

Ashley stated that the Technical Committee met to discuss the comments on the first draft plan received from EPD. The version distributed to the Council today reflects revisions to management practices that addressed EPD's and the committee's comments. The details on the recommended water management practices are summarized in Sections 6 through 8 of the draft Regional Water Plan. The plan for the meeting is to discuss the refined list of management practices one at a time and then answer any questions. Ashley thanked the Technical Committee for their hard work.

December 7th Instream Ad Hoc Meeting

The meeting was held at Macon Water Authority for all of the Regional Water Planning Councils to provide additional information on the current interim instream flow policy and the Resource Assessments. Su provided a summary of the meeting. The speakers included EPD's Nap Caldwell who presented the history of instream flow requirements in Georgia, Gail Cowie who provided a summary of instream flow policies for neighboring states, and Dr. Mary Freeman, who talked in depth about the importance of variability in stream flows (high flows, low flows, etc.) in providing habitat. MOC Council members attended the meeting included Larry McSwain, Eva Persons and Technical Committee members Mike Hopkins and Mark Wyzalek. Dr. Freeman provided some options for additional evaluation for consideration, including: 1) quantify flow regime alteration (degree of change) by comparing the unimpaired flows with projected demand; 2) evaluate higher minimum flows for Resource Assessments; and 3) place and evaluate additional nodes for specific natural resources to be protected.

Q: Ham asked how 7Q10 was calculated and if changing the instream flow requirements will impact any recommendation for future off-line reservoirs on small tributary streams.

A: Farrell and Su explained that the 7Q10 is typically calculated based on the nearest stream gage that is most representative of the stream in question.

Comment: Chairman Richardson added that rainfall data and the watershed data are considered when extrapolating 7Q10 or estimating reservoir yield.

Q: John Bembry agreed that periodic floods are very important to fisheries. He asked if the 7Q10 addresses the periods of high water needed for a healthy ecosystem.

A: Su responded that minimum instream flows do not address the periodic need for high flows. Dr. Freeman suggested that more detailed studies in the natural variability of the stream would provide this information. The unimpaired flows in the surface water availability Resource Assessment are conservative simulations of stream conditions with the human impacts removed to the degree possible.

Q: Eva Persons commented that Florida's standards include both depth and flow .

A: Su commented that there was a hand-out from the meeting that will be provided to the Council that summarizes the requirements for neighboring states. Su explained that Florida's minimum instream flow and level requirements are established through site-specific studies. The number of minimum instream flows and levels established by these studies are documented each year.

There was a discussion regarding the instream flow protections in other states. Georgia is protective in comparison to many of the states, although the requirements are different.

McSwain commented that all other states seemed to have better protection than Georgia. Ashley pointed out that this was not correct because South Carolina does not have a water withdrawals permitting program until very recently. It recently passed the 2010 South Carolina Surface Water Withdrawal, Permitting, Use and Reporting Act to begin regulating withdrawals. North Carolina requires water users to report their use but does not regulate withdrawals. Recently the state has begun a program to determine ecologically protective flows, but this will likely be years

in the making. Alabama and Tennessee also do not have instream flow standards for water withdrawals permitting. Wastewater discharge permits are mostly based on annual 7Q10.

Comment: Bembry commented that flow variability is very important, especially because the MOC is downstream of the Metro Water District. Periodic floods in the Ocmulgee River are important for protecting habitat conditions.

There was a discussion about the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license requirements for Lake Jackson, which is a Georgia Power Company-operated Lake. EPD cannot change the flow releases required under the company's FERC license. Permits on the tributaries to the Ocmulgee River would require 7Q10 minimum instream flows, but the main stem minimum release is controlled by the FERC license.

Q: Ham asked if Macon Water Authority and others have minimum instream flow requirements enforced by EPD.

A: Tony Rojas responded that their withdrawal permit includes a 2-stage seasonal minimum flow limit on the Ocmulgee River. However, because their withdrawal existed prior to 1977 (when surface water withdrawals began to be regulated in Georgia) they are grandfathered to withdraw a 35-MGD quantity at all times. There is a separate withdrawal permit for the Lucas reservoir with a minimum flow requirement below the reservoir. Rojas also commented that this permit was issued before EPD adopted the 2001 Interim Instream Flow Policy.

