

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

November 19, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council Members

FROM: David Ashley, Tai-Yi Su, and Clay Zielinski
JJG Jacobs

SUBJECT: Council Meeting 8 Summary
Middle Ocmulgee Water Planning Council

CC: Kevin Farrell, Ted Hendrickx, GA EPD
Charlotte Weber, JJG/Jacobs

Georgia Comprehensive Statewide Water Management Plan Middle Ocmulgee Regional Water Plan

Meeting Date: November 4, 2010
Location: Macon Water Authority, Amerson Water Treatment Facility

1) Welcome and Introduction

Council Chairman Richardson welcomed the group. Chairman Richardson thanked everyone for their participation and Tony Rojas for the use of the Amerson Water Treatment Facility. Chairman Richardson also recognized Council member Gator Hodges for being included in Georgia Trend Magazine's "40 Under 40" listing.

2) Technical Subcommittee Update

Chairman Richardson stated that since Council Meeting 7, the technical subcommittee has been working very hard through meetings and conference calls to review the management practices and draft plan sections. Chairman Richardson recognized all subcommittee members by name, and asked subcommittee members Russell Adams and Mark Wyzalek to give a summary of the work that is being done. The Chairman also asked that Vice Chair Ben Copeland give a brief update on the Joint Council Meeting held October 6th in Macon.

Russell Adams explained that the technical subcommittee has held three conference calls since the previous Council meeting. Almost immediately after the Council had ranked the initial list of

management practices, EPD published “Detailed Guidance for Managing Demand (water conservation guidance) with specific guidance on regional selection of water conservation goals and practices. A conference call was held on September 29th to discuss this document, and the subcommittee requested additional time to review the water conservation guidance.

On October 7th, a second conference call was held to review tiered conservation practices by sector. During this call, the conservation goals and practices were discussed and revised based on the guidance provided by EPD. Representatives from municipal, industrial, and agricultural water sectors spoke as to which practices were most appropriate for the Middle Ocmulgee Region and these practices were documented by the planning contractor. A supplemental document (technical memorandum) to the regional plan will document the suite of practices recommended by the Council.

A third conference call was held on October 13th to review sections 6 and 7 of the draft regional water plan. An implementation schedule for the management practices was included in Section 7. This schedule was a surprise to the subcommittee as EPD was requiring specific dates for initial, short-term and long-term implementation of management practices based on the EPD template. The subcommittee asked not to assign time frames to practices that may or may not apply and recommended that there be no schedule for voluntary practices. Accordingly, Section 7 was revised by the planning contractor and submitted to EPD on October 15th. Chairman Richardson expressed concern that guidance is being given by EPD after decisions have been made, and this caused extra time and work. He also noted that the Council is working through these issues and meeting deadlines.

Vice Chair Copeland spoke on the Joint Council Meeting held on October 6th. He noted that the meeting was informative with several discussion panels, but didn’t seem to be a “working” session. Several other Councils have gaps and jointly owned gaps between regions that will require coordination. One such region is southwest Georgia (Lower Flint Region) where agriculture use is very large and there is a significant gap. However, the panel members mentioned that even when all agricultural withdrawals were eliminated, it would only cover approximately half of the predicted gap. Copeland stated that the “take- away” from the Joint Meeting is that the Middle Ocmulgee Region is in fairly good shape.

Chairman Richardson agreed that Middle Ocmulgee Region is fortunate to be in good shape. The only perceived gap that will really need to be addressed is in dealing with wastewater (water quality).

One Council member asked how many changes we are getting from EPD, and how much more work is required to deal with these changes. Chairman Richardson responded that it is not very significant, mostly restructuring and rewording and that all Councils will need to use similar language and structure.

Ashley provided an overview of what would be discussed in this Council meeting. The statewide energy forecast was just received and will be introduced. The submittal of sections 6 and 7, addressing how to meet potential gaps, will be reviewed. There needs to be a discussion on where the Council goes beyond the initial 3-year appointment (term to expire February 2012).

Section 8, dealing with how to evaluate progress (benchmarking) will be discussed. Finally, Charlotte Weber will discuss additional outreach moving forward.

