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

September 16, 2009

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Coosa – North Georgia Water Planning Council Members

FROM: Rick Brownlow, CH2M HILL

SUBJECT: Council Meeting #3 Summary

Georgia Comprehensive Statewide Water Management Plan
Regional Water Planning

Council Meeting #3 Summary

Meeting Date: September 16, 2009
Location: Lake Chatuge Lodge, Hiawassee, Georgia

1) Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Bennett welcomed the group and thanked them for being on time. He introduced Commissioner Lee Mulkey who was representing Gerald Dunham, Chairman of the Habersham County Commission. He then introduced Frank Riley to welcome the group to Towns County.

Mr. Riley noted that Towns was a small county and that tourism was its primary industry. He noted that Towns County was home to Young Harris College which was becoming 4-year this year, and home of Zell Miller. He explained that most streams in Towns County flowed north in the Tennessee River basin. Mr. Riley then recognized Rick Stancil, City Manager of Hiawassee, and Bill Kendall, Towns County Commissioner. They both welcomed the group and identified key local issues that relate to the work of the council. Lastly, Andy Baker, acting US Forest Ranger in Blairsville, mentioned that the forest service is here because of water, primarily to protect water quality. He explained that the forest service wants to support watershed protection, and the decisions that the local groups make.

Chairman Bennett thanked the group for submitting information on visioning process for the presentation today noting that our council did better than most other councils. He explained that the homework exercise was complete but that there is still time to comment on the vision

statement. He then mentioned that several things have happened since the last meeting. One was the leadership forum meeting with Dr. Couch. Mr. Bennett asked Vice-chairman, David Ashburn to comment on that meeting. Mr. Ashburn said they met in Macon with Dr. Couch and that he enjoyed Dr. Couch's comments and the direction she set. The meeting covered the authority of chairman as well as the role of the planning consultants as support for the councils. Dr. Couch said that the plans will be put together to form the statewide plan noting that the regional plans will need to "match up" with each other to form a cohesive overall state plan. She also said it's ok for the council to talk with representatives of Alabama and Tennessee, but suggested that the council leadership be briefed by state officials on the status of our negotiations before any contact is made. Other issues discussed were the website, and that there is no "plan already in the drawer". Mr. Bennett noted that he also spoke with Dr. Couch, and discussed TN and AL, but those discussions should be done with coordination with EPD. He said that he and Mr. Ashburn will meet with EPD prior to CM4 on this issue. He also stressed that everyone participate, and no one dominate. He also stressed the importance of good coordination with other councils.

2) <u>Management Practices Demonstration (Tennessee Valley Authority)</u>

Mr. Bennett introduced Mike Eiffe, Program Manager for Water Supply from TVA. Mr. Eiffe mentioned that there's plenty of water to go around, but not enough during drought times in the right places. He explained that TVA wants to coordinate with the council, as needed during the plan development process. He provided background on TVA, the nation's largest public provider of public power, 73 years old. He noted that TVA has 8.8 million residential electric customers through distributors, and 60 industrial power customers noting that they want to be an environmental steward of the nation's fifth largest river system. He explained that TVA receives no federal appropriations and that they were fully funded from electric power revenues.

During the presentation Mr. Eiffe showed the entire Tennessee River watershed and explained that there were a several types of TVA projects (1)Tributary Multipurpose (Hiawassee), (2) Main River Multipurpose (Guntersville), (3) Tributary Run of the River (Apalachia), (4) Tributary non-power (Little Bear Creek). They have two types of reservoir operating guides, basically holding reservoirs at lowest in the winter, and highest in the summertime. He reviewed the operating curves for their reservoirs, and discussed the importance of flood control. They try to manage all lakes in an equitable manner, to "share the pain", if necessary. Main river projects only vary 5-6 feet in winter to summer, but tributary projects vary as much as 30 or 40 feet between winter and summer, for flood control. Rainfall/runoff is the fuel that drives their system.

