Memorandum

To: *Suwannee-Satilla Regional Water Planning Council*

From: *Rick Brown and Brian Keel, CDM*

Date: *04/08/10*

Subject: *Council Meeting 5 - Summary*

This memorandum provides the meeting summary of the Suwannee-Satilla Regional Water Planning Council Meeting 5 (CM5), held on March 25, 2010 at Valdosta Technical College.

1) Welcome and Introductions/Recap CM 4/Approve Agenda/Approve CM4 Summary

Chair Darvin Eason call the meeting to order and introduced two guests to the meeting that offered to welcome the Council. First Mayor of Valdosta, John Fretti, gave a welcome to all in attendance and expressed his concern over the significant flooding experienced by the City in April and September 2009. Mayor Fretti encouraged Council to consider regional projects to address multiple objectives such as stormwater management, water supply, and recreation. Following Mayor Fretti, the President of Valdosta Technical College, Dr. Perren welcomed Council and meeting attendees to the College. Dr. Perren Highlighted several of the programs at the College and wished the Council success it their work.

The Public Attendees introduced themselves at the request of the Chair. The Planning Contractor (PC) presented the Agenda and the Council approved the Agenda unanimously. The PC presented a recap of CM4, summarizing what was accomplished in CM4, and provided an overview of where the Council was in the planning process.

A summary of results of the evaluation forms from CM4 was also presented. The PC asked if the Council had any questions on the Council Meeting 4 Summary and requested the approval of the Summary. Council member Dan Raines made a motion to approve the CM4 Summary. The motion was seconded by Scott Downing and Council approved the Summary with a unanimous vote.

The meeting continued with an overview of the objectives for Council Meeting 5. These included:

- Review baseline municipal and industrial water and wastewater forecast results;

- Review methodology and preliminary results of energy forecast;
- Discuss results of current conditions Resource Assessment modeling as presented at Joint Meetings;
- Discuss regional portfolio of management practices and management practice selection process; and
- Understand how management practice selection ties back into demand forecasts and resource assessments.

The location and possible dates for Council Meeting 5 were discussed. The PC suggested that Council members think about a location and time in late June that worked well for them and it was agreed that Council would finalize the date and location at the end of the meeting.

The PC then provided an update and overview of several items that occurred since the last meeting. An overview of the items is provided below

a) Table of Contents and Draft Plan Section Review

The PC distributed copies of the final Table of Contents for the Suwannee-Satilla Regional Water Plan. The PC thanked the members of the Table of Contents subcommittee that included Greg Evans, Scott Downing, and Wesley Langdale. The PC then asked for volunteers to form a subcommittee to review draft plan sections between now and June 30th. The following Council members volunteered:

- Greg Evans
- Scott Downing
- Wesley Langdale
- Greg Evans
- Rusty McCall

The PC will work on preparing draft plan sections over the next several weeks and will work with this subcommittee to obtain their input and finalize the draft sections for presentation to the whole Council prior to June 30th.

b) Planning Efforts in Florida

The PC briefly discussed the status of ongoing water supply planning work by the Saint John's River Management District located in northeast Florida. The District is updating their water supply plans and has identified some water resources that may

be of interest to the Council (i.e., St. Mary's River). For additional information on this topic, Council members can go to:

http://sjr.state.fl.us/facts/DWSPprocess.html

c) Outreach to Key Municipalities

The PC discussed the importance of conducting outreach to municipalities in the region that are not represented on Council and asked for Council's help identifying key entities besides water/wastewater providers to whom we should perform outreach. The PC presented a list of counties and cities in the region.

A Council Member (CM) noted that Echols County was not on the list. The PC will revise the list to include Echols County.

d) Chair and Vice Chair Elections

The PC reminded Council that under the terms of the adopted Memorandum of Agreement – Operating Procedures, the terms of the Chair and Vice Chair were up and Council needs to elect these positions. The PC confirmed that the current Chair and Vice Chair were willing to continue their service if elected, and asked Council members to write nominations for Chair and Vice Chair on the white board at the front of the room. Council agreed to hold the election before lunch.

e) Governor's Water Contingency Planning Task Force

The PC gave a brief presentation on the recommendations of the Governor's Water Contingency Planning Task Force, consisting of two portfolios of contingency management practices should Lake Lanier no longer be a water supply option to Atlanta. It was noted that the current contingency plans focus on conservation and reuse and do not involve groundwater development below the fall line. The Task Force's full report is available by searching "water contingency planning task force" at http://georgia.gov.