3) Statewide Energy Forecast

Tai-Yi Su gave a presentation on the Energy Forecast which has just been completed and was received on October 29th. EPD established an ad hoc group that was comprised of major power companies in the state in order to help with data collection and to give technical guidance. The base year for this forecast is 2005 in order to be consistent with municipal and industrial forecasting. The analysis was statewide and only contains regional information through 2017.

There are a total of 16 thermoelectric facilities in Georgia withdrawing a total of over 2.7 billion gallons per day. Only 7% of this withdrawal is consumptive loss (approximately 187 million gallons per day (MGD)), and the rate of consumption for facilities depend on their respective processes. This list is comprised of thermoelectric facilities only, as hydroelectric withdrawals are not consumptive. Su pointed out Plant Scherer on a map showing all existing facilities and commented that while Georgia Power operated Plant Scherer, 4 to 5 companies have joint ownership of the plant. Thomas Wicker commented that Georgia Power owns less than 50% of Plant Scherer. Su reviewed the different power generation processes and stated that the trend is for more recirculated cooling water processes in the future (which withdraw less water than once-through cooling, but consume a higher percentage). The primary reason for switching to cooling towers is to eliminate the heat load that once-through cooling introduces to streams.

One Council member asked how much water power plants lose (consumptive use). Su noted that it depended on the plant, but that Plant Scherer withdraws approximately 60 MGD and returns about 25 MGD. This loss is through cooling, and does not include evaporation over Lake Juliette.

In order to forecast water demand, an average withdrawal (and consumption) quantity in gallons per Megawatt-hour was calculated to get an average withdrawal (and consumption) factor for each process. Those calculations were reviewed and found to be consistent with national studies. From here, baseline and alternative scenarios were forecasted with the alternative being a high growth scenario. These scenarios relied heavily on the population projections provided by the Office of Planning and Budget.

Council members Ham and Peters asked about the accuracy of the projection. Su noted that there are too many variables to give a definite level of accuracy beyond what is planned through 2017 (there is available permit data and a level of comfort as to what plants are coming on and going off line through 2017). The bottom line is that these projections are based on the best available data and reasonable assumptions.

Ham asked if Georgia Power has any reluctance using the population data. Wicker stated that all power companies were involved in putting this together and all use the same data, so they feel as comfortable as they can. With power, it depends on where these people move to, and looking beyond 2017 becomes increasingly harder to do.

Rojas stated that there are locations that are better suited for power generation (proximity to gas mains, transmission centers), and asked if the state should be looking in those locations for water availability. Su commented that power generation facilities are usually located near population centers or future growth centers, and that some assumptions need to be made regionally as to the impact on water resources.

Robert Dickey added that no major power plants have been built over the past 25 years or so, but that will change as capacities at these facilities are reached. Thomas added that the types of plants and regulations will need to be looked at as well when discussing the location of future plants and their impact on water.

Su stated that from 2021 through 2050, an addition of 1,000 megawatts is predicted to be needed annually. Ham asked what the increase has been over the past three years. Su pointed out from the graph that it looks pretty consistent with the 1,000 megawatt per year number. Ham asked how much of this additional power generation will be used for Georgia versus the southeastern region in general. Thomas noted that the vast majority stays in Georgia.

Wicker also discussed that power facility planning must be done based on peak loading (the hottest days of the year when energy demand is highest) rather than average demand. Chairman Richardson commented that the same is done for municipal water demand. Wyzalek asked how much of the projected increase is for base load and how much is for peak loading. Su commented that the data is not that specific. We can contact the planning contractor who developed the forecast to see how they included base and peak loading data.

Su spoke about renewable energy in Georgia. For the forecast, only 1% of power needs are assumed to be met by non-biomass and non-hydro by 2030. Current trends indicate that biomass is the only potentially significant renewable energy in Georgia. She then went on to talk about overall withdrawal and consumption projections through 2050. In addition to current facilities and currently planned facilities (based on air permit applications at EPD) through 2020, the 2050 forecast includes an unassigned consumptive use ranging from 170 MGD (baseline additional capacity scenario) to 189 MGD (alternative additional capacity scenario). Because there is no geographic information available beyond 2020, the 170 MGD forecasted consumptive use (baseline scenario) is statewide and no locations have been assigned in the forecast.