There was a discussion that Lake Jackson is a FERC regulated dam with a 400 cfs (or inflow if less) minimum flow requirement. EPD cannot require a higher release from the dam than is required in the FERC license. There have been waivers in the past during extreme drought conditions to maintain the levels in Lake Jackson.

All of the Federal reservoirs were built before the state had minimum flow and water withdrawal permitting requirements. Additionally, the reservoir releases are protected by Federal supremacy.

Thomas Wicker explained that Georgia Power performs an extensive public participation process as part of relicensing.

Rojas commented that before Lake Lanier, the flows in the Chattahoochee River were probably pretty small during drought. Now the flows are stored and can be released during extreme drought conditions. There are benefits to dams.

McSwain asked about the grandfathered permits.

Farrell commented that the pre-existing withdrawal quantities are grandfathered if they were issued prior to 1977; however, any increases in withdrawals are subject to instream flow requirements.

Su discussed one of the evaluation options suggested by Dr. Freeman. She recommended that additional nodes might help provide a more refined scale to the study (for the natural resources to

be protected). Dr. Freeman recommended prioritizing the high-value resources and the functionality that they want to preserve. This will require working with WRD to prioritize and identify the high value resources.

Farrell commented that the purpose of the ad hoc meeting was to provide the Councils with additional information. The Council's draft plan currently includes a recommendation to the state to further study instream flow issues. Farrell asked if there were any changes to the recommendation for additional studies for instream flows. Su added that specific language or written suggestions on the recommendation were welcomed.

Les Ager (member of the public) commented that permit conditions that allow a stream to be pumped dry are not appropriate. He suggested that the Council recommend that the State phase out antiquated zero minimum flow requirements for the grandfathered permits.

December 8th Natural Resources Commission (Joint Committee on Water Supply) Meeting

Elmo asked Ashley to provide a summary of this meeting in Atlanta. The Water Stewardship Act (SB370), created a legislative committee to develop a report on water issues. The Commission received status updates from several agencies.

- Georgia Environmental Finance Authority (GEFA) – has legislative authority to address water supply issues.
 - GEFA has provided over \$200 million in funding for water supply projects since 1985. Their funding comes from four sources, two state and two federal. This year, because of budget issues, the General Assembly mandated that GEFA securitize its Georgia Fund, using \$288 Million, and leaving a balance of only \$28 million.
 - In 2008 GEFA was given broad legislative authority (SB 342) for funding and developing water supply projects, but has received neither funding nor staff to support any major initiatives.
 - GEFA has funded \$14 million in water conservation projects using federal ARRA (stimulus) monies.
 - GEFA recently initiated a study (Water Supply Interconnection Redundancy and Reliability Act) of the interconnection potential of water providers in the Metro North Georgia Water Planning District
- EPD – Director Allen Barnes discussed the status of the State Water Plan and the 3-month schedule extension. He commented that they continue to work with the governor's office on the reauthorization of Lake Lanier. EPD also presented a new rule on interbasin transfer on Dec. 7th using the identical language from the State Water Plan that outlines a 22-step process when considering interbasin transfers. The rule is currently available for public comment and will be considered at the DNR Board meeting on January 22nd.

Comment: Rojas commented that an interbasin transfer rule provides much more flexibility than a law would but ensures there is a process.

Q: Ham asked if the rule established restrictions to the distance of interbasin transfers.

A: Ashley responded that there are a number of considerations that would have to be addressed but there are no constraints on distance.

Q: Bemby asked for clarification that the Director is responsible.

A: Rojas commented that the EPD Director's decisions are subject to higher authorities.

Q: Bemby asked if there were any requirements regarding existing transfers.

A: There was a discussion that the current interbasin transfers benefit the Council. Ashley commented that any major changes in existing interbasin transfers would likely be subject to the proposed rule.

- Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission (GSWCC) – Director Brent Dykes discussed a study that looked at existing dams with the potential for water supply. There is a list of the top 20 sites, most of which are located in North Georgia. Ham commented that there are a couple of GSWCC-managed dams in Monroe and Lamar Counties.
- Georgia Water Policy Center – Doug Wilson provided an instructive discussion showing the issues in southwest Georgia, primarily in the Lower Flint Basin. Large numbers of agricultural withdrawals are reducing or eliminating dry weather streamflows in three basins (Flint, Ochlockonee, Suwannee).
- Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce – Katie Kirkpatrick gave a presentation advocating for reauthorization of Lake Lanier and additional funding for water supply projects.
- Georgia Conservancy – Will Wingate gave a presentation supporting SB 370 and additional water conservation; and acknowledging that new water supply reservoirs may be needed. But he advocated for a stepwise process for reservoirs, essentially making them a last resort after other options were shown inadequate; and for expansion of existing reservoirs in preference to new reservoirs.
- Georgia Chamber of Commerce – Chris Clark advocated for development of new supplies, urging the committee to remember that water is a key competitive issue and that our neighboring states are already saying that Georgia has inadequate water supplies.

4) Review Revised Draft Plan Sections 1 - 5

Su provided a brief overview of the major comments received by EPD.

- Coordination with local governments and interested stakeholders
- Strengthening the linkages between the Council's vision and goals and not just filling gaps
- Working within the page limits
- Groundwater gap analysis (comments from Dr. Kennedy)
- Addition of summary box at the beginning of each section

In addition, updated water demand forecast for energy generation and watershed modeling results and have been added to Section 4 and 5, respectively.

Q: There were several questions about the energy demands.

A: The water withdrawals for energy generation are based on type of process. The assumption is that plants with similar processes will have similar water withdrawal/consumption factors (water withdrawal or consumption per megawatt of power generation). The energy forecasts include

the energy currently used as well as future needs. Future energy needs were developed by the energy ad hoc forecasting group. Some of the future energy needs were not allocated to a specific facility or process. The forecasts will be updated in the future when the Public Service Commission has better available data.

Q: Bemby asked if additional model runs should be considered to reflect changes in the energy demand.

A: Su responded that if the Council feels that some of the unallocated energy development will be located in the Middle Ocmulgee Region, then additional model runs can be done to reflect their water use. At the moment this information is not available.

Q: Bemby asked if the forecasts include the biomass and green energy potential for the region.

A: Su responded that biomass is considered in the mix of the energy production in the future. The future generation is not location-specific and is a pretty small blend of the energy sources for the future.

There was some discussion regarding the land use map (Figure 2-3) in the draft plan. Some suggested overlaying the city or county boundaries on maps. There were discussions about posting some of the maps and map files on the website so they were available for the local governments to use.

Q: Bemby asked if all of the cities and counties in the region have a copy of the draft plan.

A: Su responded that DCA developed a list of all of the elected officials within the region. The elected officials were invited to this Council meeting and will be invited to future meetings. There are plans to send letters to inform local governments on where to access the draft plan. If Council members encourage elected officials to read the draft plan, it is important to inform them that it is still a preliminary draft.

Su explained that the groundwater availability section was revised based on specific technical comments from Dr. Kennedy. The section has not been reviewed yet by Dr. Kennedy but the revisions are based on his comments.

Discussion: There were questions about the existing groundwater permits in the Crystalline Rock aquifer (in Jasper County particularly). There is one well for the City of Monticello that is quite deep in the Crystalline Rock.

Su explained that the Crystalline Rock water balance model predicted availability ranges from 0.01 - 0.063 MGD/sq.mi. There is a lot of uncertainty with well yields in the Crystalline Rock aquifer, so the lower end of this range is used for conservative planning. This is under the assumption that the aquifer underlying the Middle Ocmulgee Region is similar to the modeled area.

Q: Rojas commented that Figure 5-1 appears to blend counties that use surface water and groundwater systems.

A: Su responded that the figure could be clarified. The intent was to show the geographic extent of the Resource Assessments.

Q: Wyzalek commented that the energy use (in Figure 5-1) is misleading with zero production for the Lumber City node which includes Plant Scherer. He recommended using a symbol instead of the number zero.

A: Su agreed. She commented that the table does not reflect the revised forecasts.

Q: Ham asked about Table 5-1 and whether the well in Jasper County the only one that is shown.

