



B&V Project 164139
B&V File C-1.4
April 18, 2011

To: Upper Flint Water Planning Council

From: Kristin Rowles, GWPPC and Robert Osborne, Black & Veatch

cc: Tim Cash, Assistant Branch Chief, GA EPD

Subject: Meeting Summary: Council Meeting 10 on April 14, 2011

The council meeting was held on April 14, 2011 at Lake Blackshear. The list of attendees is attached. In addition to these minutes, all the presentations (slides) discussed in this meeting will be posted on the Upper Flint web portal (<http://www.upperflint.org/>).

Welcome, Introductions and Chairman's discussion

Chairman Chase started the meeting with an invocation. Chairman Chase thanked Buddy Leger and the Crisp County Power Commission for providing breakfast. Chairman Chase next thanked the members of the Council for their role in the process, and he said that this is a model for how government should work. Council member Mike Beres thanked Chairman Chase for his contribution.

Next, Chairman Chase asked the Council to approve the meeting minutes from the Council's last meeting. Vice-Chairman Dick Morrow made a motion to approve the minutes, and they were approved by consensus. Next, Chairman Chase asked for consideration of the meeting agenda. The agenda was adopted by consensus.

Plan Process/Timeline

Kristin reviewed the following revised milestone schedule:

<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Milestone</u>
April 14, 2011	Council Meeting 10
Late April, 2011	Production of Final Plan/Plan Review Committee (if needed)
May 2, 2011	Recommended Plan to GA EPD
May-July 2011	Public Notice of Draft Plan

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

August 2011

Final Production of Adopted WDCP

September 30, 2011

GA EPD Approves Upper Flint Regional
WDCP

Overview of Plan Revisions

Kristin Rowles referred to the April 7th review draft of the plan. She said that changes in this draft included: minor edits (such as grammar or formatting), references, revisions based on decisions at the last council meeting, and revisions based on committee work since the last council meeting. She said that the committee work related changes would be discussed in committee reports. She said that the Council could make changes today as needed during the meeting, and if necessary, follow-up by the Plan Review Committee next week is possible.

Next, Kristin reviewed major changes in each of the sections:

Sections 1 & 2

- New maps in Sections 1 and 2
- Clarifying notes and references
- Section 2, Page 2-4: 2006 Flint Plan clarification. Kristin said that this change, requested by EPD, clarified that the 2006 Flint Plan and this plan will be implemented together.
- Will add reference to Council meeting summaries

Section 3

- Page 3-1 to 3-3: clarification on what is included in various forecasts
- Section 3.1:
 - Clarifying language on models
 - Statement of Council position on model assumptions for upstream reservoirs (page 3-5) [from last Council meeting]
- Section 3.2.2: Groundwater models were recalibrated, results will be discussed in the Water Quantity committee report later today [recommended by committee]
- Section 3.2.3: Discussion of nutrient modeling results [reviewed by Water Quality Committee; recommendations today]
- Section 3.3.1: Figure 3-6 – New impaired waters graphic
- Section 3.3.2 – Revisions proposed from Plan Review and Water Quality Committees based on Division of Wildlife Resources' comments

Section 4

- Section 4.3: clarification on what is included in agricultural water use forecasts

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

- Section 4.4: Thermoelectric Power Production Water Demand Forecasts – revised [reviewed by Water Quantity – recommend adoption (with modification)]

Section 5

- Section 5.2: New groundwater results; more explanation of meaning of results [recommended by committee]
- Section 5.3: Discussion of nutrient modeling results [reviewed by Water Quality Committee; recommendations today]
- Section 5.4 (page 5-6): Surface water and groundwater availability sections revised for consistency with other changes and from committee review

Section 6: Table 6-1

- Order of management practices and noting priority practices
- SF1 wording in description [Water Quantity Committee]
- Moved former WQ5 to Section 7.4 (coordination with other councils) [Plan Review Committee]

Section 6.2

- Page 6-10, last paragraph: revisions to address gap discussion and storage need [Water Quantity Committee; recommendation today]
- Page 6-11: New paragraph on water conservation – credit for prior implementation [last Council meeting]

Section 7

- Table 7-1: Implementation Schedule
- Table 7-2: Cost Estimates for Implementation
- Section 7.4:
 - Information needs: 5th bullet [W. Qual.], 7th bullet [W. Quant], last bullet [W. Qual.], nutrient modeling [forthcoming]
 - Water policy: 1st, 3rd, and 4th bullet points [last Council meeting], last three bullet points [Plan Review Committee]
 - Coordinated Recommendations with Neighboring Councils [last Council meeting]

Section 8

- Table 8-1: Benchmarks
- Section 8.4: Conclusion – emphasis on need to continue regional planning process [Plan Review Committee]
-

Executive Summary and Supplemental Document

- Executive Summary to be developed next week

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

- Supplemental documents cited in plan and available on Upper Flint Council website

Kristin provided a list of the supplemental documents as a hand-out. She said that these would be available on the Council website soon, and if any Council members would like to review any of these documents before then, let her know.