Ham asked when the numbers will be assigned. Su noted that if the Council had additional information or would like to request future modeling runs with additional demand for power generation, they could do so.

Wicker spoke to the way Georgia Power plans. There is a process under the Public Service Commission (PSC) that every 3 years an integrated public resource plan is developed to estimate future energy needs for the state. This plan is reviewed by the PSC for approval. When working on these plans, a 10-year planning horizon is used. In the certification process they must submit requests for proposals for anyone who wishes to build, and there is a right for independent producers to come in. This process has been in place since the 1970's and has worked well to meet the growing needs of the state. The last plan has just been finished, so the next plan may provide an opportunity to update the forecast and the plan.

Whitten asked if anyone is doing research on nuclear power plants, and how that could change water needs. Wicker stated that there are currently 2 nuclear plants (Vogtle and Hatch), and that Plant Vogtle has been approved for 2 additional units that will add around 2,000 megawatts of additional capacity. Because of the lead time of construction, those additions won't begin operation until 2016 and 2017. There is typically a long lead time from approval to operation, so while all alternatives are being looked at, forecasting beyond 2017 is not possible.

Su again stated that the Council can request additional model runs for new scenarios (adding additional power production) to evaluate potential gaps. The potential issue with asking for these theoretical scenarios is that the results may not come back in time for the January plan submittal. The other option is to use the known 2020 values and update the next water plan with newer energy water forecast in five years. The planning contractor feels reasonably comfortable that there will not be an additional gap for the range of 2020 consumptive use under either baseline or alternative scenarios.

Ham asked about the water needs of the municipal, industrial, and agriculture sectors, how much excess regional water is available. Chairman Richardson stated that if we put all of the demand information together it doesn't look like there are any gaps. Copeland added that Dr. Kennedy is revising the groundwater (Cretaceous aquifer) model and whether there is a gap depends on what the revised yield would be. Ashley stated that while the surface water availability model allows us to view potential gaps, it does not give a picture of total water available in a given region. The only way to test how much water is available is to run different modeling scenarios with higher demand. Farrell added that direct impacts on surface water flow are more of a concern if the withdrawal is coming from a river rather than a reservoir. For example, Plant Scherer takes water from Lake Juliette, so there is not much impact on low flows of the Ocmulgee River. The Council can recommend that future consumptive use would have to come from storage rather than on-stream.

3) Review of the Regional Plan

a) Major EPD Comments

Ashley discussed the review comments from EPD. The planning contractor is working on revising sections 1-5. The major EPD comments for Sections 1-5 were to coordinate with major stakeholders and governments and get public outreach comments, as well as to strengthen the linkages between the management practices and the Council's vision and goals (not just to use the practices to fill gaps).

For sections 6-7, a draft was submitted on October 15th. The subcommittee did a lot of work and Ashley thanked the committee. The major comments received from EPD included:

- Adoptability: The regional water plans needs to follow the process of various planning guidance issued by EPD;
- Gaps need to be filled or addressed;
- Use stronger language where gaps were identified and include management practices to address the gaps;

- More geographic specificity (such as north or south of Fall Line, county or sub-watershed) and more explanations and clarity on management practices;
- An implementation schedule/timeline needs to be included; and,
- Prioritization of management practices and recommendations to the State.

b) Discussion on Gaps and Sections 6 and 7

Ashley commented that there are several supplemental documents available, and that many of these documents provide county-specific information that is being used for planning. He asked for everyone to please continue to review information for their respective county and provide feedback when necessary.

Rojas asked if the plan looked at gaps for specific counties and municipalities, and if not, then where the gaps are. Ashley responded for surface water availability resource assessment, there are no gaps at planning nodes in or below the Middle Ocmulgee Region. For groundwater, there may be a gap, but it is spread across the state and is not specific to any region. Also, Dr. Kennedy is in the process of revising the groundwater model and it looks as though more water may be available.

