

ACFS Governing Board Meeting

Apalachicola FL

March 17-18, 2011

DRAFT – Pending Approval by GB

Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Objectives and Agenda

The Governing Board (GB) meeting started at 9am. Dan Tonsmeire welcomed the group and introduced Noah Lockley, Chairman of the Franklin County (FL) Commission. Mr. Lockley welcomed the group to Apalachicola. Next, Tonsmeire thanked the Apalachicola caucus, and especially Betty Webb, for their work on setting up this meeting. Next, Tonsmeire set the tone for the day. He noted that the GB has 56 members, which is the same number of people that worked on the U.S. Declaration of Independence. Tonsmeire introduced the facilitator, Gail Bingham.

Bingham told the Governing Board that she looks forward to a good working relationship. She said that she's observed that the group has a real hunger to get to the issues. The organizational structure is now in place, so the GB can focus more on the issues. Next, Bingham reviewed the meeting objectives (listed on agenda) and walked through the agenda. Bingham asked each member to introduce themselves and reviewed ground rules for the meeting. She emphasized a focus on learning from one another.

Old Business

Dan Tonsmeire asked if there were any questions about the meeting summary. Billy Turner made a motion to approve the meeting summary from the December meeting. Vince Falcione seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Finance Committee

Billy Turner reviewed the current financial statements and the budget (hand-outs). Turner noted that the budget was very tight. There is a need for revenue beyond membership dues if the group's activities are to be supported. Turner made a motion to approve the budget. Charles Stripling seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Next, Turner reviewed the fund-raising plan. He thanked Brad Currey for working on fund-raising for ACFS. Currey reported that Nancy Rigby of Coxe Curry Associates has volunteered to assist in identifying grantors and in helping with background materials, such as a question and answer document for members to use when meeting with potential funders. Currey referred to the fund-raising benchmarks handout description developed by Wilton Rooks. It has four major segments for funding requirements; each segment has a fund-raising amount identified. Brad Currey summarized his discussions with Nancy Rigby and said she had initiated research to identify potential funding sources. The initial stage will focus on foundations and corporations, and it can include requests for funding for operating expenses and project-specific activities. Currey has spoken with the Woodruff Foundation, and the foundation has

expressed interest in possibly supporting ACFS, but no commitments have been made. ACFS would need to seek funding from other sources.

Q. What level of self funding would foundations expect to see for operating expenses?

Currey said that he has not addressed that specifically yet, but he does believe that foundations would expect to see that the GB has “skin in the game”.

Q. Where did the cost estimates in the fund-raising plan come from?

Billy Turner said that they were starting estimates to serve as a basis for developing plans, but may need to be revised as plans become more specific. Wilton Rooks said that the estimates were based in part on cost range estimate information offered in responses to the RFQ, and underscored the point that the numbers could change quite a bit as the proposals are developed further. Woody Hicks noted that the amount for the In-stream Flow Assessment (\$115,000) was low.

Q. Will there be more discussion about the need for a full-time executive director?

Bingham said that it would be appropriate to discuss during the discussion of the 5-Year Plan and 2011 Annual Plan.

Currey added that foundations are not going to want to pay operating expenses beyond an initial start-up phase. For operating expenses in the longer term, the group will need an annual campaign to raise funds from parties that have an interest in the group’s work. There will be a big selling job in the future; the foundations will help us get started. Foundations can be approached for funding for specific projects. Currey thinks that ACFS has a good chance of getting funding, and he suggests that the GB members review the foundation research and see if they have additional suggestions. He also said that ACFS will need GB members to volunteer to make calls and visits to potential funders. Currey and Turner both expressed support for the need for an executive director.

Turner suggested that the GB approve the fundraising program, including Brad Currey as the coordinator on foundation and private fund-raising efforts. Turner said that opportunities for government funding are probably limited at this time, but Turner will coordinate any government fund-raising efforts.

Chad Taylor made a motion to approve the fundraising program (benchmarks and coordination). Pat Stevens seconded the motion. Tim Thoms said that all the members of the GB have a responsibility to help with fund-raising, and the plan will help to guide us. Dan Tonsmeire thanked Mark Masters for his support for the ACFS operations. Tonsmeire asked for approval of the motion by consensus, and it was approved.

Action Planning Work Group

Dan Tonsmeire thanked the Action Planning Work Group for their work. He said that this process has been moving quickly. Bill McCartney also thanked the committee and others for their work on the plans. McCartney said that the guiding principle was to tie the plan to the mission and charter of the ACFS. He

said that three elements were considered: (a) a plan for the planning process, (b) a wish list of things to do, and (c) an annual action plan. The Five Year Planning Program document addresses (a) and (b); the 2011 Annual Plan addresses (c). McCartney also said that the plans that have been developed will allow us to describe to others what ACFS does.