Vice-Chairman Morrow said in a recent GMA meeting he promoted the continuation of the regional water planning process, and he said that he believes there is support to continue the process. Council member Beth English said that because the council members were political appointees, they can help make this process more visible to the proper channels. Council member Buddy Leger said he had heard that the Commissioner of Agriculture was planning to meet with the chairmen of the councils. Michael Beres suggested it would be helpful if Council members reviewed the Upper Flint plan face-to-face with legislative representatives. Council member Randall Starling suggested that the Council should remain active in promoting the plan and should meet again at some point in the future to monitor progress, even without planning contractors. Starling asked if there was anything they would have to do from a legal standpoint to have more meetings. Steve Simpson said the Memorandum of Agreement that the Council signed with EPD says that EPD should be notified.

Kristin explained that the Regional Water Plans will be released for public comment on May 9, 2011. The comment period is expected to be 45 days. She said there is an Internet site for collecting comments on the regional water plans. The new website, for this purpose is called the Public Comment Collection Center (<http://www.gaepdcommentcenter.org>). She said the link will also be available from www.georgiawaterplanning.org. Comments can also be submitted to EPD by mail, fax, and e-mail (see hand-out). She said that the comment website will allow the Council members to see what comments are being made on the plan. Use of the website requires registration. Chairman Chase asked if it was appropriate for council members to make comments. Kristin answered yes.

Next, Council member Lamar Perlis asked the council to consider a change to one of the Council goals. He suggested adding “commercial” to the list of water using sectors in Goal #4 so that it reads:

Manage water resources sustainably through the three “C’s” – conserving, capturing and controlling water – in order to provide for the needs of all water users in the region (agriculture, utilities, residential, commercial, industry, forestry, and recreation).

This revision was approved by the Council by consensus.

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

Water Quantity Committee Report and Recommendations

Council member Cliff Arnett, Chair of Water Quantity Committee, thanked the committee members for their efforts. He said that he has learned a lot about consensus through this process. Council member Buddy Leger thanked Arnett for his commitment and his time.

Arnett said the committee met on March 23, 2011, and the meeting summary for that meeting is in the pre-meeting packet. The committee also met on April 12, 2011. A summary of this meeting was handed out during the meeting. Arnett said that both of these meetings involved discussing outstanding issues and finalizing the draft plan.

First, Arnett explained references in the plan to resources shared with Satilla-Suwannee Council. The Upper Flint shares the Alapaha node in the Suwannee with this neighboring Council. It is referenced on pages 3-5 and 5-2 and in Tables in Sections 6, 7, and 8 in the plan. Pages 50 & 51 of pre-meeting packet are copies of pages in the Suwannee-Satilla plan that reference the Upper Flint Council's management practices that will affect this node. Arnett said the committee approved presentation of shared resources information and recommends adoption (as presented in April 7th review draft). Chairman Chase asked for any more discussion and asked if there was consensus on approving the shared resource language. **The shared resources presentation in the plan was approved by consensus.**

Next, Arnett reviewed new groundwater results in the table below. Arnett said both the Claiborne and Cretaceous aquifers were recalibrated based on more up-to-date use information. He asked Kristin to explain the results. She said that the recalibration was conducted due to the availability of better information. She said that the results provided wider sustainable yield ranges for these aquifers. She explained that the results are a range because the lower end of the range is based on a conservative assumption that use will increase uniformly across the aquifer, while the upper end of the range is based on an assumption of non-uniform increases in use. The non-uniform assumption allows for more use because use can be limited in some areas where adverse impacts are projected by the model while allowing increased use in other parts of the aquifer where adverse impacts are not projected. Section 3 compares the sustainable yield range to current estimates of use, for which there is also a range. The lower end of the range for use estimates includes average year agricultural withdrawals, while the upper end of the range includes dry year agricultural withdrawals. Kristin said that the committee had asked for an improvement of an explanation of the results in the plan text, and the new

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

draft reflects revisions to the explanation to meet this request, as well as the revision to the results themselves. These changes appear in Sections 3.1.1 and Section 5.1.