2) Revised Municipal GPCD and Municipal Water Forecast

The PC then gave a presentation on the work conducted by the PC and the Council's Municipal Ad Hoc group since CM4 to refine gallons per capita per day (GPCD) values for each county in the region and reviewed how these numbers were used in municipal forecasts. The PC mentioned that these numbers are intended for regional planning and not for individual permitting decisions or future allocations. The PC also mentioned that it is not appropriate to compare one county's GPCD value to another's because there are several factors that go into this number and variation across counties is expected.

The PC also presented the results of the base forecasts and distributed a handout summarizing the results. The forecasts do include passive conservation that occurs as a result of the 1992 National legislation which mandated low-flow fixtures. Active conservation will be considered as part of the management practice element of the regional water plan. The following questions and comments were offered:

- CM: Are you indicating that the order in which the forecast groupings are shown here (municipal, industrial, agricultural, energy) is the order of priority for water use? *PC Response: No, this is just the order in which the forecasts are being completed.*

- CM: Are Moody Air Force Base and Wild Adventures Water Park included in the municipal GPCD numbers for Lowndes County? *PC Response: Moody is self-supplied so their water use is not included in the publicly-supplied GPCD. Wild Adventures is supplied by Lowndes County and so their water use is factored into the GPCD for Lowndes County.*

- CM: Explain how Brantley and Echols Counties have GPCD values less than 100 when the self-supplied use rate was recommended at 100? *PC Response: Publicly supplied GPCD was calculated separately from self-supplied GPCD using actual water use data and population served data provided by public suppliers. In the case of Brantley and Echols Counties, the publicly supplied GPCD was less than 100. The 100 number was recommended by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee (the USGS recommended number is 75 but the subcommittee felt that his value might under represent self-supplied water use.*

- CM: Were large industries pulled out of the municipal forecast? *PC Response: Yes. These uses were taken out of the municipal forecast and put in the industrial forecast.*

- CM: We need to consider how we're going to plan for growth from these numbers. *PC Response: Agreed and today will help provide a better understanding of the proposed process.*

- CM: How are we accounting for people on City water that live outside the City limits and are not included in City population? *PC Response: We used actual population served numbers as reported by public suppliers.*

- CM: Are private water systems included in the municipal forecast? *PC Response: Yes, any system serving 25 or more people or 15 or more taps is included.*

- CM: How did we arrive at these numbers? Subtract all the large water users from total water use and divide by population? *PC Response: Yes, any large industries are subtracted out and then we divide by the population/customer base served. Residential, commercial, and light industrial users are all included in these numbers.*

- CM: We have a couple industries getting ready to relocate to Brantley. *PC Response: If they are municipally supplied, we are potentially underestimating the GPCD, but since we can't crystal-ball what might happen we may have to capture these at the next plan update (which will be a maximum of 5 years out). If the industries are self-supplied, we can capture them in the industrial forecast.*

- CM: The prison in Folkston (Charlton County) is on the City sewer system but not on City water. The town is only 3,000 people and the prison population is an additional 1,500 people. Is this included in the water use numbers? *PC Response: This should not be an issue on the water side because they aren't on public water supply, but on the wastewater side we might be slightly underestimating the flow. We will look into this.*

- How does a prison population affect these numbers? *PC Response: It depends on the area. In areas where the city population is relatively small compared to the prison population and both are served by the same supplier then this can affect the water use numbers. You'll see a higher GPCD because prisons tend to use a lot of water per capita.*

- CM: I would encourage Council members to consider asking some of these questions of your county or city representatives as they are probably up to speed on some of these issues. It might be worthwhile for each of us to have a debriefing with our representative(s) after this meeting.

The PC then summarized the recommendations of the Municipal Ad Hoc group as follows:

- Use a self-supplied GPCD of 100.

- Use the publicly-supplied county-specific GPCDs for the base forecasting.

- Consider developing an alternate scenario after you've reviewed the results of the base forecast.

