

*Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) River Basin Stakeholders*  
**GOVERNING BOARD**

**Lake Blackshear Resort**  
**Cordele, Georgia**

**December 13-14, 2012**  
**9:00 am Thursday – 12:30 pm Friday**

***DRAFT AGENDA***

**Meeting Objectives/Desired Outcomes:**

- **Hold Annual Meeting of the ACFS;**
- **Ratify ACFS officers for 2013;**
- **Adopt 2013 budget and authorize EC to enter into professional services contracts;**
- **Receive an update from the Technical Oversight and Contracting Work Group (TOCWG) on SWMP/IFA tasks;**
- **Discuss potential next Phase of SWMP;**
- **Seek consensus on an ACFS comment letter to the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in response to the request for public comment on the Water Control Manual scoping process;**
- **Discuss functions that might be desirable for a tri-state institution to undertake and provide feedback to the TUC about what additional information would be useful about how other institutions implement these functions. If time, discuss which agencies are currently providing some of these functions in the ACFS basin.**
- **Learn about existing conservation measures and newly developed techniques for reducing water used for irrigation;**
- **Hear update on drought conditions in the ACF Basin;**
- **Learn about other ACFS committee and work group activities, and organize next steps including:**
  - **Financial report and learn about ongoing fundraising activities;**
  - **Update on membership recruitment activities;**
  - **Membership, Intergovernmental Affairs, and Education and Outreach.**
- **Suggest topics for next Governing Board meeting and plan next steps.**

**Thursday, December 13, 2012**

8:30-9:00 Continental Breakfast, Registration, Informal gathering

9:00-9:20 Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Objectives and Agenda

*Advance materials: ACFS Dec 13-14 Governing Board Meeting Draft Agenda*

*Charles Stripling, ACFS Chair*

*Gail Bingham, facilitator*

9:20-9:30 Old Business

*Objective: Approve September 2012 meeting notes. Complete any other old business.*

*Advance materials: September 2012 GB Meeting Notes*

*Charles Stripling, ACFS Chair*

*Temporarily Adjourn Governing Board Meeting; Call Annual Meeting to Order*

- 9:30-10:00 ACFS Annual Meeting  
*Objective: Hear a report on the year's accomplishments.*  
*Advance materials: 2012 Financial Report*  
*Presentation [15 min]*  
 Charles Stripling, *ACFS Chair*  
 Jim McClatchey, *Finance Committee Chair*  
*Questions and Discussion [15 min]*  
  
*Adjourn Annual Meeting*
- 10:00-10:15 BREAK  
  
*Reconvene Governing Board Meeting*
- 10:15-11:00 New Business  
*Objective: Approve 2013 budget, authorize EC to enter into professional services contracts, ratify new officers, and look ahead to plans for 2013.*  
  
*Advance materials: ACF Stakeholders Proposed 2013 Budget; Professional Services Team Memo*  
  
*Presentations on new business items*  
 Charles Stripling, *ACFS Chair*  
 Jim McClatchey, *Finance Committee Chair*  
  
*Facilitated Discussion and Decisions:*  
  
 Proposed Budget Motion: Adopt proposed ACF Stakeholders Budget for 2013  
 Proposed Professional Services Motion: Recommend the GB authorize EC to contract with professional services team based on team memorandum  
  
 Ratify 2013 Officers  
  
*Presentation on plans for 2013*  
 TBD, *incoming ACFS Chair*
- 11:00-12:00 Issues Committee: ACFS Scoping Comment to USACE on Water Control Manual  
*Objectives: Review, revise as needed, and approve proposed scoping comment letter. Decision can carry over to Friday, if needed.*  
  
*Advance Materials: ACFS USACE Scoping Comments - Draft*  
  
*Presentation*  
 Jim Phillips, *Issues Committee chair*  
  
*Facilitated Discussion and Decisions*
- 12:00-1:00 LUNCH
- 1:00-3:30 SWMP/IFA Update  
*Objective: Presentation of project status, unimpaired flows dataset options, and upcoming project activities and timeline*  
  
*Introduction*  
 Brad Moore, *TOCWG chair*

*Presentation*

Stephen Simpson, *Black & Veatch: Unimpaired Flows Dataset Report*

Woody Hicks, *Report on USFWS ACF Technical Workshop*

*Questions and Discussion*

3:30-3:45

BREAK

3:45-5:15

Discussion: Institutional Options

*Objectives: Discuss functions that might be desirable for a tri-state institution to undertake and provide feedback to the TUC about what additional information would be useful about how other institutions implement these functions. If time, information about which agencies are currently providing some of these functions in the ACFS basin will be discussed.*