The Surface Water Quality Resource Assessment does show that there are potential assimilative capacity gaps, particularly in area south of the Fall Line. However, these are model results based on full permitted load conditions and 2050 flow projections, and are not “real world” discharge conditions, so assessments of streams in these areas may be needed in order to determine if treatment capacity or level needs to be upgraded. Additionally, as the Region grows some rural counties will continue to rely on septic systems, and management practices will likely be needed for operation and maintenance of septic tanks.

Ashley discussed addressing potential water quality gaps; specifically, the potential need to add physical capacity in some areas and higher levels of treatment in others. Actual modeling results are not facility-specific, but more on the level of knowing that certain areas may have potential assimilative capacity or nutrient issues. More monitoring may be needed to get actual water quality condition data before investing in higher levels of wastewater treatment. There is a need for local level master plans in both water and wastewater areas, but particularly in wastewater where there are potential gaps. More detailed and specific local plans will assist in making good decisions on how to manage gaps at the local level.

Rojas asked about the slide shown by Ashley - that while there are dates for capacity needs, there are no dates on treatment upgrades. Su stated that the treatment gaps were for 2050, and that capacity shortfalls begin around 2020 and 2030 for some counties. The timeline was estimated to show the relative urgency of predicted capacity shortfalls.

Copeland asked if the results for Peach County take into account the upgrades in Ft. Valley, and the fact that the Macon Water Authority will soon be serving northern Peach County. Su stated that the map showing the results is meant to show when planning needs to occur, and also that there may be some existing plans (along the lines of the changes in Peach County) that EPD is unaware of, and therefore were not included in the model assumptions. Local entities are

encouraged to evaluate what's happening locally and make sure that EPD is made aware of any decisions so that these results can be as accurate as possible.

Rojas asked if the wastewater treatment gaps were mainly due to problems areas north of the region. Ashley stated that he did not believe that was the case, because the gaps were south of Lake Jackson, where flow is regulated. Rojas then asked how there would not have gaps currently and what causes the future gaps. Su commented that the modeling is based on projected population growth, and that the water quality assessment is based on estimated 2050 loadings, so that if all modeling predictions were to occur during critical conditions (when streams are lower due to droughts or increased withdrawals) this could have negative effects on water quality.

Ashley also noted that non-point source pollution is an issue, so management practices will be needed to address this. He showed a slide of impaired water and estimated stream miles of assessed conditions based on various water quality parameters (biota, DO, fecal coliform, etc.)

Ashley discussed master planning guidance for wastewater as well as monitoring guidance. For monitoring, Ashley reiterated that the results shown are from model predictions and not real data. The way to find out what actually needs to be done is to do monitoring and develop better data. Monitoring also helps to determine if the management practices and guidelines in watershed protection plans are working.

Rojas commented that the 5-year recommendation for master plan updates may be too frequent in areas with no growth. He suggested the interval be revised to every 5-10 years depending on conditions and development levels. Ham asked where funding for these master plans would be coming from. Ashley stated that it would be from local governments.

Wyzalek stated that EPD had been doing plans on a 5-year cycle, and that part of that was monitoring, modeling and giving results on water quality. He asked if there was any thought of EPD starting that back up. Kevin stated that the basin management plans had been a one-time effort, and had been replaced by the regional water planning process. He noted that the state will continue to spend \$1-2 million annually on monitoring.

Ashley reviewed water quantity and quality issues for the region and potential management practices to address these issues. He also reviewed the background of the "Detailed Guidance for Managing Demand" and stated that there will be a DNR Board rule-making process by June 2011 regarding SB370 (Water Stewardship Act) and State Water Plan.

Seleb asked whether the watershed water quality monitoring that is being done on a local basis (required by EPD for plant upgrade or expansion), as well as new regulations are going to be put in any kind of unified database. Ferrell commented that EPD receives data in many ways and formats, and is working on organizing these data so they will be available on their website for communities to enter data and view data from all areas.