- The industrial forecasts are relatively flat for the region, so build in a factor of 5 MGD to account for unanticipated growth in future industrial water use.

The PC also highlighted that the Ad Hoc group discussed an alternate municipal scenario that could be based on the highest county GPCD and apply it to the whole region to be conservative, but this approach might not be technically sound or accurately represent the region.

- CM: What are some major unintended consequences of using an overly high GPCD? *PC Response: There are a few potential adverse consequences. GPCD is used to generate wastewater flows. In this region we are withdrawing primarily from groundwater*

and discharging to surface water, so a high GPCD could falsely forecast wastewater assimilative capacity issues. It could also make the region look wasteful. It could also prematurely drive water supply issues. CM: It might also prematurely skew budgets for infrastructure improvements.

- CM: We're close to Florida, so we also need to make sure our sources and methods are credible so we can defend our water uses. *PC Response: That's true, we don't want to destroy our credibility with overly conservative numbers.*

- CM: How did we develop the self-supplied assumption of 100 GPCD? *PC Response: The original USGS report used 75 GPCD for self-supply, but the Coastal Ad Hoc group indicated that many municipalities use 100 because that is the tap equivalent unit in that region. Our group decided to also go with that number.*

The PC mentioned that if Council does not adopt these forecast numbers, there will be a lot of work to get done before the next meeting so we don't fall behind schedule. The PC also presented the revised population projection numbers. These numbers are higher than the previous projections and are possibly slightly conservative for our region. It appears that de-coupling population from employment increased the population projections.

3) Municipal Wastewater Forecast

The PC presented the base municipal wastewater forecast, including a review of wastewater forecasting methodology. The main source of information for this forecast is EPD permit data and census information. One thing we slightly refine since the Ad Hoc committee meeting was Land Application System (LAS) percentages for each county.

4) Industrial Water Forecast

The PC reviewed the methodology for the industrial water forecast and presented base forecast results. The following questions and comments were offered:

- CM: With the State's population projected to double over the planning horizon, wouldn't that equate to more industrial growth than we're seeing here? *PC Response: That depends. It might be that most growth in the region will be commercial, tourism, or retail. Past trends did not show robust industrial growth in all of the regions.*

- CM: Douglas has been experiencing a lot of commercial growth.

- CM: If bioenergy plants come in, are these included in the forecast? *PC Response: These may be included in the energy forecast.*

- CM: I think our region will be attractive to high water use industries. *PC Response: If we want to plan for industries coming in, we have to know the type of industry, location, and how much water they would use. Since we don't know this the Ad Hoc committee is recommending that we used the additional growth factor of 5 MGD.*

5) Industrial Wastewater Forecast

The PC reviewed the methodology for the industrial wastewater forecast and presented base forecast results. This forecast is based on industry-specific wastewater to water ratios, some of which were revised based on input from the industrial stakeholder group that has been working with EPD. The following questions and comments were offered:

- Is the preferred method of future wastewater discharge LAS versus point source? *EPD Response: It will depend on options available by each specific location. Nutrient standards in the south will play into this decision. LAS won't solve all problems but it is a preferred option for some entities.*

- CM: Will that preference be reflected in the forecast trends? *EPD Response: No, the forecast is based on past trends.*

- CM: Can we consider recommending LAS as a management practice? *EPD Response: Yes.*

- CM: Due to impacted flows in streams, wastewater discharges might be the only flow in these streams at times. *PC Response: This is true. EPD Response: This might benefit some streams.*

The PC explained the surface water nodes (which are generally planning locations that have long-term flow data) and drainage areas in the region, pointing out the fact that some drainage basins extend outside the region's boundaries. This means we will have to coordinate with folks from other regions within our watersheds. The PC mentioned that at this point we want Council's opinions and agreement on the base forecast numbers. Once we have agreement we can move forward with generating the future forecasts to put into the resource assessment models.