*Advance Materials: TUC Summary Functions Report*

*Overview Presentation*

Shannon Bonney, *University of Georgia*

*Facilitated discussion in small groups*

5:15-5:30

Public Comment

5:30

ADJOURN FOR THE DAY

6:00

Reception and Dinner

**Friday, December 14, 2012**

7:30-8:00

Continental Breakfast

8:00-8:15

Reconvene Governing Board Meeting

*Objective: Reflection from Day One; Review agenda for today.*

TBD, *incoming ACFS Chair*

Gail Bingham, *facilitator*

8:15-9:00

Open Discussion

*Objectives: Complete any unresolved decisions carried over from Day One. Address additional topics that arose during the meeting.*

9:00-9:30

Information Session: River, Climate and Weather Forecast in the ACF Basin

*Objectives: Update on drought conditions and forecast*

*Presentations*

John Feldt, *Blue Water Outlook*

*Questions and Discussion*

9:30-10:00

Information Session: Agricultural Water Conservation

*Objective: Learn about existing measures and developments for irrigation conservation.*

*Presentation [20 min]*  
David Reckford, *The Flint River Basin Partnership*  
*Questions and Discussion [10 min]*

10:00-10:15 BREAK

10:15-10:55 Performance Metrics for the Sustainable Water Management Plan  
*Objective: Discuss as a full Governing Board the work done in the caucus meetings on the performance metrics*

*Advance materials: Performance Metrics Summary Table*

*Presentations*

Kristin Rowles, Report on Fall Caucus Meetings  
Gordon Rogers, Performance Metrics for the SWMP

*Questions and Discussion*

10:55 ADJOURN MEETING

11:00 -11:05 Call Virtual Meeting to Order; Roll Call of Members

TBD, *incoming ACFS Chair*  
Mark Masters, *ACFS Executive Manager*

11:05-11:15 Consideration of Possible Motion to Approve ACFS Scoping Comments to USACE

Gail Bingham, *facilitator*

11:15-12:15 Committee and Work Group Status Reports

*Objectives: Learn about current committee and work group activities. Includes current financial report, fundraising activities and other committee activities.*

*Advance materials: Financial Statement, Fundraising Report, ACFS 2013 Membership Recruitment Plan*

*Finance Committee and Fundraising*

Jim McClatchey, *Finance Committee chair*  
Brad Currey, *Fundraising Committee chair*

*Membership*

Jim Poff, *Membership Committee chair*

*Intergovernmental Affairs Committee*

Betty Webb, *Interagency Committee chair*

*Education and Outreach Committee*

Deron Davis, *Education and Outreach Committee chair*

12:15-12:30 Wrap up and Next Steps

*Objectives: Summarize decisions and next steps, with assignments. Identify possible topics for next meeting and discuss dates and location.*

12:30 ADJOURN VIRTUAL MEETING

ACFS

Governing Board Meeting

Unicoi State Park

September 12-14, 2012

Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Objectives and Agenda

The Governing Board (GB) meeting started at 1:30pm. Charles Stripling welcomed the GB. Next, Wilton Rooks welcomed the GB members to the Upper Chattahoochee region. Next, Brad Currey addressed the group regarding the mission of the ACF Stakeholders. He noted the success of the fund-raising campaign to date (\$1.1 million). He is optimistic of attaining \$1.5 million in the campaign. He asked that the group re-affirm its commitment to work together to build consensus, even if there are some uncertainties and information gaps. Next, the GB members and others at the meeting introduced themselves, and then Gail Bingham reviewed the materials packet and the agenda.

Old Business

Vince Falcione made a motion to accept the May GB meeting summary, and Tim Thoms seconded the motion. ***The motion was approved by consensus.***

SWMP/IFA Status Report

Brad Moore provided an update on progress of TOCWG. Slides presented to the GB are available on request. Major items covered in the update include:

- Water Demands – TOCWG is in the process of reviewing the B&V deliverable on water demands in the Basin.
- Unimpaired Inflow (UIF) Dataset – UIF meeting hosted by B&V and GA Tech to discuss issues with current UIF dataset and potential work needed to improve it.
- Instream Flow Analysis (IFA) – Atkins is developing the IFAs for the rivers and their flood plains and has provided a proposal to TOCWG is working through proposal by Atkins on detailed approach to completing IFA for the Estuary.
- The TOCWG held briefings with the states of AL, FL and GA plus the Corps of Engineers on the SWMP this summer.
- Contractors are on time and budget with work plan; contractors have regular coordination meetings.
- Major issues for TOCWG:
  - Evaluation of Estuary – Need to select methodology for Bay evaluation
  - Unimpaired Inflows (UIF) Dataset – Will be evaluating need to improve the dataset.

- Funding –Filling information gaps and addressing discovery issues will require fund-raising.

Next, Brad Moore presented a motion to approve Phase D of the SWMP/IFA (attached) subject to amendment of the 2012 Operating Budget. Phase D includes two components: the second half of funding for Task 6.1 (baseline model runs) (\$52,141) and funding for B&V participation in the fall caucus meetings (\$6,000). Summary of motion discussion:

- Comment to keep the flow chart of Phases and Tasks up to date
- Are lake levels still included in the “IFA”? Environmental impacts of lake levels are not included in Atkins work but lake levels will be assessed in the SWMP model.
- Do we need to evaluate using UIFs? We will not be able to attain conditions of the past. However, the UIF dataset actually describes the inflows that are the baseline for the model and, thus, are needed for its calibration.
- Clarification that the motion has been approved by consensus of both the TOCWG and EC.