McCartney said that the work group received 11 major responses from members in comment on the documents, considered all of the comments received, and accepted all that were consistent with the document, although they may not appear in the same part of the document on which the comment was made. The Executive Committee also reviewed the documents. McCartney said that the document is dynamic and subject to change as needed. McCartney said that ACFS needs to really focus on some projects, and we need to implement them with vigor.

Note: *The documents discussed on 3/17/2011 are the same as the ones sent to the GB a week before the meeting. The Five-Year Planning Program document is dated 3-10-2011. The 2011 Action Plan is dated 3-9-2011.*

Five-Year Planning Program document

Bingham asked the GB to start with the Five-Year Planning Program document (5YPP). This document outlines the planning process and identifies a menu of options for ACFS activities. Bingham explained that each year items will be selected from this menu for priority action in the year ahead, so not everything in this document necessarily will happen and it can evolve over time. Starting this summer, the GB will follow the steps listed on page 10 to implement this annual planning process.

Bill McCartney moved that the ACFS adopt the 5YPP document. The motion was seconded by Jim McClatchey. Bingham suggested that the group discuss the draft, suggest modifications, and vote on a final document tomorrow; the group agreed. Bingham asked for a show of hands to see who had questions and suggestions for changes. Chad Taylor asked for a bit more time to review the documents before discussion. The group took a 20 minute break.

After the break, the GB discussion addressed following in the 5YPP document:

- George Taylor asked if some action areas might be of interest to more than the interest groups listed for each planning objective. It was agreed that this was true, and it should be understood that these objectives are not limited to those groups listed.
- Billy Houston suggested that Objective D include business, industry, and recreation as well as navigation. There were no objections.
- Jim McClatchey said that item C.4 (page 13, line 16) advocates for “safe” groundwater yields. He asked for clarification of what “safe” means? Woody Hicks said he had a similar concern about the term “effective” permitting in item C (line 3, page 13). Hicks suggested changing “effective” to “sustainable and resource-based”. He noted that this could require a wording change in the charter, too. Jim McClatchey said that the same words could be substituted for “safe” in C.4. Bingham assessed consensus; the group had no objections.

- Frank Stephens suggested that the group needed to assess what level of agreement or disagreement exists in the group. He thinks that the group might be more in agreement than they know. He suggested that an action item be added to review each member/interest group's wants and needs. Bingham suggested that this would be an appropriate item to discuss for the 2011 Plan. Further discussion was put on hold.
- Gordon Rogers said that page 14, line 27, says to "consider" submitting comments on the Georgia water plans, while page 12, line 3 says to submit comments (without "consider"). He said the same comment applies to comments on the Water Control Manual. He suggested striking the word "consider" in these instances. Gail assessed consensus; there were no objections to this change.
- Tim Thoms said that while the plan addresses the GA water plans, it does not address any FL or AL water plans or policies. He suggested that review and comment on FL and AL water policy and plans should be added. Following a discussion of the different status of water policy in the three states, Gail assessed consensus; there were no objections.
- Jerri Russell asked for clarification on the annual review process and what it means for an item to be included (or not) in the 5YPP document. Bingham clarified that the 5YPP will be reviewed and revised annually, and it is a menu of options from which to select items for the annual plan. Bill McCartney confirmed that the 5YPP is a dynamic document that can be updated as needed. Although the plan lays out an annual review process, he thinks there is latitude for updates as needed if urgent. Bingham also suggested that if items about which there is disagreement are included, they can be discussed further in the future. Inclusion in the 5YPP document is not a commitment to undertaking that action.
- Bill McCartney further clarified that after this GB meeting, these documents would not be draft, but they would be subject to update and revision in the annual planning process (or as needed). Brad Moore said that page 8 describes "contingency" planning as needed to address unanticipated events. Wilton Rooks suggested changing "draft" action items to "potential" action items to better reflect the intent behind their inclusion in the 5YPP document.
- Wilton Rooks asked if it is best to channel the annual planning process through the Issues Committee. Brad Moore noted the role of the Issues Committee in the charter is to prioritize potential areas of work for ACFS. Frank Stephens said that designating the Issues Committee to coordinate the planning process was an expansion of the role of this committee. Dan Tonsmeire clarified that there are five standing committees in the Charter, and other groups are workgroups with time-limited missions. Frank Stephens suggested that, alternatively, annual planning could be coordinated by the Executive Committee. It was noted that the Issues Committee does not have a very active membership at this time. Bingham asked for the Executive Committee to discuss this over lunch and develop a recommendation.
- Billy Turner expressed concern that wastewater assimilation is not explicitly addressed in the Objectives. He said that it could be included in the natural systems and ecology objective (E), but he would be more comfortable with a direct statement about the need for wastewater assimilation. McCartney said he thought it could be included under an existing objective. Bingham asked Turner and McCartney to determine how to address this together over lunch.

