Memorandum

To: *Altamaha Regional Water Planning Council*

From: *Rick Brown and Katherine Zitsch*

Date: *April 5, 2010*

Subject: *Council Meeting 5 Summary*

1) Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Brinson Lanier called the meeting to order and asked the Planning Contractor (PC) to start the day's proceedings. The PC welcomed the Council and mentioned that an official welcome from Plant Hatch would be in the afternoon when members went to the visitor center for the information and driving tour of the plant.

The PC provided an overview of the agenda and meeting dates and location for the next Council meeting. Little Ocmulgee State Park was suggested and it was noted that the Council would revisit this at the end of the day.

The PC then provided a brief summary of the last Council Meeting (CM 4). CM4 built on the resource assessment information presented at CM3. Council members and the PC reviewed municipal and industrial water and wastewater forecast methodology and status, continued the discussion of management practices, and discussed the Joint Meetings. The Council updated and adopted its Vision and Goals and adopted the Council's Public Involvement Plan. The PC then reviewed Council feedback from the meeting and the overall status of water plan effort and schedule.

Following this discussion, the goals and objective of Council meeting 5 were outlined:

- 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.

Next the PC handed out a draft table of contents (TOC) for use in developing the regional water plan document. The PC thanked Gerald DeWitt, Will Donaldson, and Paul Stravriotis for their efforts on the subcommittee to develop the draft TOC.

The Chair and PC asked for subcommittee volunteers to work with the PC in developing preliminary plan sections. The following Council members volunteered: Ed Jeffords, John Roller, Sue Sammons, and Jim Strickland.

A discussion was held regarding the need for outreach to key municipalities. The PC noted that if Council members have municipalities or water providers that are not included in the Council and should be included in outreach, they should provide municipality names and, as available, contact information.

A summary was provided by the PC of the Governor's Water Contingency Planning Task Force. The Task Force completed their work in December 2009 and the final report is available online. The PC will email Council members a link to the final report. It is also available by going to www.georgia.gov and searching "Water Contingency Planning Task Force." The shortfall estimated for 2012 is 250 million gallons per day (mgd). Two portfolios were developed to address the shortfall: one for 2015 and one for 2020. Neither includes utilizing groundwater from south of the fall line. The 2015 Portfolio includes conservation, indirect potable reuse (252 MGD), and small groundwater supply systems (26 MGD). The 2020 Portfolio includes: conservation, reservoirs – expansion and new (236 MGD), and small groundwater supply systems (26 MGD).

Logistics for the afternoon tour of Plant Hatch were discussed. Members could attend the presentation at the visitor center and/or the driving tour of the plant.

2) Leadership Elections – Council Chair and Vice Chair – The PC noted that the Chair and Vice-Chair need to be elected every 6 months based on the operating procedures of the Altamaha Council. Ed Jeffords made a motion that the Council re-elect Brinson Lanier and Mike Polsky for Chair and Vice-Chair. The entire Council seconded the motion. The motion carried with no dissention.

3) Revised Municipal Water Use (GPCD)

The PC mentioned that each Council member should have received a technical memo describing the municipal and industrial water and wastewater forecasting methods. Work was completed with a Council subcommittee on setting preliminary county level per capita water use rates in gallons per capita day (gpcd) for the

region. These use rates were developed for public and self-supplied users. It was pointed out that this is the foundation to complete the water forecasting. Once the Council provides the green light that it agrees with the subcommittee recommendations, then the Council can move forward with forecasts and determine the amount of water needed and the management practices for future water needs/gaps.

The self-supplied gallons per capita day (gpcd) rate was determined to be 75 gpcd (from the USGS Report: Water Use in Georgia for 2005). For public systems, the PC first completed a comparison between USGS gpcd data (by county) and weighted county gpcd derived from EPD data. The PC then conducted outreach to collect data from select individual municipal suppliers and to compare these data against the values originally reported by USGS and EPD. The PC also collected some EPD district office input as well as data from municipal providers, especially if the data were anomalous. If large industry was accounting for large gpcd, then that industry was taken out and accounted for in the industrial water use category. Smaller water using industry is included in the gpcd, however.