***Dan Tonsmeire made a motion to approve Phase D as presented, and Jim McClatchey seconded the motion. Phase D was approved by a consensus of the GB.***

Next, Steve Simpson provided an SWMP update from Black and Veatch (slides available on request). Summary points from the presentation and discussion include:

- Simpson explained net consumptive use estimated for different sectors for both current conditions and 2050 forecast.
- He clarified that the data being used contains some values based on permitted levels, but the use data is based on multiple data sources (observed, estimated, and modeled).
- He clarified that the estimated impact of groundwater use on surface water flows is shown in the “Stream-Aquifer Impact” sector. He further clarified that this sector includes groundwater use by agriculture and by other sectors (municipal and industrial).
- Simpson clarified that that disaggregation of weekly UIF to daily is important for evaluation of some performance indicators but that there remains significant uncertainty in the reliability of the data at the daily timestep.
- He reported that the USACE provided data on net consumptive use by reach for AL and FL but we are still trying to capture more detailed data from both AL and the Northwest FL Water Management District.

Next, Marty Kelly from Atkins provided a status report on Atkins’ on-going work on the Instream Flow Analysis. His slides are available on request. Summary points from the presentation and discussion include:

- How is the IFA going to be integrated in to the SWMP? Recommended flows from IFA can be used as a performance indicator.

Information Session: Commercial Fishery Failure for Oyster Fishery Requested by State of Florida

A declaration of a commercial fishery failure caused by a fishery resource disaster has been requested by the Governor Scott of Florida under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act for oyster harvesting areas in the Gulf of Mexico, and especially in Apalachicola Bay. The Act provides for disaster relief funding, which could employ fishermen in restocking the oyster beds. Shannon Hartsfield summarized the current situation and reviewed the status of oyster beds in Apalachicola Bay for the GB members. Hartsfield said that the current situation is very critical for the fishery, and he hopes that the ACFS will be able to help improve conditions in the system.

Information Session: “ACF Water Resources: Managing Demand and Climate Change”

Aris Georgakakos provided a presentation on assessment of the impact of climate change in the ACF. His slides are available on request.

Georgakakos said that observed data show that there has been a decline of precipitation and an increase in potential evapotranspiration (PET) from 1960 – 2009. Over the same period, soil moisture and runoff have declined. These trends are expected to continue, and droughts are expected to become more intense. He presented graphs of projections of precipitation in the Lake Lanier and Seminole Lake watersheds under different climate change scenarios. He said that climate projections consistently project precipitation to decrease and for the distribution of precipitation to “stretch” (become wetter and drier than the historical climate). Soil moisture and runoff are expected to decline further. ACF watersheds are expected to experience reduced mean precipitations with wetter and dryer extremes.

Georgakakos presented expected impacts with climate change under current water management. Lake Lanier would experience deeper and more frequent lake drawdowns, and 2050 demands would exacerbate lake water stress. The system will have less capacity to meet instream flow targets.

Georgakakos illustrated projected impacts of climate change on the Bay using a hydrodynamic model. This model can be used to evaluate the impacts of various flow regimes created by different WMA’s. He also illustrated the projected effects of sea level rise. The mouth of river may move inland with projected inundations due to sea level rise. With a moderate level of sea level rise, salinity levels in the Bay would rise 3 to 8 ppt (adverse impact on oysters). He recommends work to establish ecological requirements of sturgeon and oysters, the development of flow scenarios associated with upstream development and management plans, and an assess salinity impacts of those flow scenarios.

Discussion summary:

- Climate change projections appear to indicate the salinity conditions will continue to worsen, despite any possible efforts to improve upstream flow contributions to the estuary.

- We want variability in salinity in the Bay for oysters.
- We want to be able to sort out what part of the projected changes is due to climate change and what part is manageable. The projections today show the impacts of climate change, not changes in demand. The unimpaired inflows (UIFs) show this decline over the historical period (1960-2009), and future UIFs are also expected to decline.
- This model could be used to evaluate changes in management on salinity.
- We need to identify the needs of target species in the Bay. If we know that, then we can evaluate impacts on Bay of upstream water management.
- This bay salinity model is driven by flows at the Sumatra gage.

### Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

ADJOURN FOR THE DAY

RECONVENE FOR THE DAY: Thursday, September 13

### Water Management Alternatives Expert Panel

The GB members introduced themselves to the panel members. Next, Stripling welcomed the panel members, and the panel members introduced themselves.

- Carol R. Collier, *Delaware River Basin Commission*
- John “Woody” Wodraska, *Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (ret) and South FL Water Mgmt District (ret)*
- Brian Richter, *The Nature Conservancy*
- Daniel P. Sheer, *Hydrologics*

The panel members’ slides will be available on the ACFS website.