- Homer Hirt said that the most urgent action item is A.3 (page 12, line 1): comments on the updated Water Control Manual. He questioned whether the GB is ready to prepare such comments and noted the urgency of doing so. Bingham said that this item is included in the 2011 Plan. She said that the first step is to agree to do it (by inclusion in the 2011 Plan), and the next step is to develop the actual comments. Dave McLain agreed that it is important for the group to determine the ACFS position and comments; this is a high priority and time sensitive issue.
- Chad Taylor noted that action items are not in any priority order (see: page 4, line 7). The GB will prioritize action items in the annual plans. He also noted that the Action Planning Work Group will be dissolved upon adoption of these two documents; carrying the planning process forward will be the duty of the Issues Committee (or the Executive Committee).
- Tim Perkins referred to item B.7 (page 12, line 31). He said he would prefer not to name a specific federal agency or a recreation area. Gordon Rogers noted that this comment came from the Sally Bethea of the Upper Chattahoochee Riverkeeper, and she would be here after lunch. Bingham suggested that Perkins and Bethea address this issue over lunch. Pat Stevens said that the GB has decided in the past that it will not involve federal agencies without a specific decision to do so. Therefore, she disagrees with naming a specific agency here.
- Jerri Russell suggested a new action item that would synthesize the needs across the whole basin and identify points of commonality and gaps. Bingham asked her to draft the language for this over lunch.
- Pat Stevens suggested that the last paragraph on page 6 regarding the tri-state water litigation be deleted through the end of line 2 on page 7 and replaced with a general statement that the operation of USACE reservoirs has been subject to litigation for 20 years. Then, in the next sentence, delete the word “second”. There were no objections.
- Pat Stevens suggested the following changes under A on page 11:
 - Add the following action items:
 - Evaluate operating protocols to support municipal water supply.
 - Maximize reservoir storage capabilities to support municipal water supply.
 - Recommend management practices to sustain current and future water supply needs.
 - Delete item 1(b) regarding the feasibility of alternative water supplies. She said we should focus on the capabilities of this basin.

The GB discussed Stevens’ proposals. Some thought that item 1(b) is an important part of evaluating the capabilities of the basin and added that there is a need to define how water supply development conflicts with downstream and ecological needs. It was noted that 1(b) already includes words such as “urge evaluation” to avoid taking a position on the topic, and it will be difficult to reach agreement without knowing what the options are. David Dixon said he would prefer not to remove 1(b), but it could be moved to a different category. It also was noted that it could be difficult to accomplish 1(b) in the first 5 years. It was suggested that the word “budget” be replaced with “assessment” in item A.2. There were no objections to that

change. Bingham assigned a group, including Pat Stevens, Mitch Reid, Glen Page, and David Dixon, to work on language changes related to Stevens' suggestions over lunch.

The group broke for lunch.

2011 Annual Plan

After lunch, Bingham suggested that the GB take up the 2011 Annual Plan (AP) and then come back to the 5YPP document later in the meeting. She asked the group spend a few minutes reviewing the 2011 AP document. Next, she walked through the AP with the GB. The objectives from the 5YPP document are included in Section I (page 1). Section II (page 2) lists 10 priorities for 2011. Section III details action items for the priorities. Bingham noted that the milestones for each priority action are still in draft form, and asked the Governing Board if it would be comfortable with the group that is taking the lead on that priority developing the detailed implementation steps.

The following items regarding the 2011 Annual Plan were discussed by the GB:

- Dick Timmerberg suggested adding "and lake levels" after "flow regimes" in the following places: Page 1, line 34; page 2, line 41; and page 10, line 1. Also, on page 10, line 5, he suggested adding "recreational" to the list of needs. Bill McCartney noted that the language on page 2, line 40 ("flow regimes" without "lake levels") was previously approved by the GB. Bingham noted that the GB can change it now. It was noted that this would also need to change in the 5YPP document. It was also noted that there are other changes in each document that will require changes in the other.
- Brad Moore referred to Priority 10, the in-stream flow assessment. He asked whether this item was possible to accomplish this year and whether it should be included in the 2011 Plan. It was noted that the AP says that the assessment should be "initiated" (not necessarily completed) in the 2011 AP. Gail asked how many GB members thought this priority should be initiated this year; most of the GB raised their hands.
- Dan Tonsmeire noted the need to coordinate the schedule on priority items #9 and #10: the sustainable water resource management plan and the in-stream flow assessment. Woody Hicks agreed that the items were inter-related and said that the schedule would be funding dependent. Billy Turner and Dave McLain said that these two needed to proceed in sync. Hicks also observed that different approaches could be taken. Tonsmeire said that for the in-stream flow assessment, his thought was that this year's activities would include a literature review and gap analysis to initiate the assessment. Bingham asked if members could okay this item as written, given the discussion. There were no objections.
- Pat Stevens said that page 10, lines 8-9, refer to exploring a partnership with NOAA. She reminded the GB that it had previously agreed not to develop formal relationships with federal or state agencies without a clear decision to do so as a group. If there is action on this item, it will need to come back to the GB for approval.
- Pat Stevens' noted that difficulty of conducting public relations on behalf of ACFS given the lack of substantive work and agreement to date. Others noted that the group's existence was an accomplishment in and of itself.