The preliminary results from this work was summarized in a technical memo and provided to the Council ad hoc committee that participated in the refinement of gpcd (committee members included Gerald DeWitt, Jim Free, Ed Jeffords, Brinson Lanier, Mike Polsky, and John Roller). Refinement and outreach resulted in a more credible adjustment to gpcd values of four counties in the Altamaha region. The committee recommended to the Council to use the self-supplied water use rate of 75 gpcd and the individual gpcd for each county as refined by the PC. The range of gpcd for the Altamaha Region was presented and ranged from 95 – 195 gpcd.

It was pointed out that no demand altering management practices were included in the baseline water demand gpcd other than passive/natural conservation resulting from the 1992 Energy Policy Act. Moving forward, the Council should keep in mind that there will be natural/passive conservation as houses are remodeled and plumbing fixtures are replaced with lower flow water fixtures that were mandated by the Act.

It was emphasized that forecasts are to be used in regional planning only; they are not for individual permitting decisions. This is a very important part of what the ad hoc committee talked about – "what are the unintended consequences of what we do?" These numbers should not be used for permit allocations, and this needs to be incorporated into the final state water plan.

The PC then presented the results of the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (OPB) population projections. OPB population forecasts are officially released. They are currently

through 2030, but will be provided through 2050. The projections show the Altamaha region growing from 250,659 in 2010 to 374,565 in 2050. The next step in the forecasting process is to combine population and water use (gpcd) to forecast future needs.

A discussion was then held on the gallon per capita day usages. The main data source for gpcd information is the USGS report previously presented. This report has statewide coverage, so it helps provide a common platform across the state. These data were collected from a large number of local water providers but are not intended to take the place of or be as detailed as some of the data that are collected/produced by local water utilities. We need to strike a balance between regional and local water planning. The regional plan will look at water use at a more regional level than what would be required for local water planning.

Another source of data was the EPD drinking water system survey, which was self reported. This is a good data source, but not as reliable as the other two.

As an example of what the PC completed, it was mentioned that Bleckley County originally had 39 gpcd from the USGS report. The PC conducted outreach and found out that the population served was inaccurate. The refined number was 115, which is within the region's range of 95 – 195 gpcd.

The PC then highlighted a couple of points that were raised by the subcommittee. It was mentioned that the Council could adopt one single gpcd for the entire region. The strength of this is that it takes away some concern that the data might be used for an allocation in the future. The downside is that some of the counties may have a reason for a higher gpcd – such as more commercial or light industrial – and they expect that to continue moving forward. Or they may have a high rate of water loss and may need to implement a leak detection program. The subcommittee agreed to have a county specific gpcd rather than a single value.

Another option discussed was to have three different water use rates in the region (high, medium, low). The subcommittee did not reach agreement on this last point and wanted the full Council to consider this option. As planning contractor, we are recommending that we use county-based gpcds. The technical memorandum that you received shows data for all of the different individual providers. Again, we need to balance a regional approach with county level information.

Chairman Lanier mentioned that the subcommittee looked at the fact that some of the Counties with higher water use rates have prison populations. That makes water use a little higher. In Candler County, the County spent about $2 million to upgrade the water system and spot leaks. Candler County went from 20% lost water down to 2%. The reason that our

County's water use rate is low is also that we don't have a prison population, and we have efficient use of our water.

The PC pointed out that's exactly why those numbers are important. There might be good reasons why the numbers are different between counties and there will be a range.

A Council member pointed out that in Dodge County, there are three prisons, so that may elevate the water use rate some.

The Chairman pointed out that the subcommittee found the water use rates to be fair/reasonable. The subcommittee leaned towards county specific rates, but the full Council needs to weigh in.

The PC noted that water use rates were in 2005, which generally speaking looked like an average water year.

It was pointed out that many individual homeowners have shallow wells for uses like lawn irrigation, and these water use rates are not included in any of these numbers. Shallow well usage may be more pronounced in this region than in other regions because here, we only have to go about 25' down to get to the surficial aquifer.

It was further pointed out that the region's numbers are a fair bit higher than in metro-Atlanta, but metro-Atlanta values were residential only, they did not include commercial.

A Council member pointed out that Wayne County water use rates without the prison are lower. The prison uses over 300 gpcd based on County population.

Kevin Farrell of EPD asked if there was any input to refine the percent population served? The PC mentioned that yes, the EPD database was used to get a sense for what might need changing. This happened in one to two cases in this region.