The council then discussed model limitations. Concern with potential adverse impacts was noted, but Council members also have significant concerns about the accuracy of the models. Arnett said that for him, the answer is adaptive management. As we continue to learn about the system, we can revise the plan.

Chairman Chase asked for any more discussion and if there was consensus on the revisions related to the groundwater results. **The revisions were approved by consensus.**

Next, Arnett reviewed a revision in Section 4.4: Thermoelectric Power Production Water Demand Forecasts. The Committee recommends that addition of a new sentence at the end of this section:

The Upper Flint Council recommends that as a part of water withdrawal permitting decisions for new thermoelectric power production or any other water-intensive industry, a thorough evaluation should be conducted to determine if an adequate and sustainable water supply is available to meet the demands of the new permittee.

Council member Mike Donnelly said that this is consistent with the process a utility would follow in siting a new power plant. Chairman Chase asked for any more discussion and if there was consensus on this language. **The revision to Section 4.4 was approved by consensus.**

Next Arnett, noted a change in text on SF5 in Table 6-1 (page 6-6 of the plan) which changed from: “Addressing the surface water availability gap at Bainbridge may require the addition of storage...” to: “Eliminating the surface water availability gap at Bainbridge will require the addition of storage”. The Committee recommends adopting this revision. Chairman Chase if there was consensus on this language. **The revision was approved by consensus.**

Next, Arnett reviewed several other revisions, including:

- High priority management practices listed 1st in each section in Table 6-1
- After *Surface Water Availability* on page 5-6:
 - Change “Close the gap” to “Address the gap”
 - Added last sentence of same paragraph to note storage needs/recommendation
- Page 8-1, 1st paragraph, line 4: Changed “closing gaps” to “addressing gaps”
- Page 7-15, 7th bullet point: Deleted the last sentence, which read: “Furthermore, the Council recommends the analysis of alternative structural hydraulic measures

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

such as temporary weirs, gates, and/or steps to control river stage and sediment transport and scour at or below Woodruff Dam in order to protect critical habitat.” The Committee recommends adoption of these revisions (as presented in April 7th review draft). Chairman Chase asked if there was any more discussion and if there was consensus on approving this language. **There was no additional discussion on these revisions, and they were approved by consensus.**

Next, Arnett said that the committee recommended new revisions (not reflected in the April 7th review draft) that will present the “gaps” throughout the plan as “modeled gaps” and “gaps identified by the model”. The Committee recommends adoption of this revision. **The revision was approved by consensus.**

Next, Arnett presented the committee’s recommendation on revising how the gap is presented and emphasizing the Council’s storage recommendation. This recommendation revises the plan text on page 6-10 and 6-11 and Note 8 (page 6-10). The Committee discussed these revisions extensively. The Committee recommends changing the last paragraph on page 6-10 to read:

As described above, the Council selected management practices to address its vision and goals and gaps by the resource assessment models. However, the implications of these gaps for other users, in-stream needs, and aquifer health are not fully understood; evaluation is needed to delineate and quantify the impacts of these gaps. Without a more complete understanding of severity of these impacts, the Council would violate its own vision and goals if it were to recommend complete closing of the gaps at this time. The Council's vision and goals call for sustainable management of water resources that ensures that the welfare and needs of the region are met. They call for providing for the needs of all users, while protecting the economy, public health, and natural systems, and they specifically call for protection of the forestry and agricultural sectors of the regional economy. Complete closure of the gaps would require complete cessation of water withdrawals by agriculture in dry periods unless and until offsetting storage or augmentation are implemented. Even with complete cessation of water withdrawal by agriculture in dry periods, the entire gap cannot be closed. The complete cessation of consumptive use would have severe economic impacts for water users in the region, especially agriculture, and the economic impact on the state would be devastating, as well. It would be a major water policy shift with extraordinary implications for the region’s economy and quality of life. Such drastic action is not justified. Construction of large-scale storage or augmentation will close gaps identified by the model. Therefore, it is the Council’s position that the only way to satisfy the modeled gap at Bainbridge is to build one or more reservoirs in the Flint River Basin.