The first speaker was Brian Richter. Richter provided an analysis of water sources and uses in the basin, and commented that, although there are significant challenges, the ACF has adequate water and flexibility to resolve the issues in the basin. Over 60% of the water that falls on the basin is used by plants, and about 31% drains to the rivers. The remainder goes to the groundwater. Water used in the basin is about 9% of precipitation, with about 4% returned to the system. He suggested that ACFS focus on turning points of conflict into opportunities, illustrating for example the importance of the Chattahoochee to the pattern of high flows in the Apalachicola and the importance of the Flint to base flows. Thinking in this way might suggest ideas for allowing the watershed to function as naturally as possible while using water carefully.

The second speaker was Dan Sheer. He emphasized the value of establishing a clear definition of management objectives in order to identify focused management alternatives. Management strategies are undertaken to achieve management objectives. Sheer reviewed management objectives that are common in water management planning and noted that these would come from performance criteria or preferences but then are described in terms of maximizing desired characteristics and minimizing negative ones rather than being described in terms of specific values. He also explained that it is helpful to think in terms of tradeoffs. The key to finding management alternatives that improve the situation for as many stakeholders as possible is to design a rule that makes releases when the benefits of doing so are high and the costs of the loss of reliability are low. He noted, however, that the relationships between the benefits of releasing water now versus holding it for future reliability have many uncertainties. He also recommended using lots of model runs to evaluate tradeoffs among multiple objectives and taking an adaptive strategy. An adaptive strategy for management is important to getting initial agreement on a plan.

The next speaker was Woody Wodraska. He commented on lessons learned in his experience in water planning. He emphasized the importance of conservation as the starting point. He also said that problems are difficult to solve until people agree that the status quo is unacceptable. He emphasized the importance of having shared guiding principles for water planning. He said that planning requires the “touch of a master’s hand” to pull all the components of successful planning together.

The last speaker was Carol Collier. The Delaware River Basin Commission has a primary objective of protecting the water supplies of Philadelphia and New Jersey from saltwater intrusion when freshwater flows are not adequate. She emphasized the need for an integrated approach to water management. The states involved in the Delaware River Basin Commission give up a portion of their sovereignty to manage the watershed, but the Commission is OF the states, not ABOVE the states. She said that stakeholder engagement is critical to the Commission’s planning. She added that science and policy development need to be separate, with policy makers asking the questions and scientists providing decision-relevant information. Some questions are more about policy than science. Planning should include different operations and sometimes different objectives for high, normal, and low flows. She said that it is critical to protect your headwaters. She emphasized that there is no silver bullet. She also emphasized the importance of plans that are adaptive, nimble, and resilient. She said that a river basin commission is important because it keeps the focus on the river and not on state boundaries.

Next, the panel had a facilitated discussion, based on questions developed by the TOCWG.

Q. What concrete actions should management strategies target?

A. Richter said it is important to see where the major concerns are and identify where progress can be made most readily. He noted that one area of focus could be the severely low levels observed in the Flint River Basin in drought periods. He said that farmers in the Flint Basin want to improve the efficiency of their water use, but they need help, including financial help, to do

so. He said that is one possible area of focus. Wodraska emphasized the importance of having early success in implementation of management strategies and choosing strategies to attain early success. He encouraged ACFS to advocate for river basin management regardless of state boundaries and to lead with conservation. He noted the importance of treating all users fairly. He emphasized the importance of groundwater management as well as surface water management. He recommended a focus on low flow conditions first. Wodraska also emphasized the importance of engaging business leaders to stimulate action.

Q. What options does the ACFS have to affect the timing of the high flows to reflect a more natural pattern (later in winter/early spring)?

A. Sheer said that, particularly in dry winters when the risk of spring flooding is lower, the reservoirs could be allowed to fill earlier, so that spring rains flow through the system to allow higher flows in the spring rather than in the winter. He said that a simulation model could be used to see what level of storage is available under various scenarios at the beginning of spring flood events. He explained how this was addressed in the Potomac to support downstream flows as well as water supply.

Q. Are there specific strategies you can recommend for different flow conditions (low, medium, high)?

A. Collier said that the New York City water supply reservoirs have operation strategies that vary based on flow conditions. She said that there is flexibility to manage for multiple objectives within the constraints on the system. In 2004-2006, the river got three major floods, and the Commission changed its strategies to address flood control better. It had been more focused on drought management before then. The Commission manages for different objectives under different flow conditions. Priorities changes as conditions change.

Q. What advice would you give ACFS about how to use adaptive management?

A. Collier said that everything they do is adaptive. They currently have a flexible flow management plan that details operations. It is a one-year agreement. It has been updated each year for the past several years. Information is collected on implementation to support informed decisions about adaptations to the plan. The Commission needs to consider how to adapt to sea level rise, population growth, and new industry, among other variables. They try to determine what the system is most sensitive to and how to move forward. Richter said that model simulations are important, but it is critical to start trying strategies on the ground with implementation. Wodraska said that getting more data is not always what is needed. He said we are often data rich and analysis poor. It is easy to agree to collect more data, but it often does not inform management decisions.