Rojas asked about long term water quality monitoring and wastewater master planning and why they needed to be moved up in priority. Ashley noted that the latest results from the Water

Quality Resource Assessment were not available when the initial list of management practices was ranked in Council Meeting 7; they were ranked lower in priority by the Council at the last meeting. We have better understanding of the implications of the resource assessment now and recommend that the Council consider moving these two water quality practices up in priority.

Ashley discussed Section 7.1 (Table 7-1 Implementation Steps) and Section 7.4 (Recommendations to the State). These two sub-sections have been submitted as drafts to EPD. Rojas commented that the demand management tiers make sense for management practices, but implementation timelines will be different for different areas or entities; so we shouldn't include the same dates for every management practice. He commented that time is not the driving factor, rather criteria and conditions. Certain practices may be required based on the conditions that exist in any given area. He suggested that this be considered by all Councils and for all regional plans throughout the state.

Ashley commented that the technical subcommittee raised the same concerns. In the first draft for committee review, the planning contractor included timelines associated with initial, intermediate, and long-term implementation actions. The subcommittee commented on the language of Table 7-1 and the timeline was taken out when submitted to EPD. EPD has come back and said there needs to be some sort of time frame for implementation. A major job this Council now has is to come back and look at how to implement timelines in a meaningful way.

Wyzalek asked if there was a specific requirement that we show a schedule. He commented that the Council may have to put it in the plan, but perhaps it could be addressed in different ways for different management practices. Ashley confirmed that there was language in the State Water Plan and in the Planning Guidance to include implementation schedules. Rojas expressed the need for guidance from EPD or the planning contractor to help to explain that conditions affect the time requirements and that the timelines should be flexible based on those conditions.

Su stated that we have been trying really hard to work within the 40-page limit constraints, which have recently been softened by EPD. This may give an opportunity to provide additional explanation or specificity on certain conditions and how management practices will be implemented. The planning contractor will be working in this direction and try to tie management practices to conditions.

Chairman Richardson noted that funds were available in GEFA but a substantial portion was taken out with the securitization of loans. Funding is a difficult issue, and the GEFA board is trying to address this now.

Wyzalek asked what the logic is behind the recommending additional monitoring and studies at Lake Jackson but not for downstream areas. Ashley responded that Lake Jackson nutrient issue is a multi-regional issue involving a number of local governments and planning districts (Middle Ocmulgee and Metro District), it is best handled at a state level. Su added that EPD's goal is to have watershed models for all watersheds in the state, and the reason Lake Jackson made the list is because the resource assessment showed a potential nutrient (nitrogen) loading issue in Lake Jackson and in the watershed above Lake Jackson. The Council can recommend other areas of the region for additional monitoring and modeling.

Ham asked that if the Council is making decision on long term funding, can it recommend the state be required to pay for all funding. Chairman Richardson mentioned that there are loans available through GEFA, but Ham specifically asked about grants because these are waters of the state. Ashley asked for written suggestions from the Council on how to deal with funding.

4) Section 8 – Monitoring and Reporting Progress

Ashley discussed benchmarking as required in the Regional Water Plan planning guidance. Benchmarks are defined as specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-phased methods of measuring progress toward goals.

Ashley stated that the Council's current 3-year term ends in February 2012 and that there are no provisions in the State-wide Water Management Plan for interim activity or responsibilities (after June 30, 2011). The Councils may recommend how they would operate between plan updates. EPD may reconvene water Council leadership after the election to form recommendations to the Governor/Lt. Governor/Speaker of the House.

Chairman Richardson stated that the planning contractor has been contracted to provide consulting support to the Council only through June of 2011, and asked where the resources would come from to keep things rolling beyond that time. He expressed the need to recommend funds additional State funding for EPD in order to carry out this process, and that the recommendation needs to be put in the plan.

Farrell mentioned that other Councils are also talking about different ways to organize beyond the June 30, 2011 contract. The door is open as to how the Councils may operate. The expectation is for the Council to recommend a Regional Water Plan to EPD, and that going forward if the Plan is updated or amended, the new Plan would also be recommendations from the Council. How to accomplish this has not been laid out, and no money has been set aside.