A: Su responded that only the wells with water withdrawal permits are listed, so the summary does not include individual wells and public wells using less than 100,000 gallons/day. Su responded that the list of permits would be checked to make sure that no permits were missing from the table or associated with the incorrect aquifer. Specific communities mentioned by the Council included Crawford County, City of Flovilla, and others.

Su returned to Table 5-1 and added that the revised results for the Cretaceous Aquifer are expected in late December. The gap is expected to decrease.

Q: Bemby asked how the agricultural demands in the lower portion of the region were allocated to the Floridan and Cretaceous aquifer. He suggested that the Plan or supplemental materials should include information on which permits withdraw from each of the aquifers, so that permittees know if they withdraw from an aquifer with a gap (Cretaceous aquifer).

A: Su stated that the future water forecasts are based on the location of the current withdrawals. Dr. Hook's forecasts considered the application rates and the source of the withdrawal.

Comment: John added that the use of the Floridan aquifer should be encouraged, where possible.

Comment: Ben commented that the aquifers don't layer neatly. The Floridan is actually on top of the Cretaceous aquifer in the region.

Comment: Su added that the productivity of the aquifers is different and can be site specific. Dr. Kennedy commented that the upper tip of the Floridan aquifer the region has access to may not be as productive as the rest of the Floridan aquifer.

During the break, Wood recommended that a cross-section figure of the aquifers be added to the report to help readers understand the aquifer layering within the region.

Su continued with the overview of the changes. Table 5-2 was updated on a county basis and shows a trend of where future water supplies may be needed. Section 5-3 shows the surface water quality results with the watershed and lake model results.

Q: Rojas asked how EPD calculated the split in nutrient forecasts between point source and non-point source loads. The summary implies that wastewater treatment plants are the source of the runoff, but lawn fertilizers typically play a significant role. He is concerned about how these figures may appear to the public.

Su responded that the watershed models do indicate that the wastewater discharges in the Metro Water District are the main contributors of nutrient loadings in the Upper Ocmulgee watershed. The group discussed that the assumptions in the watershed model are conservative and modeled the future discharges at full permit values.

Rojas commented that if the wastewater discharges are taken to permit limits, then the runoff associated with future land use should be used, or the percentages are not accurate.

Su responded that the wastewater modeling assumptions are very conservative and agreed it is unusual for plants to operate at their permit limits.

Rojas is concerned that the results target wastewater treatment facilities. The group discussed that the nonpoint source runoff should mirror the same growth reflected in the full wastewater permit limits. There was some discussion about looking at the watershed model results under existing discharge levels versus under full permit limits. Ben commented that with the interbasin transfer, a higher portion of the Metro Water District's point source discharges were draining to the watershed than the nonpoint sources, which would drain to the Chattahoochee basin.

The group discussed that it would be helpful to have watershed models for the entire MOC and not just the area upstream of Lake Jackson. Su will look at the watershed model results again and discuss the Council's concerns with the modelers. There will be a Technical Memorandum on the Lake Jackson watershed model at some point in the near future.

5) Review Sections 6 through 8

Ashley commented that there was going to be a cursory review of Sections 6 – 8 and then after lunch there would be an opportunity to discuss any of the specific management practices in greater detail.

EPD asked that more evidence of coordination with local governments and state agencies be included in the draft plan. At the beginning of the planning process, there was a significant outreach process to the water utilities and local governments. There may be increased interest from the local governments now that there is a draft plan with draft recommendations.

The groundwater gap is expected to decrease and the recommendations may be revised based on these results.

Previously, the Council recommended removing some of the specificity related to management practices because of concerns about the different needs of different systems, permit compliance, and costs of implementation. EPD requested additional specificity in the review comments for the first draft. In the current draft, the management practices outlined in Section 6 – 8 try to strike a balance between adding details without making a “one size fits all” requirement. The management practices are separated into two groups; the priority practices and the additional practices that may be considered on a local basis, based on site specific conditions. The priority management practices are shown in Table 6-1 and the additional management practices in Table 6-2.