Q. What are strategies to address water scarcity and uncertainty associated with scarcity conditions?

A. Richter recommended having a drought management plan that pre-negotiates strategies and allocations in advance of critical conditions. He suggested that flexibility can possibly be

attained by trading water allocations among sectors in critical periods. For example, in some places, urban areas pay compensation to farmers for water in critical periods. Sheer said that there is a lot of water in this basin and that will help with addressing scarcity. Wodraska said it is important that GB members take a broad view as to what perspective they represent. Collier added that it is critical to have an agreed plan in advance.

This session was followed by a series of break-out group meetings in which GB members were able to meet in small groups with each of the four panelists.

## BREAK FOR LUNCH

Luncheon Speaker: John Erbele, General Manager of Smithgall Woods

### Water Management Alternatives Expert Panel – Closing Session

The facilitators of each small group asked follow up questions from their group, and then time was provided for questions from individual GB members.

Q. What do you do when you need to move forward without the information you need?

A. Richter responded that, although there is often the desire for more information, it can be more helpful to work with what you do know about the system, take some actions, and then have an adaptive management approach to incorporate what is learned from those initial actions. The Nature Conservancy recommends a presumptive standard for management where data is not available for more specific standards. Sheer added that analogs work; similar situations will respond similarly.

Q. Should we pursue conservation first before any other planning and analysis, or should it be a top priority in the plan? What does “conservation first” mean?

A. Wodraska said to start with conservation to shape management and get buy-in and to address waste, but you will need other measures, too. Sheer said it is always a good idea to take no more than you need. Collier said that measurement also is a step toward more efficient use; it helps to know how much you are using. Wodraska said that defining standards for success in an attainable way is important.

Q. What do you think about aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) as a management strategy?

A. Richter said that part of conservation is recognizing the benefits of natural infrastructure (e.g., wetlands, forests) and protecting them. He said he would prefer to see groundwater managed within its natural limits to provide for human use and ecological health over using an engineering approach such as ASR. ASR can play an important role for urban water supply in droughts. Sheer said that this basin has options that are less costly than ASR to attain the same objectives. Wodraska said that ASR should be considered when surface storage is being considered.

Q. What are institutional options suitable for ACF management?

A. Collier said that you cannot manage water if you limit yourself by state boundaries. You need to look at the whole watershed. To get to a management plan, ACFS needs to do more than putting the plan together. ACFS will have to engage the states. Sheer said to figure out first how to manage the resource and then develop the management institutions.

Q. With regard to performance metrics, how can we get participants to be flexible?

A. Wodraska said that he senses fundamental differences in guiding principles and the need to evaluate whether ACFS members share guiding principles. Other groups have already been through similar processes before and provide good examples. Sheer said that members need to get all performance measures on the table. They should be translated into objectives (e.g., maximize good events/minimize bad events). Sheer said it would be better to evaluate alternatives relative to each other on these objectives, rather than measuring alternatives by absolute metrics.

Q. Institutions need funding. How do you avoid getting stuck in a bad “marriage” in the form of an institution where partners may not live up to agreements?

A. The Delaware River Basin Commission is reliant upon funding from signatories and grants, and is limited in its ability to charge but has not had full funding from all of its members. The Commission staff now is holding retreats with the commissioners to determine what they want the Commission to be, with one goal being more support from signatories. Wodraska said that it is usually easier to get a user fee approved than a tax.

Q. What about oysters? What management alternatives have been used in other watersheds to address oysters and species like them that are both economic and ecologically alternative?

A. Collier said that oysters are an indicator of restoration in the Delaware; they experienced a big crash in the species but oyster populations now are increasing again. They use shelling to create habitat and movement of spat from high to low salinity areas. Richter said that ACFS needs to look closely at what oysters really need. They seem to be especially vulnerable to low flows.

Q. How important is it to know about the tradeoffs among interests? And do you need economic evaluation to support this analysis?

A. Sheer said that all of us have multiple and often similar interests, not just the interest each represents. We may differ in the priorities we place on those interests. It is important to understand each others’ interests to support the development of management alternatives that address all interests. You need to rely on the technical consultants to help you in interpreting the complexity. Use multiple model runs to identify an alternative that does well by satisfying everyone. Do not just try to protect your own interests. Richter said that each of us will not get what we want until we figure out how to help everyone else get what they need. You do not need to know each other person’s interests at a high level of detail, but you do need to be attentive to them and help to address them. Collier and Wodraska agreed.

Q. What specific solutions have you seen elsewhere that you think could help in the ACF?

A. Wodraska said that optimization models with dashboards are an important planning tool. Sheer said there are lots of basins similar to this basin, including the Everglades and the Delaware, where timing is important as it is in the ACF. He said that many basins on the East Coast are similar to the ACF. ACFS should focus on timing of flows.