He discussed a slide showing historical monthly rainfall data noting that average rainfall does not normally fluctuate very much month-to-month. However, runoff has a seasonal pattern with more in the late winter/spring than in the late summer/fall. They manage their lakes in order to capture the runoff. They have 135 years of runoff data on record. Currently, they are 17% below average of runoff. He explained that TVA has six (6) fundamental objectives in daily operation: navigation, flood damage reduction, hydroelectric power generation (as possible), recreation,

water quality, water supply. Navigation is the number one priority. Navigation locks at all dams, are operated by COE, owned by TVA. 9 foot navigation depth is required; normally operate minimum 11-foot depth. 50 million tons of cargo travels on the Tennessee River, each year. He explained that it was cheaper to ship by barge than by rail or truck. He noted that TVA has 29 hydro plants, 3600 MW of power capacity underscoring the importance of several facilities such as the pumped storage facility at Raccoon Mountain from Nickajack Lake. He then showed a map of the United States with withdrawals per square mile and noted that TVA had high withdrawals but very low consumptive loss due to the returns of cooling water used to generate electricity. He then discussed water quality objectives and minimum flows that they use to guide their operations during warm summer months.

Mr. Eiffe also said they also aerate the water to add Dissolved Oxygen (DO), as well. At some projects, they use different technologies to mix the increase DO such as top level mixers, bottom level liquid oxygen insertion, turbines that integrate oxygen, and aerating weirs. He then discussed recreation, its importance, and recognized that North Georgia Mountains are some of the prettiest he's seen in the basin. He then reviewed reservoir levels and their target balancing guide of operations for this year, so far. He said this year has been dryer than normal, yet have been much better than the previous two years. They have a special operation planned for Lake Blue Ridge, modification of penstock, requires dewatering of the lake. Environmental studies are taking place now with lake drawdown expected to occur late next summer. TVA took over this facility, and is now modifying it to remove the need for periodic deep drawdowns of the lake.

Question: How many nuclear plants do you have?

Answer: We have 6 nuclear plants.

Question: How much cheaper is it compared to hydro?

Answer: It is more expensive. ~3 cents nuclear (approximate)

Question: Are you expanding nuclear?

Answer: Yes, we are, one new unit at Watts Bar facility, nuclear generation is in our plans for expansion. Possibly two new units at Bellafonte, but no license yet.

Comment: Nuclear generation costs in Georgia are generally much lower than hydropower. Nuclear 2.5 cents, hydro 6.5 cents from SEPA (in Georgia). TVA is cheaper for hydropower generation.

Question: Was a study released several years ago that stated that the Tennessee river would not "miss" several hundred million (250 MGD) (400 cfs).

Answer: This is a complex issue, depends on the community, and current water flow conditions. When TVA gets a water withdrawal request, they must consider the proposed activity on the authorized purposes of TVA facilities, where is it, how do you get it, what is your pipeline path, etc?

Question: You mention the multiple purposes, includes congressional authorization, what are the priority rules for the operating objectives.

Answer: TVA does not have water allocations for lakes in the way the COE does. They are required to maintain navigation, hydropower and minimum flows, constrained by current operating policy. The priority order is navigation, hydropower and flood control; beyond that there is no priority.

Question: So what do you do when conflict of priorities occur?

Answer: We have to have 9 feet of water, first. Then we must provide flood risk protection, next we generate power.

Comment: In 2003, the state of TN was asked how much water could be withdrawn without impacting operation. TVA prepared a reservoir operations study where they studied historical data, and determined that they could meet objectives and still withdraw high numbers, particularly at Chattanooga. During drought, it will have an impact, but still water is available. Mr. Eiffe mentioned that if the water is removed, the primary loss is in hydropower generation at multiple (as many as 6) locations.

Question: What is the percentage of power generation in this area?

Answer: 60% coal, 25% nuclear, 10% hydro

Question: The Department of Energy is asking for ways to maximize technologies to increase electric generation. What are you considering, more turbines?

Answer: I don't know. More turbines would be expensive, the ones we have now aren't even being used around the clock. The aeration (auto-venting) of the turbines decreases the efficiency of the turbines as well.

Question: Are there plans to develop another pumped storage facility?

Answer: I don't know, but it would be difficult to do today because of environmental regulations. Good for peak shifting.

Question: In light of the TVA's legislation that has three purposes, and the Magnusson decision, how does that affect the operation of water withdrawals by TVA? Does it give you heartburn or make you nervous?

Answer: No. We understand that it is an issue, but have not received any applications for inter-basin transfers. I cannot speculate on legal issues.

Chairman Bennett mentioned that there is a difference between TVA, Alabama Power, and The Corps of Engineers. They operate under many different criteria, has to do with how they were funded.