Q: Bemby asked about the benchmarking goal for residential per capita water use. Given the requirements in the Water Stewardship Act, he suggested that the benchmark be changed to reduce residential per capita use instead of to maintain and/or reduce residential per capita use.

A: Deatre Denion noted that lack of detailed billing data categories may complicate the

calculation of the residential per capita use.

A: Ashley commented that the flexibility was provided for smaller communities and communities who already have aggressive programs. PC will look at re-wording “maintenance”.

Comment: Bob Lazenby mentioned that the forestry commission has a manual of best management practices for forestry that should be included along with the nonpoint source practices included in Table 6-1.

Comment: Ham asked for the text on page 6-10 under WQ6 – Reduce Runoff from Impervious Surfaces to be changed to read “Local and State Governments may consider...” adding the state to the existing language.

There was a question regarding whether state development projects were required to use the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual. Farrell responded that the state follows the local requirements. There was a discussion that GDOT is an exception and follows adopted procedures and not local requirements.

Chairman Richardson commented that the Federal and State Governments have tried to exempt themselves from the storm water utility fees in the past. Rojas added that there is a recent release from the Federal Justice Department; cases have been decided differently depending on the connection between the service and the storm water utility fee.

Q: Persons asked for the paperwork for the \$100,000 319 grants that were mentioned at the ad hoc meeting.

A: Every Council is eligible for up to \$100,000 in grant funds that can be awarded to a local government, and that government must have a local match of 40 percent of the total. The match can be in-kind services. Councils have until the end of January to select their priority project.

Q: Ham asked what Council has the biggest gap.

A: Lower Flint, with a large gap at the Bainbridge node.

Q: Wood asked if the Middle Ocmulgee was coordinating questions regarding kaolin water usage with the Upper Oconee Council, as they have a higher kaolin production.

A: Yes.

Q: Bemby commented that there is a disconnect between the surface water assessments and the groundwater assessments in terms of geography. Some of the counties share water with those in the Cretaceous and Floridan aquifers. He asked if there was a recommendation to the state to realign the Council boundaries based on groundwater.

A: Chairman Richardson responded that even counties who rely on groundwater for supply, discharge wastewater to surface water and therefore they need to consider both. The state put a great deal of thought into the Council boundaries.

A: Farrell added that the aquifer models are on a regional basis with other communities.

A: Su commented that the Resource Assessments and gap analysis looked at what the demands are on the groundwater aquifer based on the existing blend of sources.

A: Ashley added that the draft plan included a recommendation to gather additional information on conditions in the Cretaceous aquifer to address the concern that not enough was known.

Q: Wood suggested that for management practice WQ7- Develop Programs to Protect Sensitive Land - the term “acquired” should be replaced with the word “protected” or “placed in conservation land” so that the benchmark is not limited just to land that is purchased in fee simple.

A: Good comment.

Q: Chairman Richardson asked if there was a discussion at the Legislative Committee meeting regarding the Council role following the adoption of the Plan.

A: There was discussion at the meeting regarding the need for long-term funding for the Councils.

Ashley read the paragraph in Section 8.3 that described Plan amendment process to the Council and asked the Council if they would like to suggest any changes or make the language stronger. The Council discussed the need for a process to hold future meetings to review and discuss amendments to the Plan, as needed. As the Councils are currently not paid for their time, most would continue to volunteer to attend a meeting to discuss potential revisions. The suggestion was to add language that would allow the Chair to call a meeting (if needed) both before and after the end of the MOU in 2012. Many felt that it was important for the Councils’ work to be funded long-term.

There was consensus from the Council to include language allowing the Chair to call a meeting of the Council between planning processes to review and discuss any issues that are relevant to the Council, including Plan Revisions.

Ashley provided an overview of the significant events currently identified in the draft plan that could trigger a re-evaluation of the plan.

Ham recommended including agriculture into the first bullet point (in addition to energy generation or military facilities). It was requested that the Plan also list changes related to the Judge Magnuson’s ruling and other potential major political or judicial decision as events that might trigger an update.