A subcommittee member stated that he supported individual county rates because those factors that drive specific water use in that county are then used with population in that county. We don't lose the individual county factors.

The PC noted that based on the population projections, it is looking like Georgia is almost doubling the population from 2010 (just over 10 million) to 2050 (just under 20 million). Growth is based on population, birth over deaths estimate (age, sex) and the amount of net migration into region.

A Council member pointed out that unless the plan is to build more prisons in Wilcox County, they'll never meet that population increase. The PC noted that growth is modest for

Wilcox County. The real question is for planning purposes, do you want to overestimate or underestimate growth?

4) Completed Baseline Scenario Municipal Forecasts

The PC presented that it is expected that there will not be a major change in how water is generally used in the region and that past trends are likely to continue in the future. The PC presented information on percent self supplied versus publicly supplied in the region. It was noted that more urban counties have a higher percent of publicly supplied water.

A Council member asked if self supplied includes agricultural water use. The PC responded that this does not include agricultural water use.

The PC generated wastewater forecasts based on water use and percent sewered and percent septic. A centralized wastewater number is important because these become wastewater discharges and feed assimilative capacity models. Our subcommittee chose to use historic trends for percent septic and percent centralized wastewater and did not recommend altering these percents going into the future.

The PC performed additional quality assurance/quality control on the land application system databases. LAS information often didn't have discharge data associated with them, which made it difficult to determine percentages.

A Council member asked whether, as technology changes on discharge treatment, we will account for this? The PC mentioned that projections don't look at changes in technology moving forward. When we look at management practices, we may look at the need for improvement at some of the plants. Point source and land application forecasts take current trends into the future.

Chairman Lanier reminded the Council that this will be a statewide water plan and waste disposal plan. In his visit with the new EPD director, the director stressed that this is living document that will be changed as facts change. The presentation made by the PC this morning is based on the best available facts that we have today and sound reasoning. Because this is a living document, we can change later if further information arises. We need to put our stamp of approval on self supplied water use of 75 gallons per capita per day of water. Further, county specific gpcd seems to be the best way to go. Our Council should approve or disprove this approach.

Jim Free made a motion to approve the 75 gallons per capita day self-supplied water use and the individual county gpcds. Ed Jeffords seconded the motion. Chairman Lanier asked if there was further discussion.

A Council member asked about the difference between 75 gpcd and whatever is used in these counties. The PC noted that the 75 self-supplied value (individual well user) is from a smaller data set because individual well users typically don't meter their water. In addition, there is no commercial or light industrial water use reflected in the self-supplied numbers whereas the county numbers have both of these uses. Finally, potentially more of that water is for indoor water use exclusively.

A Council member asked if there was any double allocation. The PC noted that there was not. That's why we separated out self-supplied versus publicly supplied. The PC used the 1990 census data to determine the number of people that lived outside of the service area, so they separated those people out from the public supply.

A Council member asked if agricultural water use was separate. The PC noted that it is and that we'll talk after break about thermoelectric and agricultural water use and a little on industrial water use.

A Council member noted that 75 gpcd has been around since the 1990s, so it is probably a high number now with conservation devices.

Chairman Lanier called for a vote. The motion carried with no opposition.

Chairman Lanier noted that the Council needs to approve the summary of Council meeting 4. Sue Sammons motioned to approve the summary of Council Meeting 4. Dan McCranie seconded the motion. The motion carried with no opposition.

Chairman Lanier also noted that the Council needs to approve the agenda for this meeting. James Mark Burns seconded. The motion carried with no opposition.

5) Completed Baseline Scenario Industrial Forecasts

The PC presented that the purpose of the industrial water needs forecast is to capture heavy water using industries. There is typically not a good relationship between production data and water use. There is typically a closer correlation between employment and water use. Forecasts don't take into account changes in technology, however. In working with industrial groups, employment was generally determined to be the best indicator of future growth. Specific adjustments can be made on case by case basis if there's a reason to do so. One thing to note is that if employment projections decrease, it was determined that we would hold the water use at the same level.