The Committee recommends adoption of these revisions. Council member Raines Jordan asked if the Council was recommending a reservoir on the mainstem of the river. Council

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

member Hays Arnold said that it does not say that. Cliff Arnett said that this wording says that if you do not build new storage in this region, do not talk to us about closing the gap. The gap will be there unless there is new storage. Vice-Chairman Morrow said the Council wants all options on the table and does not favor one reservoir option over another in the plan. He said that while he personally opposes a mainstem reservoir, he can support this statement. Council member Brant Keller said this plan section reinforces the explanation that you cannot close the gap by conservation alone. Buddy Leger said that a reservoir is needed if the gap is to be closed and the wording calls for storage in the Flint River Basin, not Flint River.

Mike Donnelly said that Jordan is correct: some readers will assume that we are supporting a dam on the mainstem of the river. Lamar Perlis asked if it is possible that storage might be needed for reasons other than closing the gap. Dick Morrow said that in this plan, the gap was the reason to recommend storage. Terrell Hudson said that this is a regional plan; a local plan might have other reasons to call for a new reservoir. Hays Arnold said that the region needs to keep its options open and be ready for the worst case scenario. The Council further discussed whether the plan should call for storage for a reason other than the gap. Chairman Chase said that the plan does not preclude building a reservoir for other reasons, but those reasons are not within the purview of the Council and the Council should not overstep its responsibility. Cliff Arnett asked to call the question. Randy Starling reminded the group that it was deciding whether it could live with the plan language as presented. Chairman Chase asked for a vote to ensure that support for these revisions was unanimous. **The Council votes unanimously in favor of the recommended revisions.** It was clarified that the last sentence of the paragraph (ending on page 6-11) should be underlined in the plan.

Water Quality Committee Report and Recommendations

Committee Chair Raines Jordan thanked the Committee Members for their contributions. He said the process has been exciting, thought provoking and educational for him. He also commented about the need to keep this Council together to keep moving forward.

Jordan explained that the committee had two Meetings. The March 7th meeting summary is in the pre-meeting packet (pages 34-41), and the April 7th meeting summary was provided as a hand-out. The committee reviewed the new nutrient model results, discussed outstanding issues and finalizing draft plan, discussed the 319 grant proposal from Two River RC&D, and developed recommendations to Council for today's meeting.

Jordan presented the committee's recommendations to the Council. First, in Section 7.4, the committee suggested a modified Information Need regarding assessment of baseline agricultural BMP implementation (5th bullet point, page 7-15). Revision of this item was

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

referred back to the committee at the last Council meeting. The committee recommends the following revised text:

Conduct a comprehensive assessment of baseline implementation of water conservation and water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) by agricultural producers. The Council recognizes that state and federal agencies have existing programs that measure BMP implementation, but at this time, a comprehensive baseline assessment is lacking. A comprehensive field survey of BMP implementation, such as the one conducted periodically by the forestry industry, would support estimation of potential benefits of future implementation, tracking of implementation progress, and BMP prioritization.

There was no additional discussion on this revision, and it was approved by consensus.

Next, Jordan said the committee suggested a modification to the introductory paragraph under Information Needs (page 7-14) as follows:

Addressing the following information needs would support improved water resources management and future water planning. Implementation of research and assessments to fill these needs will require funding (state, federal, other). Implementing agencies are not indicated here; if funding is identified, qualified researchers from state universities, institutions, and agencies, as well as private sector firms, can fulfill these information needs. As new information becomes available, it should be incorporated into future cycles of this regional water planning process, and the resource assessment models should be modified to reflect up-to-date information as it is developed.

This revision was approved by consensus.

Next, Jordan said the committee added a new bullet point under Information Needs (Section 7.4) regarding use designation:

Evaluate the use designations assigned to stream reaches in the Upper Flint region as a part of the Triennial Review of Georgia Water Quality Standards. This review is intended to ensure that water quality performance criteria reflect actual conditions, in terms of both use and quality.

This revision was approved by consensus.

Next, Jordan explained that revisions to address comments received on Section 3 from the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) had been referred to this committee by the Plan Review Committee. The recommended revisions are presented on in Section 3.3.2

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

page 3-12 of the April 7th review draft. Additionally, the list of rare aquatic species provided by DWR on page 48 of the pre-meeting packet will be added to a supplemental document to the plan. Chairman Chase asked if DWR was aware of the committee's revisions to address their comments and what their reaction was. Kristin said that DWR was aware of the revisions. DWR would have liked to have seen more of their suggestions adopted, but they could live with the revisions. **There was no additional discussion on these revisions, and they were approved by consensus.**