- Gordon Rogers said that there is a need to recalculate the unimpaired flows dataset to support priorities #9 and #10. George McMahon said that the state and USACE are working on the unimpaired flows dataset, and ACFS could proceed without creating their own unimpaired flows dataset. Rogers disagreed; he asked when the right time would be for the GB to consider adding more nodes to the unimpaired flows dataset (e.g., Carsonville and Newton in the Flint River Basin). Woody Hicks said that this would be an item to include in the RFP to be discussed by the Data Needs Sustainability workgroup on Friday (3/18).
- Gordon Rogers said that submitting comments on the Georgia regional water plans needed to be added to the 2011 AP. The GB discussed which regional plans it would be interested in; five were suggested: Middle Chattahoochee, Upper Flint, Lower Flint-Ochlockonee, Suwannee-Satilla, and Coosa-North Georgia. The details to implement this action item will be left to the Issues Committee. It was suggested in the 2011 AP, the GB add (1) recommending to Alabama to initiate water planning and (2) review relevant Florida water plans and policies. Bingham asked if there were any objections to adding these items; there were none.
- Jerri Russell recommended that Frank Stephens' suggestion from this morning to initiate conversations among GB members about their interests to identify areas of agreement be added to the 2011 AP.
- Tim Thoms asked if on page 3, line 14, the role of the Finance Committee to make "go/no-go" decisions on actions was only budget related. Billy Turner confirmed that the committee's decision on actions is limited to financial concerns.
- Tim Thoms noted that in the table on page 10, the timetable would subject to modification based on inter-related tasks and fund-raising. Brad Currey said that getting answers on fund-raising requests could take several months.

Bingham suggested that, if there were no further comments, an edited version of the document be prepared and brought back for decision by the GB tomorrow morning. There were no objections.

Sustainable Water Management Plan

Charles Stripling reported that the Data Needs Sustainability (DNS) Workgroup received eight responses to the RFQ for the Sustainable Water Management Plan. The next step will be to develop a more specific scope of work and issue a RFP for the RFQ respondents. Gail Bingham will assist the DNS Workgroup in this task. The DNS Workgroup will review the RFP responses and make recommendations for firms to the Professional Services Contract Workgroup and the Executive Committee. Woody Hicks said that the Scope of Work in the RFQ was somewhat loose and resulted in variations among the responses. All the respondents were qualified, each with different strengths and weaknesses. The RFQ did ask the respondents to address whether they have experience in fund-raising. Some of the respondents do. The RFP will be more specific and seek to get some cost estimates. The RFP will be sent to all eight respondents to the RFQ. The DNS Workgroup aims to finish preparing the RFP by April 1. Billy Turner asked if the group was familiar with Aris Georgakakos' modeling work, and he recommended Georgakakos to the GB. It was noted that Georgakakos is on one of the respondent teams. Dan Tonsmeire said that four modelers that have made presentations to the DNS Work Group have models

for the ACF, and all are a part of the various respondent teams or offered to provide services at no charge. The GB returned to this topic the next day and authorized proceeding with the RfP.

Committee and Work Group Status Reports

Do-Better Workgroup: Charles Stripling reported that Kathy Nguyen is working with the Vinson Institute on a survey of best management practices in the ACF. The Executive Committee has committed \$2,000 to doing the survey. The survey will go to GB members, and it will collect information existing and emerging best practices. In response to a question, Stripling said that members should respond to the survey from their full range of experience and not limit their responses to their current stakeholder group.

Inter-Governmental Affairs Committee: Wilton Rooks reported that the committee provided a report in the meeting materials. The committee is developing a contact list for government entities and elected officials. The committee will be working to develop relationships with these contacts. Committee members have had several recent meetings with government leaders.

Education and Outreach Committee: Deron Davis gave the committee report. He provided a hand-out outlining the committee's objectives: (a) issue a quarterly e-newsletter (1st issue in June), (b) host one meeting in each sub-basin, (c) identify four key conferences at which to make presentations, and (d) develop a media strategy focused on relationships with four of the largest media outlets in the basin. Leaders and budget amounts have been identified for each objective (as indicated on the hand-out). Davis reviewed an outline for the e-newsletter. Bill McCartney suggested that there be an informational presentation at each GB meeting.

Deron Davis reported that he is working with a pro bono media consultant: Greg Euston with McGraw Euston Associates. Euston will assist in the development of the media strategy.