Comment: TVA's enabling legislation does not mention requirements for each lake, which is different for Lake Lanier, which has specific sites identified for water withdrawal. The group

also discussed the amount water that falls in Georgia and goes to TVA for their uses. He wanted to make the point and get the concept understood.

Mr. Eiffe said if they got a water withdrawal and inter-basin request, they would go to the state where the activity would occur and ask if they had an objection, before beginning an environmental review. The state from which the water originates has veto power, other states can comment. If the state boundary were moved so that part of Nickajack Lake was in Georgia, Georgia would be in a stronger position.

Comment: If you return a high percentage to the basin of origin, your impact is reduced. Mr. Cope also mentioned that for a while, he was putting more water back into the TN basin than he was removing.

Question: Do you require compensation for hydropower lost if water removed from the basin?

Answer: Yes, we would require if you removed from the entire basin, and do not return.

3) <u>Planning Guidance</u>

Rick welcomed the group again, and played a video from Governor Perdue, which affirmed the importance of the water council's work. Rick began the presentation on Planning Guidance, and discussed the progress through the process, and stressed that the Council process is really only about 20-25% of the way through. He noted that the group will begin to look at some forecasting this afternoon.

He referred everyone to the planning guidance document, and identified that it has some key components that he will cover in his presentation. He discussed the "Regional Water Planning Workflow" slide, and the importance of it, the inputs as well as the analysis that will occur. Vision and goals are a big part of how the council will identify what they want to see in the region.

Rick reviewed some slides that showed some examples of management practices that can affect demand, such as efficiency, conservation, pricing, and reuse, among others. Supply management practices were also reviewed, such as reservoirs, inter and intra basin transfers, groundwater, desalination, among others. He then reviewed slides that covered water quality management practices. Such as treated wastewater facilities, nonpoint source pollution reduction methods, among others.

4) <u>Visioning</u>

The group began their discussion of this item by reviewing the work done to date. Mr. Brownlow explained that a draft has been developed, and the group was encouraged to read the draft and discuss any desired changes to the vision. He encouraged them to adopt the vision and goals either this meeting or next meeting. He read the vision and asked for comments:

Comment: there is no mention of projected needs and usage, besides current usage.

Comment: Where is water quality discussion?

Comment: What does “economic growth” mean? Do we want to be like Atlanta, without income growth? Income growth should be included as the most important part.

Comment: The vision should represent something that is recognizable and memorable. This seems too long. We need to shorten it, and make it easier to explain.

Comment: Shorter is better.

Comment: Long-term continuation or activity of the plan (implementation?)

Comment: Could the term “quality of life” be used as a substitute for many of the items in there already.

Comment: The group should use something shorter without the big words “quench the thirst of future generations” was his example.

Mr. Brownlow clarified that vision and goals have different purposes.

Comment: I agree to have a much shorter vision, and use the goals to identify more specifics.

Chairman Bennett wrapped up the discussion asking the members to offer comments and finalize the vision at the next meeting. He also likes the “trusting partnerships” terminology. Mr. Brownlow passed out pads to let the council members provide feedback today and hand in for finalizing. Chairman Bennett agreed that shorter is better.

5) <u>Population and Employment</u>

Mr. Brownlow pointed out a letter from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget (OPB) on the EPD website about revisions and “Thank you for your input”. He introduced Vice-chairman Ashburn to discuss the status of the population and employment. Mr. Ashburn discussed some of the changes related to the numbers that were very low or different.

Comment: Whitfield numbers are not correct, because they’re not including undocumented workers.

Comment: There are many things happening on the north side, close to Tennessee that is fueling growth.

Mr. Ashburn said that OPB is revising the numbers and re-evaluating their process, to re-release their numbers. Representatives from all over the state were not happy with their numbers provided by OPB, not just our region. Population is not the only driver for water needs; agriculture is also a big component. He said that we don’t have to take their number; we’ll have the opportunity to request a change and defend it using new information as a justification. He doesn’t think it will be the “make or break” issue. Our mission, agriculture, industry and others will drive the needs as well. He also discussed that employment has been de-coupled from population to depress population growth. He also mentioned that employment numbers can be flawed as well.

Comment: Industrial uses are still being projected.

Comment: Population will be available next month sometime.