Ashley discussed several organization and funding examples, including the Metro North Georgia Water Planning District model, South Carolina 208 Water Quality Management Plan model, a non-profit organization model, as well as an alternative inter-governmental agreement model. He mentioned that both the Savannah-Upper Ogeechee and Coosa North Georgia Councils have discussed creating a permanent body. The Savannah-Upper Ogeechee Council had discussed forming a permanent basin-wide body that would also include counties in South Carolina in the Savannah River basin. There are actually interests (existing regional organizations) competing to lead the Coosa - North Georgia Council.

Briley asked if there was any thought toward this being the beginnings of water management districts as is the case in Florida, as well as when recommendations are needed to be provided from the Council. Ashley expressed that no one is advocating for the water management district model. Florida's water management districts are legislatively controlled and collect taxes and issue permits in coordination with the state Department of Environmental Protection. Currently, there is no vision for our Councils to morph into that kind of body. As to when recommendations are needed, the planning contractor will have a draft of the complete report to

Council by next month, so any suggestions over the next few weeks would be helpful.

Briley suggested the Council discuss options now, and suggested asking local governments to ask Regional Commissions to be facilitators. Adriane Wood (Department of Community Affairs) commented that this Council's boundary crosses three regional commissioners, and the water Council boundaries are not the same as regional commissions. Chairman Richardson suggested intergovernmental agreements between the Middle Ocmulgee counties and funding through GEFA to provide a facilitator and hold meetings. The Council could establish a budget and meet periodically to review the progress of the plan until it is time for the update.

Ham commented that if the Council went that route, funding would be necessary and agreed with using GEFA to meet that need. Chairman Richardson explained the four types of GEFA funding sources and thought that money would probably need to be requested from the Georgia Fund.

Briley commented that using Regional Commissions may be an easier way to go. There were discussions that this could be an issue of unfunded mandates and that the way to get in front of that would be to begin now asking EPD to help local governments put in place regulations to make developers help pay for the plan.

Chairman Richardson commented that the potential problem of using Regional Commissions is the overlap as stated earlier. He suggested another route, namely to ask the Legislature to make continuing appropriations to take the Council beyond the June 30th deadline, and again recommended that funding could possibly come through GEFA.

Ashley continued going through various benchmarking examples. Ham suggested considering adding sites for additional reservoirs as a measurement tool. Ashley asked the Council to send any other suggestions of benchmarks to the planning contractor. Farrell asked if there is nothing negative heard about a benchmark, is it likely that they will appear in the plan? Ashley confirmed that it probably would and noted that there is still brainstorming occurring on this section.

Ashley discussed Section 7.2 of the plan, and how cost implications may be addressed for management practices. Because of the low level of detail in the plans, costs are likely to be given in unit costs such as dollars per capita or dollars per gallon rather than in total costs.

Ashley reviewed the supplemental document list to show the Council what technical work has been completed and to let Council members know that it will be available to everyone. Su commented that some of these documents have been sent to the Council members as pre-meeting materials and asked Council members to continue to review the data and let us know of possible changes, errors or omissions.

Ashley discussed the proposed Plan completion and future meeting schedule as summarized below:

- Subcommittee Meetings in November
- Complete Draft Plan for Council Review - Dec 8, 2010
- Council Meeting 9 (mid-December)

- Subcommittee Meetings in January as needed
- Council Meeting 10 (mid-January)
- Final Draft to EPD – January 31, 2011
- Public Comment Begins – February 7, 2011 (45 days)
- Plan Revision – March to June 2011
- Council Meeting (May or June) as needed
- Plan Adoption – on or before June 30, 2011

The Council decided to hold the next Council meeting on **Monday, December 13th**. There will be a subcommittee meeting coming up soon, and notice will be sent to all Council members. *(Note that this meeting has since been scheduled for November 18th.)*

5) Public Outreach

Weber discussed public outreach efforts that have been completed to date. All meetings have been open to the public with public notices being posted through the website and through emails. The regional water plan website contains information dealing with meeting materials and meeting minutes. Meeting notices have been sent to local governments contact lists provided to us via Georgia Municipal Association (GMA) and Association County Commissioners of Georgia (ACCG). Ashley has twice presented information at local civic organizations such as rotary clubs, as have Chairman Richardson and Council member McSwain. Several planning conferences have included water plan representatives. Press releases have also been made to get the word out. The planning contractor has contacted many utilities directly for water use surveys and to get feedback on demand forecasts.