Homer Hirt expressed concern that smaller newspapers in the region might not be reached. Deron Davis acknowledged this concern and explained that the committee is talking about how to reach these media outlets. The need to use the website and social media for outreach were emphasized by GB members.

Billy Turner said that the budget request from the committee is \$6400, but the budget is currently \$4000. Turner noted the need for coordination between the Education and Outreach and Inter-Governmental Affairs Committees on the budget to work this out.

Pat Stevens said that ACFS needs to be cautious that we do not get too far ahead of ourselves in our outreach. She added that we do have a need for internal education that helps us to understand each other better.

Action Planning Work Group (cont.)

The GB returned to discussion of the 5YPP document:

- Dan Tonsmeire said that under Objective E (page 14), in the first five action items, geographic references should be changed to the whole ACF or to name all three sub-basins. It was discussed whether some of the items are geographically specific. It was agreed that the intent of the GB is to work toward the ecological health of all three sub-basins. The following modifications were agreed to: (a) substitute ACF for Apalachicola River and Bay in #3, (b) merge items 6 and 7, and (c) list all three sub-basins in items #5 and 6.
- Dan Tonsmeire suggested the following changes on page 10:
 - In item #3 on line 14, add “and restoration” after “maintenance”.
 - In item #5 on line 19, add “and restore” after “protect”.
 - In item #5 on line 21, change “maintaining” to “sustaining”.

Jim McClatchey said that given the reservoirs and management of the system, it is not possible to fully restore the natural system. Tonsmeire responded that some productivity in Apalachicola can be recovered, but he does not expect to recover pre-dam flows. Gordon Rogers said that he prefers the word “restore”. He wants to see restoration in the Flint, though he also noted that full restoration is probably not possible. Dan Tonsmeire said that “improve” is not an acceptable substitute for “restore” because “improve” for some may include changes that might not be natural. Wilton Rooks asked if item #6 addresses Dan’s concern; Dan said that it does. Chad Taylor noted that more details can be debated for these items when they are selected from the 5YPP for an annual plan.

- Charles Stripling referred to page 13, lines 8-21. He noted several concerns about the way agricultural water use was discussed and the need to treat all sectors in the same way. Examples included:

- Line 8 reads “sustain current water needs”. For the other water use sectors, current and future needs are considered.
- Line 9 says “to minimize future water use conflicts between agriculture and other water dependent users”. This is not listed for the other sectors.
- Line 14 says “discouraging wasteful and inefficient agricultural practices”. Again, this is not listed for the other sectors; it could be positively stated.
- Items 5 and 6: Why are these items regarding Aquifer Storage and Recovery listed under agriculture?

Stripling suggested several modifications to address these concerns:

- Line 8: Add “and future” after “current”.
- Line 9: End the sentence after “needs of agriculture”.
- Line 14: Change to promotion of efficient use.
- Line 16: Replace “safe” with “sustainable and resource-based”.
- Items 5 and 6: Move to Objective A.

Pat Stevens suggested deleting items 5 and 6 from the document instead of moving them.

- Billy Turner noted the difficulty of establishing MOAs with local governments as listed on page 15, line 1, given the great number of local governments in the region.

Gail Bingham suggested that she and Kristin Rowles make the changes to the documents discussed today and distribute marked-up versions of the documents to the GB at the beginning of the meeting on Friday morning for further discussion and consideration. There were no objections.

National Integrated Drought Information System

Lisa Darby (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) gave an update on the National Integrated Drought Information System (NIDIS). NIDIS is working to develop a Drought Early Warning System that will be active in the ACF. NIDIS is currently developing webinars and media workshops on drought topics to support improved outreach and education. NIDIS plans to conduct an in-stream flows study in the ACF. She said that the Department of the Interior might bring its WaterSMART program to the ACF.

In response to a question about the NIDIS La Niña fact sheet, Darby said that La Niña can last for two years. She noted that many models are used to project climatic conditions, but they are difficult to predict.

In response to a question about the in-stream flows study, Darby said it was not yet clear how the NIDIS study might relate to the ACFS plans for such a study, but it would bring more resources to this type of assessment in the ACF. Tim Thoms said that ACFS should consider whether this is a way for the ACFS to meet its objectives. Mark Limbaugh (Ferguson Group) said that the WaterSMART program from the Department of the Interior might be a source of funding for basin studies and assessments. The program is competitive and requires a 50% match to federal funds.

Darby can be contacted at lisa.darby@noaa.gov. More information is available at <http://www.drought.gov>

Closing Speaker

The closing speaker was Mark Limbaugh from the Ferguson Group (Washington DC). The Ferguson Group provides policy and legislative advice on water issues. Limbaugh was formerly the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science in the Department of the Interior, and he was the Watermaster for the Payette River Basin in Idaho. He presented slides to the GB on collaborative water resource efforts from around the U.S.