The primary water use in this region is in the paper industry. There is also other industry, food manufacturing, and textiles. The source of water in this region is mainly the Floridan aquifer. The subcommittee discussed whether we need to account for industry that might

come, but that is not currently anticipated. The subcommittee decided that they can't "crystal ball" that information. We did outreach for any industries that might relocate for the area, including outreach with industrial planning groups. It was hard to get solid information. A couple of other Councils have asked if we need to put in safety factor for unanticipated growth in industrial water demands. The Coastal Regional Water Planning Council hasn't made a determination on the matter. Suwannee-Satilla is looking at a fairly modest amount (5 mgd). The Council opted to not make adjustments to the industrial projections.

6) Energy Forecasting Methodology and Preliminary Results

The PC presented that each energy type (coal, nuclear, etc.) has unique water needs. Energy water projections are expected in summer 2010. The PC noted that withdrawal amounts for energy are larger than what is consumed. The PC is working towards determining consumptive use by energy source.

A Council member noted that Oglethorpe has a biomass site in Appling County where the cooling system was grey water municipal water. He mentioned that if that is not in the plan for this region, we need to include it.

The PC presented the water use in the Altamaha Region. The Doctortown planning node shows everything upstream of the node – both withdrawals and discharges – not just what use is occurring near Doctortown. The PC noted that going forward the Council may need to talk to other Councils upstream and downstream. The PC anticipates subcommittee and joint meetings with other Councils to learn about what they're doing and their management practices.

The energy forecasting work includes a power stakeholder group to provide input into the forecasts. This allows the power industry to provide representation into these forecasts. The energy forecasts may be more statewide forecasts than regional forecasts; the forecasts may not distribute those needs into a county watershed level but we will have to wait and see the final outcome.

A Council member noted that upstream impacts affect us substantially. Folks above the Altamaha region have the feeling that Altamaha has plenty of water, so it doesn't matter how much water they take. The Altamaha Council ought to always be cognizant of that mindset.

The Planning Contractor noted that this is why we need to highlight joint meetings. As we look at needs in the Altamaha Region, and vision and goals, they include concepts like maintaining fisheries. We hear the Council and want to avoid the discussion of allocation while allowing a discussion of what's important in terms of resources here.

The PC confirmed that the statewide 2005 numbers include hydroelectric and thermal.

A Council member expressed an interest in efficiency in terms of energy source and production.

It was noted that Macon's cooling is more dependent on water than some of the plants in other regions of the state. Some of this will be for discussed in upcoming meetings.

7) Update on Agricultural Forecast

The PC noted that based on previous agricultural forecasting work, some water users did not feel their water uses were adequately captured. Therefore, EPD working with sub-threshold water use sectors (less than 100,000 gallons/day) including livestock, dairy, poultry and nurseries. Some water use adjustments were made, especially based on nursery water use. These adjustments rippled through other agricultural forecasting, so this forecast is a few weeks away from being completed.

Some of this information is at a smaller detail than what Dr. Hook presented earlier. Councils will decide whether sub-threshold agricultural water-use will be included in their plan. Green industry is being consulted to determine if trends need to be incorporated into golf course water use as well as nursery water use.

The PC presented the next steps for the all water use forecasts. Demands will be distributed to the aquifer and surface water planning node. The agricultural water demands and forecasts will be completed, as well as the energy water use and consumption forecasts. The PC will utilize the water and wastewater forecasts and work with Councils to begin the management practices and resource assessment analysis.

8) Resource Assessment Results

The PC presented an overview of the Resource Assessments (RAs) and mentioned that the joint meetings that were held around that state over the last month provided a detailed summary of the RAs. The PC noted that today's presentation will be more general and that summary information from the joint meetings and from the resource assessment synopsis documents are additional resources that Council members can review.

The PC then highlighted the RA for surface water quantity. The PC described the river basin delineations and the key inputs for the resource assessment. Points discussed included:

- Delineation of planning and basin nodes
- Location of USGS gauges

- Definition of unimpaired flows and 7Q10 (the lowest 7 day flow that occurs 10 percent of the time) that are used to determine the "flow regime"

The Council offered the following comments/questions:

- What does the cross section of the river look like? Can this be presented? Possibly, we can look into this.