6) WaterFirst Program and DCA Roles for Implementation

Denion gave an overview of the DCA WaterFirst program. The WaterFirst program is both an incentive and recognition program for communities with strong and comprehensive water programs. She provided an overview of the application process and highlighted some of the programs that have helped communities earn this recognition. Communities that are not designated as WaterFirst but have strong potential, may be admitted into a WaterFirst “class”. The “class” participants receive assistance towards becoming designated. Benefits associated with the WaterFirst program include networking, peer-to-peer learning, a 1% interest rate reduction on GEFA loans, annual eligibility for DCA’s Community Development Block Grant

funds, priority for 319 grant funds, road signage, and publicity. The designation is renewed every 5 years with an MOA. She showed a list of existing designated communities and communities currently enrolled in the “class”. There has been low participation from the MOC and Denion encouraged more participation. Only Lamar County had applied in the past.

7) Suggestions for Schedule Extension

Ashley provided suggestions for use of the additional time from the schedule extension and asked the Council for comments and additional suggestions.

- Conduct additional public outreach to local governments
- Coordinate with the Metro Water District
- Refine the recommendations to the State on instream flow study
- Refine recommendations on future Council role (beyond February 2012)
- Recommend a project for the available 319 grant set-aside for the region

Farrell stated that the Council needs to endorse a specific project. Since there are several potential ideas (Eva Persons mentioned a potential idea for Monroe County), they should submit a description of each project(s) for the Council’s consideration and then the Council can evaluate. He clarified that it would be a \$167,000 project with \$100,000 federal grant and \$67,000 local fund match. The usual deadline for 319 grant applications is November 30th, but the Regional Water Planning Project has been given additional time and can be submitted no later than January 31, 2011.

8) Local Elected Official and Public Comments

No comments.

9) Wrap Up/ Next Meeting

Upcoming Schedule:

- Written comments on draft plan due to PC by January 14th
- Council will review Final Draft at CM10 (early February 2011) – council members asked to avoid the last week of January
- Council to submit an Initial Recommended Plan March 2011
- 45 day comment period to start May 9th, 2011
- Final plan to Council – Sept 9th, 2011
- Final Recommended Regional Water Plan due no later than Sept 30th, 2011

Elmo thanked everyone for their persistence, dedication, commitment, and continued attendance at the meeting. Other Councils have struggled with attendance, but the great participation of our Council will lead to a really strong plan. Elmo urged the Council members to submit comments.

Ham thanked Ashley and Su for getting the preliminary draft plan to the Council in advance of the holidays.

The Go Fish Center staff offered a tour of the facility.

The meeting was adjourned at 2pm.

Meeting Attendees

Council Members in attendance

John Bembry

Jason Briley

Ben Copeland Jr.

Keith Dalton

Robert Dickey

Jim Ham

William Lazenby

Larry McSwain

Harvey Norris

Eva Persons

Barry Peters

Elmo Richardson

Tony Rojas

William Whitten

Thomas Wicker

Council Members not in attendance

Russ Adams

Tony Bass

Blair Cleveland

Jerry Davis

Richard Haddock

Bobby Hamby

Charlie Harris

Gator Hodges

Paul Leath

Jay Matthews

Hal Newberry

Robert Ray

Terry Scarborough

Staff in attendance

Kevin Farrell (EPD)

David Ashley (Jacobs JJG)

Tai-Yi Su (Jacobs JJG)

Charlotte Weber (Jacobs JJG)

Kimberly Shorter (AECOM)

Technical Sub-Committee in attendance

Mark Wyzalek (Macon Water Authority)

Mike Hopkins (Newton County Water and Sewerage Authority)

Marcie Seleb (Butts County Water and Sewerage Authority)

Partnering Agencies and General Public

*Adriane Wood (Department of Community Affairs - DCA)

*Jimmy Evans (Georgia DNR Wildlife Resources)

Cliff Bowden (Georgia Farm Bureau)

Don McGough (Georgia Farm Bureau)

*Deatre Denion (Georgia Department of Community Affairs)

*Frank Green (Georgia Forestry Commission)

*Bill Stembridge (Regional Representative for Senator Saxby Chambliss)

*Karol Kelly (UGA – Extension)

Leo Gilmour (City of Perry)

Tres Thomas (City of Covington)

Les Ager

Jarrell Greene

Chris Petersen

**Indicates attendee represented a partnering agency*