Next, Jordan explained that the committee recommended several revisions to address the new nutrient modeling results. The committee had reviewed the new results and the explanation of the results in Sections 3 and 5 of the plan. The committee discussed several concerns about the model calibration, assumptions, and inputs. The committee recommends the following revisions to address these concerns:

- Page 3-10: Add the following as new 3rd paragraph under Nutrient Modeling:
"The Council received the lake and watershed model results late in the planning process, but in its review of the models and their results, the Council had several concerns about the model assumptions and inputs. See Section 7.4 for a recommendation related to the Council's concerns about the lake and watershed models."
- Add the same paragraph on page 5-4 after 2nd paragraph in Section 5.3
- Add the following as a new information item in Section 7.4:
"The Council recommends a peer review of the lake and watershed water quality assessment models to better understand the methodology as it relates to the output and calibration. Pending the review, the council recommends that the model outputs not be utilized for setting water quality standards in-stream or for any other regulatory purposes including point source permitting in the region."

Committee member Brant Keller commented that the model needs to be improved before it is used for permitting. Cliff Arnett commented that the peer review of the model is recommended. This recommendation is similar to the Council's recommendation on the Water Quantity models, but it goes a bit further in that it recommends that the model results not be used before further review. Arnett confirmed that this is true.

Chairman Chase asked Tim Cash (EPD) to comment on the proposed revisions. Cash said that peer review is a process that is standard for research, but he has some concerns about how it would be implemented in this situation.

The Chairman asked for a vote to assess support for this proposal from the committee. **The Council approved the committee's recommended revisions related to nutrient modeling by unanimous vote.**

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

Jordan explained that Forrest Hill with the Two Rivers RC&D will explain a 319 grant proposal. This proposal would be eligible for a pool of funds set aside by EPD for Council identified 319 projects (nonpoint source). A summary of the project is included on pages 39-41 of pre-meeting packet. Forrest Hill distributed copies of the full proposal as a hand-out.

Forrest Hill explained the project, which will improve dirt and gravel roads in the Upper Flint Region to control sedimentation. The project targets dirt and gravel roads crossing TMDL listed streams in the region. Ten priorities are identified, although other roads can be improved after the needs of the priority targets are addressed. Implementation will include both structural and non-structural Best Management Practices (BMPs). Hill asked for the assistance of Council members in site selection for the project. The project will also provide training for local officials across the state in the Better Back Roads BMPs developed by Two Rivers RC&D.

Brant Keller asked about monitoring requirements for the project. Hill explained that EPD had approved of the project approach; monitoring requirements are limited because the practices to be used are well understood. Cliff Arnett asked if future maintenance would be required of participating local governments. Hill said that 3 years of maintenance is required, but in his experience, counties will keep the maintenance up for much longer. Vice-chairman Morrow said that he had learned a lot from Two Rivers through the Better Back Roads program and that counties should use the Better Back Roads manual as a practical guide.

Raines Jordan said the committee recommends that the Council send a letter of support for this proposal. A sample letter of support was distributed as a hand-out. This letter is necessary for the proposal to be eligible for the special pool of funds. **The Council approved supporting the proposal by consensus.**

Plan Review Committee Report

The Plan Review Committee met on March 29, 2011. A meeting summary is included as pages 42-46 of the pre-meeting packet. The committee reviewed the March 8th review draft of the plan and developed recommendations to Council for today's meeting. Chairman Chase gave the committee report.

First, the committee noted that the Water Quality Committee had suggested re-ordering management practices so that the top priority practices are at top of each section in Table 6-1. The April 7th review draft reflects this revision; priorities were selected based on the survey conducted at the last Council meeting.

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

Next, Chase said that the committee recommended modifying its recommendation on the future of the councils as follows (Section 7.4):

The Council recommends that the General Assembly legislate authority to the Regional Water Councils, including the Upper Flint Council, to manage, plan and provide oversight of water resources within each region around the State. Funding should be provided to the Councils from State appropriations. Revenue raising authority should be considered for these councils (similar to the Metro North Georgia Water District). All funding raised should be used to provide for the coordination and implementation of the regional and state water plans and for studies, assessments and future plan updates within the respective regions.

Council member Randy Starling said that he was concerned about granting revenue raising authority to each Regional Water Council. Vice-Chairman Morrow said that the state uses this type of authority with good success, and these authorities have accountability to elected officials. Chairman Chase said this was an effort assert local control over future management of our region's water resources.

Starling said he does not support the language about revenue raising authority for the regional councils. Raines Jordan expressed support for a regional water authority. Michael Beres noted that any funding raised should stay in the region. Beres suggested that the sentence regarding revenue-raising should be deleted after "State appropriations".