Weber presented the idea of creating invitations to editors of media outlets to attend the December or January meetings. She suggested that a letter be sent by Chairman Richardson personally asking media outlets to attend could be helpful. Chairman Richardson suggested including members of radio and TV stations as well. Weber asked that Council members add names to the current media list if they know of any, as we need to personally invite them.

Other outreach ideas discussed included presenting the water plan at local events and functions and to get schools involved. March 22nd is World Water Day, which would be a good day to promote the plan if possible.

Wood suggested adding an insert into water bills. Rojas suggested adding information in local newsletters - perhaps Georgia Power's. He also suggested that local elected officials who work with GMA and ACCG to put notices on the web and into newsletters. Chairman Richardson suggested giving a summary or a one-page press release to counties and local governments to put on their websites.

Wicker noted that the Georgia Economic Development Association should know what is going on for all of the Councils, and suggested inviting members of the association to future Council meetings. Weber asked for any other suggestions to be submitted to her as soon as possible so they can be added to the list of possible opportunities.

6) Elected Official and Public Comments: None.

7) Wrap Up

Chairman Richardson stated that this was a very productive meeting, a lot of ground was covered, and that there is still a long way to go over the next 2 months. The technical subcommittee is looking to hold 1-2 meetings over the next month. These meetings are open to anyone on the Council, and notice will be given for all subcommittee meetings. Participation and suggestions are welcome and helpful. Chairman Richardson thanked Rojas again for the use of the Amerson Water Treatment Facility for the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 2 pm.

Summary of Action Items

1. Check with CDM (EPD's consultant for energy forecast) over peaking/baseload data assumptions for energy forecasts.
2. Confirm that no action is needed for for additional future modeling run requests for the unassigned energy water demands.
3. Outreach to public and local governments - council members to provide list of media reps for contact, local elected officials to work with GMA and ACCG to put notices in their newsletters and on websites, PC to prepare 1-page summary document/press release to be provided to local governments to use on their websites, radio, media etc. by end of November.

Meeting Attendees

Council Members in attendance

Russ Adams	Paul Leath
Jason Briley	Larry McSwain
Blair Cleveland	Hal Newberry
Ben Copeland Jr.	Barry Peters
Robert Dickey	Robert Ray
Richard Haddock	Elmo Richardson
Jim Ham	Tony Rojas
Charlie Harris	William Whitten
Gator Hodges	Thomas Wicker
William Lazenby	

Council Members not in attendance

Tony Bass
John Bembry
Keith Dalton
Jerry Davis
Bobby Hamby
Jay Matthews
Harvey Norris

Eva Persons
Terry Scarborough

Staff in attendance

Kevin Farrell (EPD)
Ted Hendrickx (EPD)
David Ashley (Jacobs JIG)
Tai-Yi Su (Jacobs JIG)
Charlotte Weber (Jacobs JIG)
Clay Zielinski (Jacobs JIG)

Technical Sub-Committee in attendance

Mark Wyzalek (Macon Water Authority)
Mike Hopkins (Newton County Water and Sewerage Authority)
Marianne Golmitz (City of Warner Robin)
Marcie Seleb (Butts County Water and Sewerage Authority)

Partnering Agencies and General Public

Greg Popham (Forsyth City Manager)
*Adriane Wood (Department of Community Affairs - DCA)
*Jimmy Evans (Georgia DNR Wildlife Resources)
*Frank Green (Georgia Forestry Commission)
*Bill Stembridge (Regional Representative for Senator Saxby Chambliss)
*Skip Langley (Regional Representative for Senator Johnny Isakson)
*Kristi Harpst (Middle Georgia Regional Commission)
Lorraine Campagne (Woodard and Curran)
**Indicates attendee represented a partnering agency*