- CM: Are these forecasts based on the revised population projections? *PC Response: Yes.*

- CM: And they're based on two separate categories, municipal and industrial? *PC Response: Yes, plus agriculture and energy which will be discussed later.*

- CM: A few counties such as Clinch, Turner, and Ware show population increases but decreases in water demand. Echols shows a similar modest population increase as these 3, but its demand increases. How can you explain this? *PC Response: This is due to relatively small growth and a reduction in water use over time due to passive conservation being included in these forecasts. By law, new water fixtures have to meet certain flow conservation standards. As older, higher-flowing fixtures are replaced with new lower-flowing fixtures, there will be a slight decrease in per capita water demand. This passive conservation is built into the forecasts. In the cases of Clinch, Turner, and Ware Counties, the rate of passive conservation overtakes the modest rate of projected population growth. In the case of Echols County, the projected population growth rate is slightly higher and it overtakes the passive conservation rate. We will check on this and confirm this is the case. (Note: Following the meeting the PC reviewed the forecast and confirmed that this is true. The PC will develop the data summarizing the passive conservation values).*

- CM (from Municipal Ad Hoc group): From an engineering perspective I agree with these numbers.

- CM (from Municipal Ad Hoc group): We got satisfactory responses to our queries from the forecasters.

- CM (from Municipal Ad Hoc group): I don't think we can improve on these numbers the way the forecast is put together.

- CM: If passive conservation is being applied as we discussed in Counties like Ware, we need to be consistent with how we're including some of the current conservation practices underway by municipal associations such as rate structure. If we're accounting for these in one area, we need to apply them to all areas to be consistent. *PC Response: This is a good point. The conservation we discussed earlier was passive conservation that will occur with replacement of fixtures. There are additional conservation measures that you're talking about now such as people possibly implementing more metering or increasing rate structures by 2020 or 2030, and the Council can look at these actions and strategies as part of possible management practices.*

- Public Attendee: I represent Packaging Corporation of America (PCA). On your chart you show industrial paper discharges to both the Bemiss and Pinetta nodes. We're the only paper industry in the region and we only have one discharge that should show up at the Pinetta node. *PC Response: There could possibly be another paper industry in the Bemiss drainage area but outside of the Suwannee-Satilla region, as*

this drainage area goes beyond the region boundary. We will review our discharge database and make sure we are accurately representing discharge locations.

- CM: Pinetta is in Florida, right? *PC Response: Yes, just over the state line.*

- CM: I want to make sure we've accurately captured wood products facilities. There are a couple facilities in Brooks County and some in Atkinson County. We've got one wood products facility in Willacoochee that has an allocation of about 100,000 gallons per day (GPD) and actually uses about 60,000 GPD of City water and discharges to the City wastewater treatment plant. This facility also has groundwater wells and withdraws about 200,000 GPD. In Brooks County there is the OSB plant that uses approximately 80,000 – 100,000 GPD of self-supplied water. I presented these numbers to the state-wide industrial forecast group but don't know if they got put in the forecast. *PC Response: It sounds like in some cases these maybe sub-threshold industrial uses and if they are then they are not captured in the forecast. We probably are under-forecasting the needs of some of these sub-threshold water users, but the thought of the Ad Hoc group was that these uses would to some degree be captured in the "safety factor" of 5 additional MGD.*

The Chairman asked Council if they would feel comfortable moving forward voting on approval of these numbers, pending investigation of the few items raised in the discussion. Joe Hopkins moved that Council approve the forecast numbers as the basis for moving forward, subject to the committee making refinements per discussions. Greg Evans seconded the motion. Council approved the numbers, subject to the stated refinements, by unanimous vote. The PC committed to following up on these issues with an email to Council.

6) <u>Thermoelectric Energy Forecast</u>

The PC presented the energy forecast methodology. Noting that in many cases there are large withdrawals of water but in not always large consumption of water (i.e., the water is returned and not consumed). The PC indicated that we will have some, but probably not all, results of this forecast to present in June. The following question was offered:

- Does hydroelectric power production have consumptive water use? *PC Response: Generally no and the method we are proposing does not assign any consumption to hydropower.*

7) <u>Agricultural Forecast</u>

The PC presented an update on the agricultural forecast, including additional sub-threshold sectors that are being incorporated into the forecast. EPD indicated that Dr. Hook's forecast was completed and he is working on formatting it for the website and it should be out in a few weeks.