Rick mentioned that the next presentation will cover methodology of municipal water and wastewater forecasting. He asked folks to be back at 12:20, and review the maps on the wall during lunch.

6) Municipal and Industrial Forecasting Methodology

Brian Skeens began the presentation with an introduction to forecasting noting that this would generate baseline demand projections and that conservation and efficiency practices would come later in the process. He explained that these forecasts would form the basis for regional water planning but not individual permits. Four categories of water use were being evaluated, agriculture, energy, municipal and industrial. He also explained that municipal water use data would be largely sources through a USGS trend report from 2005. EPD will be posting information to the website from this report.

Question: Will you be looking at permitted and actual water withdrawals?

Answer: Yes, we're also looking at USGS rain gauges and housing age to look at plumbing water usage. Looking at per capita water demand and projected future population plus region specific factors (custom for this region – opportunity to provide feedback is coming up quickly). Transients – short term military trainees, secondary home residents, tourists.

Question: Where are seasonal workers and college students?

Answer: College students are in secondary home residents, seasonal workers may follow a similar pattern to tourists – we'll will check on this.

Local weather adjustments is also a region specific factor. The proposed per capita range for this region is 75 to 175 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). Some of biggest variables: wholesale customers/suppliers in different counties, direct customers of large industries, municipally-supplied industries. Types of water supply: public supply and large water providers, self-supply (wells) – data included in USGS study.

Question: Where did 75 gpcd come from?

Answer: USGS did research to look at this on a national level to come up with this number. It was used for consistency.

Question: What's done with the data that water suppliers provide to EPD every month?

Answer: This is incorporated into the analysis. Using a range of numbers up to 175 gpcd.

Question: What if a county has plans to expand? Seems like 75 is too low. Would like to know how many how many reporting permittees can meet 75. Don Cope has household usage survey data that could be used. There is well water use data for wells with 10 or more users. Would be useful to get a handle on numbers.

Answer: Nothing is set in stone at this point. Looking for input from Council and these comments will be considered before deciding on a per capita number.

Question: How does USGS come up with number of self supply users?

Answer: US census for total population subtract number served by public water supply.

Comment: Need to have contingency planning for what to do if self supply users go dry?

Question: Wouldn't they just dig another well if there's no public water?

Answer: This is exactly the concerns that need to be voiced to help shape the plan.

Plumbing code efficiency savings since 1992 when policy mandated use of 1.6 gallons per flush toilets. Geographic considerations will be accounted for to adjust demand/supply. Look at withdrawal records for indoor verses outdoor uses to determine wastewater production. Inflow and infiltration from the sewer system is also looked at.

Comment: I'd suggest that we pick representative county and do an actual door to door survey to get a more current read on water usage. I question using data from 1990 census (last time question was asked). Some Council members suggest subtracting population from households with sewer use to get at septic systems.

Mr. Skeens presented a list of major water-using industries in Georgia. Looking at Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) and North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) to identify trends for over 90 percent of industrial users. Employment data can be used as a proxy for projecting production/water consumption.

Comment: Employment is not a great indicator of industrial needs. Changing technologies, efficiencies, and industries can affect future needs. Important issue: who makes the determination of regional growth rates? Assume based on industries that we currently have? Any new power generation? Would rather have a high estimate than a low one just to be conservative.

Answer: Industrial group is evaluating the input numbers. Industrial growth rates are being led by EPD with help from other groups. Becky commented that this isn't the only factor determining future use. Will also be looking at how much water we have – this gap analysis will be used to help plan.

Comment: Need to be accurate so that can have reasonable targets for efficiency.

Question: What is State-wide approach to resource usage? Some folks may lose allocations they've requested to complete checks and balances.

Answer: It will vary and be discussed during joint meetings with other councils. Not that far down the road with this. Use low-, average-, high-range projections, but at the end, will have to pick number to do gap analysis. Can update in 5 years.

Questions/Discussion: Will EPD come to the Council and present a number and ask Council to agree to it? Will we know who they consulted with to come up with that number? Why is this forecast important? Cannot predict the future—one thing for sure is that environmental stewardship is a lower priority than economic well-being. Need to make sure communities are using water to maximize economy to ensure that environment will be protected. In future, can incentivize people to be efficient with water. Where do we put market forces in our forecast?