Lamar Perlis said that funding would be important to administer and continue our efforts. Morrow suggested a user fee for water as a revenue source.

Chairman Chase said this is a pivotal issue for the council. He sees it in terms of whether the region does its own planning or allows the state to plan for it. Lamar Perlis said he would rather have control here in the region. Raines Jordan said that we need new ideas and thinking for water, and we cannot implement without funding. Brant Keller expressed a preference for local control. He said that he does not mind paying money to a local authority if it provides for local control. Buddy Leger also expressed support for local control. Arnold reminded the Council that this was still simply a recommendation; we do not know what the legislature is going to do.

There was some discussion about how the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District is funded. Tim Cash (EPD) said the Metro District receives \$200,000 from the state each year for planning; the rest was raised from regional funding. Beres noted that any money raised stays in the region.

After further discussion, Chairman Chase suggested the following revision to address the concerns raised:

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

The Council recommends that the General Assembly legislate authority to the Regional Water Councils, including the Upper Flint Council, to manage, plan and provide oversight of water resources within each region around the State. Funding should be provided to the Councils from State appropriations. Revenue raising authority should be considered for these councils (similar to the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District). Funding raised should be used to provide for coordination and implementation of regional and state water plans and for studies, assessments and future plan updates within the respective regions.

This proposed revision was approved by consensus.

Next, the committee's recommendation for a new item under Water Policy Recommendations (Section 7.4) was reviewed (as presented in the April 7th draft):

The Council urges the State to seek a timely resolution of current interstate water issues that directly affect the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint Basin. The Council recommends the development of a tri-state framework designed to address interstate water issues in the future and the inclusion of the Regional Water Councils within this framework.

This proposal was approved by consensus.

Next, it was noted that the committee recommended moving management practice (formerly) WQ5 to this section as a recommendation because its purview was broader than water quality. It is presented in Section 7.4 in the April 7th review draft, as follows:

The Council recommends continued coordination and cooperation among neighboring water councils. The Upper Flint Council has worked closely with the Middle Chattahoochee and Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Councils, and our joint efforts will benefit our regions and the state as a whole.

This proposal was approved by consensus.

Local Elected Officials and Public Comments

Next, the Council provided time for local elected officials and the general public to address the council, but no one indicated that they would like to speak.

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

Final Discussion of Plan for Submittal to EPD

Kristin asked the Council if there were any more issues to discuss before approval of the plan for submittal to EPD.

Vice-Chairman Morrow reminded the Council of the importance of education about the plan. He discussed how Brant Keller provides water education programs for 5th and 6th graders in Griffin.

Chairman Chase said that the Council needs to defend this plan. He said that we were all in this together, and the Council members need to be advocates for the plan. Beth English reminded the Council that it will be important to work with the legislature.

Brant Keller said it would be good to have a PowerPoint presentation about the plan to support education efforts. Steve Simpson said the executive summary would be a good hand-out. Kristin Rowles said she had some slides that she had recently compiled for Cliff Arnett to conduct a program on the plan. These could be adapted for future presentations.

Adoption of Plan for Submittal to EPD

Chairman Chase asked for any more discussion of the plan. There was no further discussion. He asked the Council members to stand to indicate their support for adoption of this plan, as modified today, for submittal as the recommended plan to EPD by May 2nd. **All of the Council members stood to indicate their support and approve the plan by consensus.**

The Council adjourned.

Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting 10
Meeting Date: April 14, 2011

B&V Project 164139
April 18, 2011

Attachment 1:
Upper Flint Water Planning Council
Council Meeting Attendance – April 14, 2011

Council Members

Clifford Arnett
Hays Arnold
Mike Beres
Michael Bowens
Gene Brunson
Donald Chase
Mike Donnelly
Beth English
Harold Fallin
Jack Holbrook

Raines Jordan
Frank Keller
Brant Keller
Buddy Leger
Dick Morrow
Lamar Perlis
Gary Powell
Charles Rucks
Bill Sawyer
Randall Starling

Council Members Not In Attendance

Greg Barineau
Tommy Burnsed
William Culpepper
Eddie Freeman

George Hooks
Lynmore James
Jim Reid
Joel Wood

Planning Consultants

Steve Simpson, B&V
Robert Osborne, B&V

Mark Masters, GWPPC
Kristin Rowles, GWPPC

Georgia EPD

Bill Morris
Tim Cash, Assistant Branch Chief