8) Georgia Water Law

Bob Bomar, J.D., Deputy Attorney General with the Georgia Department of Law gave a presentation on Georgia water law. His presentation followed the outline of his white paper, which was distributed to Council prior to CM5. The following questions and comments were offered:

- CM: Is there a prescribed process for proposing an inter-basin transfer (IBT) to the Director? *Bob Bomar Response: Yes, there is a formal application process.*
- CM: Is there a public comment period for proposed IBTs? *EPD Response: EPD does not issue permits for IBTs, only for withdrawals and discharges. At times, an IBT may be a component of a permit though. EPD has a thirty-day public comment period for all new and modified permits, and it is during this period that the IBT component of a permit can be commented on.*
- CM: Is it true that water cannot be transferred under prior law? *Bob Bomar Response: Actually, IBTs could be considered under prior law, which is the law that is still on the books.*
- CM: When were the current laws enacted? *Bob Bomar Response: The groundwater law was enacted in 1972 and the surface water law was enacted in 1977.*
- CM: Please explain the last paragraph in your paper regarding state police powers. *Bob Bomar Response: There is relevant case law in which individuals claimed that state actions were resulting in a taking someone's property. The results of these lawsuits and the current law confirm that the state can regulate the use of water on your property for public safety, health, and welfare, but it doesn't take your property away from you. The law also grants you the right to appeal any decision made by the Director if you don't like it.*
- CM: What is the difference between Public Trust Doctrine and Reasonable Use Riparian Law? *Bob Bomar Response: Public Trust Doctrine has never really been recognized by the Georgia Courts as it only applies to large navigable water bodies.*

- CM: Can you give us definitions for Riparian Rights and Reasonable Use? *Bob Bomar Response: There really are no set definitions of these terms. Several considerations go into the determination of a reasonable use, such as the number of users of a water source, its size, physical and chemical nature and probable impairments of the water course, and several others. And again, you can appeal a decision by the Director. Riparian rights can be defined as the right of a landowner whose property boarders on a body of water or watercourse to make a reasonable use of that water subject to diminutions of the water as may be necessary on account of a reasonable use of it by other riparian owners. Also, although the surface water withdrawal law does not repeal the common law with regard to riparian rights, I am of the opinion that since the Director must make a determination regarding reasonableness of use prior to the issuance of a permit, such issuance would raise a presumption of reasonableness of use by the permit grantee.*

  During periods of low flow for both surface and ground water withdrawals, the Director may modify any permit when such water shortage places in jeopardy the health or safety of the citizens of the affected area. However, with regard to farm use permits, the order is not effective immediately (as would be the case for non-farm permits) and the farm use permittees may continue to make use of water to their permitted capacity during the appeal process unless the permittee fails to timely request a hearing. In every case, however, the Director must give first priority to water for human consumption and second priority to farm use.

- CM: So reasonable use applies more to surface water and riparian rights apply to both surface water and groundwater? *Bob Bomar Response: Under current law, riparian law applies only to defined channels, and unless you could prove to the court there is a stream with defined channels flowing underground, it does not apply to groundwater. With our current increased knowledge of how groundwater flows, perhaps riparian law may be applied to it in the future.*

- CM: What court are appeals heard in? *Bob Bomar Response: First it would be heard by an administrative law judge and any decision by the judge could then be appealed to the superior court in the county of the appellee's residence.*

- PC: During critical drought periods, critical low flows in some of our streams drop to a low point where Council may have to come up with ideas on how to improve on the low flow conditions, but upstream of these areas there are surface water uses in place. This will be a tough challenge. Do you have any advice for Council as we proceed? *Bob Bomar Response: Regarding non-farm use permits, under the surface water law, in the event of two or more competing applicants or users qualifying equally*

under Board Rules establishing a reasonable system of classification, the Director is authorized to grant permits or modify existing permits on a prorated or other reasonable basis where possible; however the Director must give preference to an existing use over an initial application. Regarding farm-use permits, under both the groundwater and surface water law, existing permits may be modified by the Director if he should determine that the quantity of water allowed under the existing permit would prevent other applicants from reasonable use of waters for farm use.