Should matter the market basis for using water and what it will produce financially. Economic impact of a unit of water needs to be considered. Availability of water is upper bound on usage. If water is available, how can you recruit new growth to the local community?

Answer: Forecast will be basis for plan. Have to start somewhere, incorporate this input into forecasting. Group of 12 industries is providing guidance on metrics used to forecast future water needs. Discussion will be considered as we move forward with the process.

There is a public input process to determine region specific factors. EPD laid out initial process to identify +/- 5 people in region to provide input—one meeting in east, one meeting in west of State. Should be a good opportunity to provide input based on discussion above.

Rick mentioned that this was good discussion to identify questions for further consideration.

7) Agriculture Forecast Results

Jeff Mullen introduced the UGA team that has developed agricultural irrigation water demand – specifically irrigated. Jeff pointed the group to information available on the following website (http://www.nespal.org/sirp/waterinfo/State/awd/agwaterdemand.htm). Initially focused on 5 primary crops that make up 90 percent of irrigated water use. Added analysis for additional group of specialty crops. Data related to water use is extremely limited, and there are contradictory datasets. People seem to be concerned about getting locked into a sector (i.e. agricultural, industrial)—each sector is independent. Council is responsible for allocation between sectors—take forecasts and make adjustments for how region will grow. Jeff walked the group through the website to show where data is available for local communities. Jeff encouraged the group to let him know if anything doesn't make sense and justifications for how information should be updated. Information for wet and dry years, county by county data, crop by crop, etc. Data is also presented by month to help plan for the high peaks. Irrigation uses are a drop in the bucket in this region – less than 2 percent.

Question: Much larger number of permitted withdrawals than there are actual withdrawals.

Answer: All numbers come from a baseline determining irrigated infrastructure, EPD meter data, Albany State survey data, and 2007 flyover data to map out permitted withdrawal sites. Datasets were compared to come up with a master database of locations. Agricultural permits are based on flow, not an amount of water that can be withdrawn. Need to consider that amounts presented are an average, not peak usage. Jeff emphasized that Council members should contact him about any concerns regarding anomalies in the forecasts.

Question: What about animal agriculture? This is a larger proportion of the ag usage in this region.

Answer: Not used in this study. Poultry industry will be generating numbers. However, compared to irrigation, not a large usage. Should be brought up to EPD to ensure that it is appropriately considered. Numbers were decided on based on national metrics. Water usage depends on number of birds in a county and an estimate of individual water usage.

Group agreed that we have to plan for the peak days and also changes in agriculture, such as increase in specialty crops that use drip irrigation and probably won't need a permit. Group discussion about existing permits that are not being used—do you plan for maximum usage? Have to weigh/forecast based on projections based on how prices change. Don't have a price/response model for specialty crops, so have to make assumptions that they react in the same way as major crops, for which there are models. Jeff encouraged group to get water withdrawals metered in order to improve forecasts.

Question: Is the farm gate value survey used to calibrate data? They should be—provides more specific data.

Answer: As much information as Jeff can receive about inaccuracies can help strengthen the results. Need to determine how much water is needed to produce different categories of crops. Need to continue to fine-tune the forecasts for future planning.

NOTE: A state-wide summary that contains commodity listings by county is available at the following website: (http://www.caed.uga.edu/publications/2009/pdf/AR-09-01.pdf)

Chairman Bennett concluded the discussion by noting that the group has provided good discussion on both M&I and Ag. Forecasts have done a good job of getting everyone thinking about issues. Statewide datasets may not necessarily apply perfectly to our region. Need to agree that we've still got a lot of work ahead to plan for how to allocate resources and use forecasting information.

8) Resource Assessments and Planning for Joint Meetings

Rick introduced Dr. Wei Zeng to speak about the resource assessments. Wei mentioned that he is on a fact finding mission to improve the quality of the data, so he will distribute the data on a CD, for review. Mr. Brownlow said he would check the size of the files and post on the website, if the files are too large to email.

Wei said that the purpose of the resource assessments is to answer three questions.

1. How much water have we been using, historically?
2. How much water has Mother Nature given us? (naturally available, how much did we start with?)
3. How much can we reliably use without compromising the needs of downstream users and in-streamflow needs?

He said they have gathered all the withdrawal and discharge records throughout the state, and will give them today to the Council chairman for distribution to the council members for review.