In his slides, Limbaugh covered collaborative water resources planning and management efforts in the Platte, Klamath, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and Colorado River Basins. He discussed the role of the federal government, the drivers for collaboration, the adaptive management approach, and the effects of federal laws, especially the Endangered Species Act. He said that ACFS is on a good path to collaboration.

In response to a question, Limbaugh said that the Endangered Species Act does lead to conflict over water resources, but it is an important law that must be addressed. He said that there are often ways to provide for species habitat and user needs.

In response to another question, he described that adaptive management is a structured process through which data can be collected and implementation revised over time. He noted that setting initial parameters can be difficult, and all stakeholders should be involved.

A GB member noted that most of the efforts reviewed by Limbaugh have federal funding; ACFS does not. Limbaugh recommended that ACFS develop a clear vision and go to Congress to request funding. He said that local matching funds would be important.

Dan Tonsmeire closed the meeting for the day. He asked the GB members to review the committee and workgroup lists that had been posted and note any additions or modification.

March 18, 2011

The GB meeting reconvened at 8am. Dan Tonsmeire announced that the Finance Committee, the Professional Services Contract Workgroup, and the Data Needs Sustainability Workgroup will meet at 11am. The GB meeting will reconvene after the committee meetings to discuss the May meeting agenda.

Issues Committee Report

Frank Stephens gave the committee report. First, he reviewed the committee operating procedures. Then, he reviewed the committee's plan to address whether the various procedures followed in different sub-basins comply with the Charter. There is a concern that guidance is needed on how GB members are selected from each sub-basin. Some flexibility might be needed. A subcommittee was formed to conduct this task: Woody Hicks, Henry Mock, Mitch Reid, Jim Philips, and Dave McLain. The subcommittee will seek to make its recommendations to the GB in June 2011.

A motion to approve this workplan was made by Frank Stephens. Charles Stripling seconded the motion. Stripling asked that the subcommittee provide its recommendations with enough advance notice for the caucuses to address the recommendations. Brad Moore asked if the Membership Committee could do this task. Stephens said that it seemed that they would get more on-the-ground expertise from those involved in the caucuses to work through the ad hoc group as outlined. It was suggested that the chair of the membership committee, Jim Poff, join the subcommittee. Poff volunteered to serve on the subcommittee. Dan Tonsmeire assessed consensus. There were no objections.

ACFS Annual Report of the Secretary

Greg Elmore, Secretary, gave the annual report. A hand-out with the report was distributed. He noted that attendance of GB members would be tracked more closely in the coming year to ensure participation. He referred to the need for guidance on selection of GB members and denoting their

interest groups, as Frank Stephens reported. Elmore moved that the annual report be accepted. Marilyn Royal seconded the motion. Dan Tonsmeire said that the Membership Committee had been asked to review membership and attendance, but that the task had been moved to the Issues Committee. Dave Dixon said that it was difficult for members to attend regularly without more advance notice of meeting dates. The GB will try to set the schedule for meetings for the rest of the year; the May meeting dates are set for May 18th and 19th. Dan Tonsmeire assessed consensus on the motion to accept the annual report; there were no objections.

Action Planning Work Group (continued)

Gail Bingham suggested that the GB start today's discussion of the planning documents with the 2011 Annual Plan. She distributed a marked-up version with changes from yesterday's meeting (new document dated 3-17-2011). Bingham gave the group some time to review the revised document. She noted that assignments of lead responsibility were made by the Executive Committee (except for the item added yesterday). She noted that Dave McLain asked that responsibility be clearly delineated. Bingham and Mark Masters will follow up with designated leads to ask for detailed milestones.

Woody Hicks asked that "effective" permitting be changed to "sustainable and resource-based" permitting. It was changed in the Five Year Planning Program document, but not in the 2011 Annual Plan. It was an oversight; the change was made.

Bingham noted Jerri Russell's suggested action item to synthesize member's needs and begin to develop consensus on basin management. Bingham suggested that this new item will be led by the DNS Workgroup to facilitate coordination with the sustainable water management plan (action item 10) that includes similar discussion amongst the GB. Brad Moore said that he thought that item 10 on page 3 already addressed this concern. Jerri Russell said that her item was added so that it could start before the contract is initiated to develop the sustainable water resources management plan. She does not want to wait to start this part of the process. Pat Stevens supported the addition of this item; she thinks that the group needs to start on this task and likes seeing it called out in this way. Brad Moore noted that it might add too much work for the DNS Workgroup. Brad Currey agreed that this type of discussion is important. Frank Stephens said that resource constraints are a concern, but it would be helpful to start this discussion. Billy Turner and George McMahon noted their support for adding this item. Bingham said that she could provide process suggestions. Bingham asked if there were concerns to discuss further or if the group could move on; no further concerns were noted.