Q. Is it possible to fix a system before it has major problems?

A. Richter said that he does not think so; the usual trend is toward more pressure on the resource until it is strained to the breaking point, and then you see a response. The ACF has not gone off a cliff yet, and the problems are fixable without draconian changes. There is still a lot of water with which to work. Sheer said that the Delaware and Susquehanna have had proactive programs to prevent major problems. Collier said that developing worst case scenario vision might help to make people more proactive. This could be done as part of an agreement on a drought management plan. Sheer said that in the Kansas River they developed a computer model of a worst case scenario drought, and that exercise helped to stimulate action, including the development of new institutions for water supply management.

Closing Comments:

- Richter: Water problems are human problems. The solutions are available to you. Don't be afraid to talk turkey with each other and expose the basis of some of the conflicts. Often when you develop performance metrics and explore scenarios together, you leave the conflicts under the carpet. You need to have frank, honest and specific conversations with each other. What is the nature of the conflict? Where does it happen? How often does it happen? This information often provides new ideas that lead to collaborative solutions. You might use the performance metrics scorecard you are working on as a basis for that discussion.
- Collier: ACFS has accomplished a lot. Need to identify the pinch points and keep an eye on the end game. You will need multiple solutions and you will need something like a marketing plan to put the plan into action. Take an integrated approach across the water cycle. Protect from the top of the watershed down to protect the headwaters, but also protect from the estuary up by determining downstream needs to target. Collier invited GB members to visit the Delaware River Basin Commission.
- Sheer: Use your consultants and identify possible solutions. There should be many available to you. And then influence those you need to implement the strategy.
- Wodraska: I thought this situation was more intractable before I got here. Remember what you've already accomplished and take time to smell the roses. After three years of working on something, I would want some closure. You need some kind of deliverable. I would urge you to get some words on paper and force some decisions about what to do next. You might be further along than you have given yourself credit for.

Charles Stripling thanked Gail Bingham and the panel.

### Information Session: Update from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Pete Taylor from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) was introduced by Billy Turner. In June (June 26, 2012), the USACOE filed a response to the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court. It argued that the USACOE has authority to meet Georgia's 2000 water supply request (for requirements in 2030) but not a commitment to do so. The legal opinion is available on the USACOE website. The opinion was supported by a technical document that included multiple model simulations (remand report).

In 2000, Georgia requested increased withdrawals in three then-year periods culminating in 2030 demands of 705 mgd. Downstream needs require flows of at least 1381 cfs at Atlanta. Withdrawals from Lanier increase to 297 mgd and from the river to 408 mgd by 2030. Return flows to the lake must increase substantially by 2030 to attain 107 mgd.

Taylor expects that the USACOE will re-open the Water Control Manual process soon. The USACOE said in its response to the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit that Lake Lanier is a part of a system and the Congressional intent needs to be understood in the context of the system. The Corps was always expected to balance purposes and there could be a shift to accommodate purposes over the period of operation of the project. If Corps accommodates the 2030 request from Georgia, the overall system energy value is reduced by less than 1%. The Corps responded to the court that storage in Lanier can be used for downstream water supply needs without a reallocation of storage. The Corps also responded that there is no provision in the law that authorized the Corps to provide financial compensation to power customers. Based on the remand report model simulations, during the most severe drought, accommodating Georgia's 2030 request would draw Lanier to 1040'. Lake levels would be lower than those experienced in past years' operation.

Taylor said that the proposed course of action is to resume the Water Control Manual update process with analysis to accommodate some level of lake withdrawals and downstream Atlanta water supply requirements. It is expected to be a three year effort.

### Information Session: Drought in the ACF Basin

Stripling introduced John Feldt. Temperatures were slightly below normal in the Southeast this summer. In the ACF, rainfall was generally below normal, though generally better than in recent years. Streamflow was generally below normal in the ACF. The Flint River has been well below normal, with record low flows at some points this year. There has not been much improvement in the drought core in the ACF. Models indicate El Niño conditions through the winter and neutral conditions in the spring. There is a good probability of having an above average recharge season this winter/spring. Feldt expects that status quo conditions will persist in October and November and that drought conditions are expected to make slow improvement over the winter.

### Information Session: Update from The University Collaborative

Shannon Bonney from The University Collaborative (TUC) updated the GB on the research on institutional options for water management in the ACF and reviewed the Collaborative’s recommendations. Her slides are available on request. Options included a non-regulatory institution, a limited regulatory commission, and a regulatory commission. Next, TUC will work with ACFS to assess which functions are essential for trans-boundary management and come up with a plan for gaining similar information from others. TUC’s report was sent out with the pre-meeting packet.