Going back to question 2, EPD has asked Arcadis (consulting firm) to help them answer the question of how much naturally occurring water is there, by removing withdrawals and reservoir effects. (also called unimpaired flow)

Question: What about groundwater?

Answer: Today we are only discussing surface water, unless there is surface water – groundwater interaction, we have a model for that. Dr. Jim Kennedy, the state geologist, is managing the groundwater availability with his consulutant CDM to present at the next council meeting.

The minimum instream flow can be determined by the council, to increase the minimum flows above the 7Q10 from the Clean Water Act.

These flows will be entered into the River Basin Planning Tool. Using the model and the unimpaired flows and water withdrawals, we can understand if we have enough water to meet the council specified unimpaired flows.

The resource assessments help us understand if there is a gap between the needs and the available supply. Management practices would be demand reduction, storage, increased returns (decrease consumptive use).

Question: Conserving doesn't increase your supply, it increases the use of your supply.

Answer: Yes, but it does allow for more users.

Wei said the purpose of the process is to see if there is a gap and if there is a gap, then how do we address that. The forecasting will provide the needs from M&I and Agriculture users, and find out if there is a gap.

Question: How you are doing the analysis with regards to fluctuations in demand and resource?

Answer: The model is a daily model. It allows for monthly input from municipal forecasting efforts and seasonal changes from agricultural forecasts.

The handouts include all the maps for the modeling, first one has the planning nodes for each basin. The next one (stick figure map) has the major users per reach.

Question: Can you provide maps with county boundaries on it?

Answer: Yes we can do that.

Question: Are the local drainage basins included in this model?

Answer: No, we are using the USGS gages, because that is where the best data is available.

Question: What is the difference between basic and planning nodes?

Answer: We have all the data at all the nodes, but we are doing the assessments only at the planning nodes. The council has the flexibility to change that, if they desire.

9) <u>Public Involvement Plan</u>

Please read it for next meeting.

10) <u>Elected Official and Public Comments</u>

Joe Cook, Coosa River Basin Initiative – The proposed Shoal Creek Reservoir is of concern. It is of concern because of interbasin transfer. It is in the Etowah basin and proposed to transfer 100 MGD to the City of Atlanta in the Chattahoochee basin. That is more than 4 times the

current interbasin transfer and causes concern for all downstream users. He is concerned that could be forfeiting future opportunities by making this transfer.

David Radcliffe, UGA – would like to get more handouts of the presentations for the next meeting for the public attendees.

Nick Jameson, GA DNR, Wildlife Resources Division – Ecosystem statement is important, also important is recreational fishing, generates $1.3 Billion annually for the state of Georgia.

11) Wrap Up/Council Meeting 3 Evaluation

Chairman Bennett thanked everyone for being here, asked the members to read the contents prior to the next meeting, and participate when asked between meetings.

Mr. Ashburn charged the council members to provide feedback to UGA on agriculture forecasting.

Chairman Bennett adjourned the meeting.

Members Present

1. Mike Berg
2. David Ashburn
3. Irwin Bagwell
4. Kenneth Beasley
5. John Bennett
6. Charlie Bethel
7. Tim Bowden
8. Don Cope
9. Kelly Cornwell
10. Pat Gober
11. Jerry Jennings
12. Haynes Johnson (alternate)
13. Sherry Loudermilk
14. Tim Mercier
15. Lee Mulkey (alternate, on behalf of Gerald Dunham)
16. Tom O'Bryant
17. Lamar Paris
18. Sam Payne
19. David Pennington
20. Jimmy Petty
21. Frank Riley
22. Keith Coffey (alternate)

Members Not Present:

1. Doug Anderton
2. Tim Banks
3. Katie Dempsey (ex officio)
4. Stephen Gray
5. Dick Martin
6. Todd Pealock
7. Chip Pearson (ex officio)
8. David Westmoreland

Partnering & Other State Agencies

1. Leamon Scott, Department of Community Affairs (http://www.dca.state.ga.us/)
2. Keith Gilmer, Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission (www.gaswcc.org/)
3. Greg Sheppard, Lumpkin County Extension Coordinator (http://www.caes.uga.edu/extension/)

GA Environmental Protection Division:

1. Becky Champion, Assistant Chief for Coosa-Tallapoosa-Tennessee Basins

CH2M HILL

1. Rick Brownlow
2. Chrissy Thom
3. Brian Skeens