On page 4, Dave McLain recommended to the Executive Committee that Bingham's facilitation services be used in implementing Priority #1. There was a question regarding the timing of the Georgia regional water plans comment period. Tim Cash (GAEPD) reported that the plans will be released for public comment on May 9, and they are expected to be adopted by GAEPD in September. Gordon Rogers asked Tim Cash if GAEPD could present to the GB on ACF related items from the regional plans. Tim Cash said that GAEPD would provide a presentation if requested. Frank Stephens noted that the Issues Committee would take the lead on this item.

Brad Moore asked about page 2, line 17; he asked whether it is important to review Florida water management plans this year, given resource constraints. He suggested keeping it in the Five Year Planning Program, but taking it out of the 2011 Action Plan. George McMahon asked that these plan reviews be scoped to “as they affect the ACF Basin”. To address Moore’s concern, it was suggested that “begin to” be added before “review” on line 17, page 2.

Greg Elmore suggested deleting “Other?” on the last line of the last page of the document. There were no objections.

Billy Turner made a motion to accept the document as revised. Bill McCartney seconded the motion. Homer Hirt asked that the word “draft” be deleted. Dan Tonsmeire assessed consensus; there were no objections.

After a break, the GB discussed the Five Year Planning Program document. Gail Bingham distributed a marked-up version of the document with changes from yesterday’s meeting (new document dated 3-17-2011). She provided the GB with some time to review the revised document. The following summarizes discussion of the document:

- Dick Timmerberg said to add “and lake levels” after “flow regimes” on pages 3 (line 31) and 14 (lines 12 and 21).
- The Issues Committee will lead the planning process, as noted in the document.
- Frank Stephens said that the striking of specific interest groups under the objectives is a good change.
- Sally Bethea suggested adding “existing” on page 12, line 14 before “reservoir”. She suggested the same change for page 13, line 1. There were no objections.
- Charles Stripling said that he did not mean for the word “permitting” to be deleted on page 13, line 22.
- Chad Taylor suggested not deleting items C.5 and C.6 (page 13, lines 27-30). He suggested adding “learn about” to the beginning of these items and moving them to objectives A, B, C, and E. There were no objections.
- Woody Hicks asked what state regulatory actions were referred to on page 14, line 5. Homer Hirt clarified which regulations were relevant here and suggested adding “and federal” after “state” in line 5.
- Change “partition” to “petition” on page 16, line 44.
- Billy Turner said that the fund-raising part of the plan needed to be strengthened. No specific changes were made in response, but parts of the plan addressing this were highlighted in the discussion.

It was noted that there was a motion on the floor from yesterday by Bill McCartney and seconded by Jim McClatchey to accept the document. McCartney said that the motion was now to accept the document as modified in the GB discussion. Homer Hirt said to strike the word “draft” from the document. There were no objections to the motion, and the document was adopted by the GB.

Other Business, Wrap Up, and Next Steps

Tom Waits asked if a GB member can call for a recorded roll call vote as provided in Robert's Rules of Order. It was noted that the Charter does not refer to Robert's Rules. Gail Bingham said that she could suggest methods to evaluate support for a motion that are consistent with the consensus approach of ACFS. GB members said that consensus means "we can live with this decision." In response to a comment that there may be occasions where it is useful to know who has objections, it was noted that GB members have a responsibility to offer an alternative when consensus cannot be reached and that this can be a way to learn more about one another's concerns. Some GB members expressed concern that a roll call vote is not consistent with the Charter. Mark Masters said that GB members can request that an abstention be recorded. Homer Hirt asked if abstention voids consensus. Abstention does not affect attainment of a consensus or a quorum. Homer asked if opposing consensus (instead of abstention) would be recorded. Bingham said that it would mean consensus was not reached; opposing consensus is different from abstention. When a GB member opposes consensus, the member is responsible to try to provide an alternative option.

Bill McCartney referred to page 14 of the Charter. He said that when consensus cannot be reached, objections are to be recorded and the discussion is to be summarized in the meeting summary. Page Estes said that the charter does provide for votes (80%) on administrative issues, but requires consensus on substantive issues.

Next, Wilton Rooks, referring to item 9 in the annual plan to begin looking for areas of agreement, said that he would like to take a straw poll of the group on whether ACFS supports raising Lake Lanier by two feet as part of maximizing the use of existing reservoirs. He said that this change would provide an additional 26 billion gallons of storage, and it is a fast and relatively inexpensive way to provide more storage. It has been proposed by the Lake Lanier Association. Gail Bingham said that the group could use a thumbs-up/thumb-down/thumbs-sideways poll to assess support and provide a starting point for members to ask one another questions. The GB discussed whether to proceed with the straw poll. Some members had concerns about the straw poll. Several people noted that it would be difficult to vote without knowing exactly what they were supporting; another added that he would not want an informal poll to be reported with the risk of later misunderstanding. One member suggested that the straw poll be about whether this should be studied vs. implemented. The GB discussed the topic a little further, but did not proceed with a straw poll.