9) Revisit Chair and Vice Chair Elections

By lunch time, nominations placed on the white board consisted of two nominations for Darvin Eason for Chair and two nominations for Grady Thompson for Vice Chair. Council member Earl Bruce made a motion to re-elect Darvin Eason as Chair and Grady Thompson as Vice Chair. Scott Downing seconded the motion. Council voted unanimously to re-elect Darvin Eason as Council Chair and Grady Thompson as Council Vice Chair.

10) The PC provided an overview of the resource assessments highlighting the following points:

Surface Water Quantity Resource Assessment

- For the surface water RA, the PC outlined the locations of the planning and basic nodes and the local drainage areas delineated by the watersheds that drain to the nodes.
- Described the amount of gauge data in relation to the overall historic record from 1939 – 2007.
- Described major withdrawals and discharges.
- The Council had the following questions/comments:
- CM: At Fargo, what municipality is discharging the planning node? *PC Response: Homerville*
- CM: The flows in all these rivers go very low especially in summer, so what types of actions should the Council take? *PC Response: That will be part of the management practices portion of our plan.*
- CM: What are the discharge requirements to low or no flow conditions? *PC Response: We will check and get the Council more information on this.*

- CM: Council would like a list of current and future withdrawals and issues; we will need to evaluate this region specifically. *PC Response: We will get that information for Council.*

- CM: Are shallow groundwater withdrawals also going to be considered? *PC Response: Only permitted withdrawals.*

- CM: Please provide more information on current surface water demands.

Surface Water Quality Assimilative Capacity Resource Assessment

The PC then provided a summary of the water quality RA highlighting the following points:

Dissolved oxygen levels in the region; the nutrient models for Nitrogen and Phosphorous for the Brunswick Harbor nutrient model; and the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) listed streams.

- CM: How does the nutrient data get input into the phosphorous model? *PC Response: We are not familiar with the method and expect that this information may be in the synopsis document for the water quality RA.*

- CM: What are the sources of water for aquifer storage and recovery in some areas of Florida? *PC Response: We do not know but can get more information on that.*

- CM: How are existing withdrawals determined for agriculture? *PC Response: This in Dr. Hook's methodology and it was discussed at CM3 and can be found on the state website.*

Groundwater Resource Assessment

The PC summarized the Ground Water Resource Assessment highlighting the following points:

Overview of aquifer types, locations and boundaries; results of the ground water modeling conducted to date which included current withdrawals, high end of sustainable yield and low end of sustainable yield.

The PC wrapped up the discussion describing the development of the synopsis documents which document the development of the RA tools and highlighted the comment period for the documents.

Council had the following comment/question:

- CM: Is the 475 mgd and annual average or maximum daily or other value? PC Response: Not sure we will get more information on this.

11) Management Practices

The PC presented the methodology for management practice selection and gave examples of possible management practices for the region. The PC walked through an example of how a gap might be filled by expanding to existing permit limits, implementing projects that are already planned, and then selecting additional management practices to fill the remaining gap.

It was noted that it is important for the Council to undertake its work while respecting local planning and permitting. The PC and EPD will help the Council in gathering other plans and projects that are out there, and this is part of the additional outreach to other entities that we want to do.

The PC then discussed some concepts for addressing water quality in the region. It was noted that there are TMDLs for many of the reaches in the region. At a minimum, Council should review and understand these TMDLs and their implementation plans. The PC indicated that the Council can go further than this, such as possibly developing management strategies or even reach-specific management practices to address water quality issues. The following questions and comments were offered:

- CM: About 10 years ago there was talk of TMDLs, with a lot of public meetings and discussions related to dissolved oxygen and other parameters. What happened with this? *Response from another CM: That might have been when EPD rolled out the 303(d) list. PC Response: The TMDL program is designed to provide strategies for managing impaired waters, but there is no implementation arm associated with the TMDL program. It is voluntary. Through Council we can develop management practices that complement the TMDL Implementation Plans or portions of these plans.*

- CM: There are some downstream users that have to perform extra treatment of surface water for their uses because upstream users may not be providing a high level of treatment. There may be opportunities for us to implement management practices that will benefit some of these downstream users, maybe even to the point that they would be willing to share some of the cost of these management practices because it means they will then not have to perform such rigorous treatment. *PC Response: That's a great idea. These are the kinds of ideas we want to come up with in our management practices subcommittee.*

The PC then noted that the management practice selection process can be complex and the Council will need to come up with an approach for making decisions. For near-term needs we should try to be as specific as possible; for longer-term needs we can be more general in our recommendations. Council will have to decide what kind of screening and ranking system to use in management practice selection. This can be a simple process (e.g., Council vote); a slightly more complex process (i.e., similar to a Consumer Reports-style ranking system with criteria and circles that indicate how well the criteria is meet); or complex with specific objectives, weighting criteria, and performance metrics. By mid-summer, Council will need to decide what kind of decision process they want to use.