Next, Chad Taylor reviewed the proposed letter of agreement for services for TUC, which was distributed to the GB on Wednesday. **Homer Hirt made a motion, with a second from Dan Tonsmeire, to approve TUC letter of service for action by the EC in the form of a notice to proceed.** GB members discussed the motion. The agreement is contingent upon available funding (which needs to be raised for this purpose). **The motion was approved by consensus.**

### Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

ADJOURN FOR THE DAY

RECONVENE FOR THE DAY: Friday, September 14

### Open Discussion

Dan Tonsmeire said that he could answer yes to Brad Currey’s question from Wednesday about committing to the process.

Chad Taylor commented on oysters as a target species – a “canary in the mine”.

Gail Bingham and Charles Stripling remarked on Carol Collier’s invitation to visit the Delaware River Basin Commission as a good idea.

### Discussion of Next Steps of SWMP/IFA

Gordon Rogers reviewed the next steps for the TOCWG and the next steps in the SWMP/IFA that would involve and require input from the GB members. He noted that the coming months would require a significant amount of time and homework by members. There will be regional caucus meetings this fall to discuss the performance metrics (especially vis-à-vis the Atkins IFA deliverable) and water management alternatives.

Steve Simpson from Black & Veatch walked the group through development of the Water Management Alternatives Template and how it will be used (slides available on request).

Discussion summary:

- Some members need to be more comfortable with the data inputs, including the UIF dataset, before making comparative decisions about water management alternatives.
- The comment period will open soon for the USACE Water Control Manual. Perhaps the TOCWG could produce a set of WMAs to provide USACE from a scoping standpoint.
- We need to make sure ACFS is keeping states and USACE informed and involved.

Marty Kelly from Atkins provided the group an update on IFA tasks that will be completed over the next few months. Main item was the October 12 deliverable on the riverine IFAs to the TOCWG.

#### Review of Summer Caucus Meetings

Steve Simpson from Black & Veatch updated the group on the summer caucus meetings and development of the preliminary performance metrics table (slides available on request; performance metrics table was provided in the pre-meeting packet).

- It was suggested that navigation channel metric should be refined to include 0.5 ft increments.
- It was clarified that many of the performance metrics data needs (yellow boxes) may not require a lot of additional funds to complete.
- It was noted that some yellow boxes have GB member names based on offers to assist in collection of more information.
- Is there a metric for floodplain inundation? Yes, it will be part of the Atkins October 2012 deliverable.
- Will ACFS be provided more detail on the performance metrics over and above what is shown in the table? Yes, the technical memo will provide more detail.
- Will the model be able to analyze flood risk? No. The model can look at additional storage and can give us a comparative answer but not a specific numerical assessment.
- Can we sort out the differences in flows that are attributed to use, rainfall patterns and future water management alternatives? The UIF dataset does capture the precipitation – runoff relationship. The TOCWG will be looking into this further.

#### Committee and Work Group Status Reports

*Finance Committee and Fundraising: **Jim McClatchey presented a motion recommended by the Finance Committee (to approve as a part of the 2012 budget the funding to support Phase D. Brad Currey seconded the motion.** There was no discussion of the motion. **The motion was approved by consensus.***

*Intergovernmental Affairs Committee: Betty Webb presented recommendations from the committee on procedures for interactions by ACFS members with government agencies (attached). Requests for interaction with an agency will be coordinated by the EC Chair through the EC as appropriate at the time of the initial contact (but not for recurring contact on related matters). **Webb presented a motion recommended by the committee to approve the government agency interaction procedures recommended by the IGAC. Mike Criddle***

***seconded the motion.*** Stripling and Webb clarified how the procedures would operate. ***The motion was approved by consensus.***

#### Information Session: USGS WaterSMART Program

Mary Freeman gave a presentation on the environmental flows work in the USGS WaterSMART Program for the ACF. Her slides are available on request. The focus of the work is to assess if changing flow regimes have resulted in ecological changes in the ACF. USGS will construct current conditions flow models for several sub-basins in the ACF, sample fish and mussels to estimate stream flow effects on population dynamic in differing streams, and simulate biota responses to flow alteration scenarios. The sub-basins include: Upper Chattahoochee, Chestatee, Potato Creek, Ichaway-Nochaway, Spring, and Chipola. The modeling tools that they are developing will allow for projection of expected impacts of flow changes on ecological criteria. In response to a question, Freeman said that it was unlikely that the WaterSMART work would support ACFS interest in assessing the flow levels for shoal bass noted in the performance metrics table. Instead, they will be looking at projecting the effect of flow changes on shoal bass populations. Brian Hughes made some general comments on WaterSMART.

#### Committee and Work Group Status Reports (cont.)

*Finance Committee (cont.):* There is a finance committee in the pre-meeting packet. Brad Currey gave a fund-raising report. He said he feels that based on input from GB members, this group is committed to working together on this effort for the long-haul. Currey gave a report on recent fund-raising, outstanding requests, and fund-raising plans. More prospects are needed to get to the goal of \$1.5million.

*Membership Committee and Education and Outreach Committee:* Dan Tonsmeire gave reports for these committees on behalf of Jim Poff and Deron Davis.