Next, the GB discussed items for the May GB meeting agenda. Gail Bingham listed several items from the 2011 Annual Plan as potential topics:

- Presentation from Colonel Roemhildt from USACE Mobile District (invitation already issued)
- Presentation from GAEPD/Regional Water Councils
- Report from the Intergovernmental Affairs Committee
- Report from the Do-Better Workgroup with draft of survey report
- Fund-raising discussion

- Report from Data Need Sustainability and Professional Services Contract Workgroups on status of RFP process
- Discussion of USFWS PAL letter and in-stream flows assessment

Chad Taylor asked whether the GB should begin work on consensus comments on the USACE Water Control Manual update. Dave McLain suggested that ACFS might want to submit a letter in advance of the release of the draft revised Water Control Manual with suggestions regarding the public comment process. Gail Bingham reminded the group that the Issues Committee will develop the approach for this action item and that it can take up the question of timing.

Jerri Russell suggested that the GB begin discussion of substantive areas of agreement and disagreement at the May meeting. Jim McClatchey said that it is important that the GB try to identify agreement on at least one major substantive issue at the May meeting.

Charles Stripling said that he thought it would be helpful to have a presentation from the Middle Chattahoochee caucus on their region at the May meeting (which will be located in the Middle Chattahoochee region). GB members agreed and suggested such a presentation from the local caucus at each of the upcoming GB meetings over the next year.

Tim Perkins asked for more information on the four different models of ACF Basin. Chad Taylor said that the modeling presentations from the workshop at Ichaway would be helpful for GB members and asked that they be posted on the ACFS website.

Gordon Rogers said that it would be helpful to provide dues paying ACFS members who are not GB members with better access to documents discussed by the GB via the website and hand-outs at the meeting.

Brad Moore asked for a status report on annual plan implementation in the meeting materials distributed before each GB meeting.

All of these items will be considered by the Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee for the May meeting agenda. Dan Tonsmeire said that the next GB meeting will be May 18 & 19 at Bagby State Park. It will be followed by the Tri Rivers Waterway Development Association annual meeting in Eufala. Tonsmeire suggested adjourning to the committee and workgroup meetings and then reconvening for a discussion of other possible additions or modifications for the May GB meeting. The GB adjourned for the committee and workgroup meetings.

The GB reconvened after the committee and workgroup meetings. Billy Turner reported that the Finance Committee discussed Brad Currey's list of potential funding organizations. Currey will work with Coxe Curry Associates to develop a fund-raising plan. Currey asked that GB members that have foundation contacts or that are willing to make fund-raising calls to let him or Dan Tonsmeire know.

Woody Hicks reported on the joint Data Needs Sustainability Workgroup/Professional Services Contract Workgroup meeting. The group discussed the procurement process and what will constitute a conflict of interest. Hicks noted that they could not eliminate firms that have ever received state funding from

one of the three states or the Corps, or there would be no firms left to bid. Gail Bingham will work with group to develop a statement for the RFP that will help to measure the degree of conflict that exists for each respondent. The next step is to prepare a tightened scope of work for the RFP for review by the Data Needs Sustainability Workgroup and then by the Professional Services Contract Workgroup and Executive Committee.

Gail Bingham asked whether the GB is ready to authorize the Data Needs Sustainability Workgroup and the Professional Services Contract Workgroup to draft the RFP, get approval from Executive Committee, distribute the RFP to the eight RFQ respondents, collect their proposals, rank them, and report back to the GB with a recommendation. Charles Stripling suggested that the Executive Committee recommend no more than three choices (ranked or not ranked), and the GB decision will be limited to those three. Chad Taylor made a motion to support the RFP process, as described by Bingham and Stripling. The motion was seconded by Gordon Rogers. Brad Moore requested that GB members be able to review all RFP responses for transparency. This was agreed. Charles Stripling said it is possible that the GB could reject all three recommended firms, and the process would need to begin again. Anyone with a relationship with one of the RFP respondents will be asked to disclose the relationship. Chad Taylor asked if this process will delay the decision until the September meeting, even if possible funding is available. It was noted that virtual meetings are permitted in the Charter, and a virtual meeting could possibly be used to accelerate the process. Jerri Russell asked if it is possible to tweak a proposed approach when deciding on a firm under this motion. It was agreed that flexibility was possible. Gail Bingham reviewed the motion, and Dan Tonsmeire assessed consensus; there were no objections.

Dan Tonsmeire asked if anyone had any comments; there were no comments. Tonsmeire thanked the meeting organizers. Brad Currey thanked the facilitator. The meeting was adjourned.