The PC suggested that Council form a subcommittee to work on the identification and selection of management practices. The Chairman asked for volunteers to serve on such a subcommittee. The following Council members volunteered:

- Greg Evans
- Scott Downing
- Bill Brim
- Andy Stone
- Howell McCallum
- Wesley Langdale
- Rusty McCall

12) Local Elected Official Comments

There were no local elected official comments.

13) Public Comments

Darrell Wilder with the Valdosta Chamber State Committee offered that the Committee supports the Suwannee-Satilla Council in their Vision and Goals. He thanked Council for coming to Valdosta and welcomed us back any time.

Angela Wall with the Southern Georgia Regional Commission mentioned that they write TMDLs and Section 319 grants, including the Upper Suwannee Basin 319 grant. She offered that they have plenty of data that they would make available to Council.

14) Wrap-up and What to Expect Next Meeting

The Council agreed to hold the next meeting in Tifton on June 17th, 2010.

15) Council Meeting 5 Evaluations

The PC distributed the evaluation forms and members of Council filled out the forms. The PC collected the forms. The meeting was adjourned.

cc: Cliff Lewis, EPD

Suwannee-Satilla Regional Water Council
Council Members Attendance List

Suwannee-Satilla Council Members		03/25/2010
1	Joseph L. Boyett	
2	Earl Brice	X
3	William L. Brim	X
4	Hanson R. Carter	X
5	Carroll H. Coarsey	
6	Ben Copeland	X
7	Scott Downing	X
8	Eugene Dyal	X
9	Darvin Eason	X
10	Michael E. Edgy	X
11	Greg C. Evans	X
12	Greg Goggans	
13	Jim Hedges	
14	Alva Joseph Hopkins	X
15	Donald A. Johnson	X
16	John Wesley Langdale	X
17	Joe Lewis	X
18	R.R. Rusty McCall	X
19	Donald H. McCallum	
20	Dan Raines	X
21	Scotty Raines	X
22	S. Gordon Rogers	
23	Jay Shaw	
24	Frank G. Sisk	
25	Miles A. Stone	X
26	Grady M. Thompson	X
27	Doyle Weltzbarker	X
28	James R. Willis	X
29	Jackie Wilson	X
	Total	***21***

Suwannee-Satilla Regional Water Council
Public Attendance List

	Public Attendee	Representing
1	Mike Allen	Lowndes County Board of Commissioners
2	Myrna Ballard	Valdosta-Lowndes Chamber of Commerce
3	Rich Batten	South Georgia Regional Commission
4	Kelly Bell	City of Valdosta Utilities
5	Jenny Conrad	Adel/Cook County Commission
6	Mike Copeland	GA Farm Bureau
7	David Ferrell	USDA NRCS
8	Brittney Foster	Packaging Corporation of America
9	John Fretti	Mayor of Valdosta
10	Ginny Holton	Packaging Corporation of America
11	Willie Jones	City of Valdosta Engineer
12	Richard Lee	Lowndes County Board of Commissioners
13	Jerry Lott	City of Douglas
14	Roger Magee	Lowndes County
15	David Mauldin	GA Farm Bureau
16	Ben Mosely	GA Soil and Water Conservation Commission
17	Jerry Permenter	City of Adel
18	Jamie Pitts	GFC
19	Tom Putnam	Langdale Industries
20	Jody Redding	Senator Isakson
21	John Rotravski	Packaging Corporation of America
22	Von Shipman	City of Valdosta Engineer
23	Alison Stokes	Valdosta-Lowndes Chamber of Commerce
24	Angela Wall	South Georgia Regional Commission
25	Darrell Wilder	Valdosta Chamber State Committee