- Please confirm whether the Lumber City, Mount Vernon, and Doctortown nodes utilize the 7Q10 as the flow regime. The Planning Contractor noted that this would be research. (*Note post-meeting: No, this value is not the flow regime. This graphic was used to depict the flow under varying conditions to provide the Council a sense of the flow variation. These nodes are semi-regulated nodes and flow regimes are determined from applicable existing instream flow requirements, including minimum reservoir releases and/or downstream flow operational requirements of FERC licenses or water control plans. In the absence of such requirements at any node, there is no required flow regime.*)

- Does the health of the river depend on cycles? Yes for some functions. Is it the same for every river? No.

- Can we show unimpaired, observed, and 7Q10 on the same graphs? We will work on different means of showing flows.

- The Altamaha River is the net recipient of groundwater return flows in the lower river reach (i.e., 60 mgd at Rayonier)? A Council member said yes, but at Doctortown the ground water import is still only <½ of 1%.

- Do upstream withdrawals impact the areas in our region? Yes they can.

- What are the impacts of reuse? This can result in a decrease to downstream flows.

- We need to be careful how much is being withdrawn upstream.

- At Mt. Vernon, 7Q10 is only protecting for drought conditions. It may be important to include consideration of emergent drought conditions. What is the absolute floor or minimum acceptable flow? This is something that the Council can discuss – utilizing a minimum flow that is higher than what EPD is presenting.

- At which meeting should we identify demand quantities? By mid-summer.

- We need to make sure we also protect assimilative capacity and what is needed to ensure that protection.

- For simulated streamflow, does that include human effects? It simply means it is modeled flow.
- Why is the Canoochee at Claxton going dry? Could be existing withdrawals and/or the effects of drought. Some streams and tributaries naturally go dry in the summer.
- Where is the Claxton Gauge located? Not sure of the exact location.
- Would surface storage be considered for management practices? Yes. Council can suggest this.
- If the level is below the 7Q10, do we need to address this situation? Yes, possibly depending on causes and needs.
- Is the flow in Claxton dependent on other imports? There is one wastewater discharge from Twin City.

The PC presented the water quality RA outlining the following points.

- Locations of dissolved oxygen (DO) and nutrient modeling were presented—smaller streams and tributaries were not modeled.
- The "naturally low" DO policy assumes low flow and high temperatures as worst case
- There are areas where there is good assimilative capacity and areas of limited or no assimilative capacity as shown on the RA maps
- TMDL listed segments for the region will need to be considered during management practice development

The Council offered the following comments/questions:

- Where are the fishing and non-fishing areas? This is included in the Water Resource Overview presented at an earlier council meeting.
- For regions outside of Altamaha, what is the Council's role in regards to water quality concerns including areas outside the region (i.e., tributaries to the Satilla)? This is a joint meeting topic if Council wishes.
- Do we have charts for TMDLs for Oconee and Ocmulgee? Yes, we will get these to Council.
- Please provide more information on how streams get on the monitoring/TMDL list.

- It was noted that for RAs, DO and nutrients were modeled only if there were discharges to the reach.
- Is there a TMDL for Ohoopee and TMDL implementation plans? Yes, we will get those to Council.

The PC then described the groundwater RA showing the following:

- Aquifer layers
- Modeled aquifer boundaries
- Aquifer sustainable yield ranges for prioritized aquifers, including baseline current withdrawals

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 comments/questions:

- Are the two Floridan models connected? In the case of the Floridan, it is one aquifer but two different models were developed.
- For RA models, have permitted values been input into the models? Not yet, but they will be for municipal and industrial uses for surface water models.
- What assumption was made on the distance between wells? Not sure; we will check that.
- What is the 30-foot metric? It is related to the cone of depression between two wells having more than a 30-foot vertical differential.

The PC then asked the Council and chair to consider forming a subcommittee to begin looking at the development of management practices. The following Council members offered to serve on the subcommittee: Gerald DeWitt, Len Hauss, Paul Stravriotis, Mike Polsky, and Brinson Lanier.

9) Management Practices

The PC defined a management practice as anything that helps us meet our regional goals and vision and that can be used to address future water resource needs. The level of detail for management practices within the regional plan can be different – some areas where we

can get very specific and other areas where we will be more general. Management practices will be unique to the Altamaha region and the nature of the gap/future need.

This is a holistic planning process – there are interactions between stormwater, water supply and wastewater. Reuse has an impact on water supply and wastewater returns – what is positive for some areas may be negative for other areas. We are looking at both point sources and non-point sources.

Management practices need to be meaningful and be capable of being used as inputs to the resource assessment tools. For instance, the surface water availability management practices should be related to local drainage areas so that we can determine what the influence is at that node.

The plan is to do surface water quantity management practices first and then surface water quality management practices.

Water quality modeling is reach driven rather than water planning node driven. We will need to evaluate how this moves forward. Point source management practices could be reuse, centralized wastewater treatment systems, direct discharges, or land application systems.

The next challenge that the Council will have is "how do we select these management practices?" As part of that process we don't want to lose sight of the Altamaha Region's Vision and Goals.

We need to be open minded to list management practices and then be level headed when evaluating management practices. In addition, we need a decision making process to evaluate management practices so that we're not bickering. Options for decision making could include simple qualitative modeling, more complex records that utilize criteria, performance measures, and scoring of management practices. We could also have simple voting. We need to have a decision making process, but the type of decision making process is up to Council.

From what we're hearing so far, we may be documenting some issues and deal with spacing issues on where wells are drilled, but for the most part we hope we're in okay shape on groundwater quantity. As a Council, we don't actually implement water projects, but we hope to provide policy on what's important to the region, working with local governments and utilities. We may need help from the Council to do some outreach and talk to providers about the planning process. Meeting future needs will involve several key steps including: documenting existing uses, documenting remaining permit capacity, identification of plans that are currently being considered, and identification of Council specific ideas.

For TMDL areas, at a minimum Council will need to be familiar with the TMDL plans and their implementation status. Council is encouraged to do more if possible to help promote the implementation of some or all aspects of the plans, focusing on partnerships and collaboration.

The PC presented that there were several ways to move forward with the development of the preliminary portfolio of management practices. The entire Council could work through the process, we could use a Council subcommittee, or the PC could provide some ideas to start from. A Council member suggested that the PC should throw out some ideas and send out emails for people to comment upon.

10) Local Elected Official Comments

There were no local elected official comments.

11) Public Comments

There were no public comments.

12) Wrap Up, What to Expect Next Meeting, Council Meeting Evaluation

The next steps in the planning process include evaluation of near term gaps and future needs. Management practices will then be developed to address the gaps and needs. After Council Meeting 6, each Council has increased flexibility on the schedule for meetings. This will allow Councils more freedom to work toward plan completion on a schedule that works best for them. Council meetings could move to more frequent meetings of shorter duration, could move to more sub-committee meetings, or could stay generally the same.

The next meeting will be held on June 22nd at Little Ocmulgee State Park.

13) Plant Hatch Presentation and Tour

The meeting adjourned and interested Council members listened to a presentation about Plant Hatch and went on a driving tour of the plant.

Altamaha Regional Water Council
Council Members Attendance List

Altamaha Council Members		**3/23/2010**
1	Gary Bell	X
2	Randy Branch	
3	Guy Rex Bullock	X
4	James Mark Burns	X
5	Gerald A DeWitt	X
6	Will Donaldson Jr.	
7	Cleve Edenfield	X
8	Jim Free	X
9	Randy Giddens	X
10	Len Hauss	X
11	Edward S Jeffords	X
12	Phillip Jennings	
13	L. Brinson Lanier	X
14	Dan McCranie	X
15	Steve Meeks	
16	Greg Morris	
17	Buddy Pittman	X
18	Michael A. Polsky	X
19	John E. Roller	X
20	Sue B. Sammons	X
21	Doug Sharp	X
22	Paul A. Stravriotis	X
23	Jim E. Strickland	X
24	Dent L. Temples	
25	Lindsay Thomas	X
26	William G Tomberlin	
27	Michael Williams	X
28	Tommie Williams	
29	Russ Yeomans	X
	Total	***21***

Altamaha Regional Water Council
Public Attendance List

Public Attendee		3/23/2010	Representing
1	Deatre Denion	X	GA DCA
2	Barry Dotson	X	
3	Don Giles	X	Georgia Farm Bureau
4	David Eigendic	X	GSWCC
5	Don Harrison	X	GA DNR - Fisheries Mgmt.
6	Alison McGee	X	The Nature Conservancy
7	Rahn Milligan	X	GSWCC
8	Ken Rosanski	X	Oglethorpe Power
9	Bryan Snow	X	Georgia Forestry Comm.
	Total	***9***	