*Issues Committee:* Bill McCartney gave a report from the committee. Jim Philips is the new committee chair. The committee will be working on updates to the five-year and annual planning documents between now and the December GB meeting.

#### Public Comment

Rachel Pawlitz – She is a graduate student at the University of Florida, and she works at USGS. She is focused in her PhD on how science related to policy is communicated. She plans to share her dissertation work with ACFS. She plans to relate the ACFS experience to watersheds elsewhere and in the context of theory.

#### Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Bingham said that the next GB meeting will be December 13 & 14 in the Upper Flint. The TOCWG will meet on December 12. Kelly Randall and Charles Stripling made some closing comments. The meeting was adjourned at 11:10am.

**Attachments:**

- (1) Motion to Authorize the Phase D of the Sustainable Water Management Plan (SWMP) and Instream Flow Assessment (IFA)**
- (2) Motion from Finance Committee**
- (3) Motion from Inter-governmental Affairs Committee**

**Attachment 1**

**Motion to Authorize the Phase D of the Sustainable Water Management Plan (SWMP) and Instream Flow Assessment (IFA)**

Move that the ACF Stakeholders Governing Board (GB) adopt as Phase D of the Sustainable Water Management Plan (SWMP) and Instream Flow Assessment (IFA) the tasks listed on the next page and further authorize the Executive Committee (EC) to proceed, within the context of existing funds and upon recommendation of the Technical Oversight and Coordination Work Group (TOCWG), in executing contractual arrangements to Black & Veatch for completion of the Tasks in this Phase. The cost of Phase D is \$ 58,141, for a total approved SWMP and IFA cost-to-date of \$637,074.

The following conditions apply:

1. Approval of this and other Phases for the SWMP and IFA are assumed to require only a one-step consensus approval by the Governing Board.
2. Significant changes in timeline, budget or deliverables, as determined by the TOCWG, to a Task within this Phase after approval by the Governing Board shall require an additional consensus approval of modifications by the GB. Any new work not referenced in the description of Tasks in this Phase shall require a separate consensus approval by the Governing Board.
3. The EC shall have the authority to negotiate and execute Task Orders and contract modifications for the Tasks (and sub-tasks) within this Phase and other Phases (previously approved by the GB) upon the recommendation of the TOCWG. The EC shall have the authority to authorize payment for completed Task Orders and execute subsequent Task Orders within GB approved Phases without additional GB approval. The TOCWG will provide recommendations to the EC for approval of completed Task Orders and payments.

Tasks numbers in this Phase reference the task numbers used in the Black and Veatch Workplan Technical Memorandum of 6-28-2012 for the SWMP, which is inclusive of the Tasks for the Atkins IFA.

Black and Veatch has submitted a detailed SWMP and IFA work plan, revised based on comments from the TOCWG. The best estimate at this time for the completion of the full plan is \$1,155,000 over a period of 24 months (ending December 2013). Future phases of this work plan may need to be modified as current uncertainties are clarified, subject to available funds and with the understanding that these future phases will be brought to the Governing Board for approval.

Tasks	Cost	Estimated Completion
Black and Veatch SWMP Sub-Task 6.1 (2 <sup>nd</sup> half of task): Conduct Iterative Basin Assessments: Develop Progressive Comparison to Existing Conditions <i>(The objective of this sub-task is to provide model outputs that describe existing conditions using a progressive approach that starts with unimpaired flows.)</i>	<b>\$52,141</b> (approved \$50,000 for this task in Phase C)	Dec 2012
Additional B&V support to attend fall sub-basin caucus meetings to develop performance criteria and water management alternatives	<b>\$6,000</b>	Dec 2012
TOTAL Amount Desired to be approved at September GB meeting to keep project on revised work plan schedule	<b>\$58,141</b>	

Attachment 2

ACFS Finance Committee

September 14, 2012

A discussion on amending the 2012 Annual Budget to accommodate a motion from the GB to approve Phase D of work on the SWMP/IFA was held on September 13, 2012. The Finance Committee notes the following:

- Phase D does not allocate more money than ACFS has in hand;
- Given what ACFS has in hand, if we spend all of the funds budgeted including the proposed increase, ACFS would have roughly \$276,000 remaining for additional SWMP/IFA Phases and/or the operation of the organization during 2013.

The Finance Committee recommends the following change to the 2012 ACFS Annual Budget:

<b>Line Item</b>	<b>Current</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Change</b>
SWMP (B&V)	\$333,000	\$391,141	\$58,141

Total proposed budget increase: \$58,141



Attachment 3

**Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint Stakeholders**

**Inter-Governmental Affairs Committee**

**TO: ACFS Executive Committee and Governing Board Members:**

**Task 1:** Discuss and make recommendation to the Executive Committee (EC) to address an interim strategy for a pro-active effort toward full and complete coordination as it relates to the interaction between the Technical Oversight Coordination Work Group (TOCWG) or The University Collaborative (TUC) with state, federal and other agencies.

**Recommendation:** Consistent with the ACFS Charter and Bylaws, in the event the Chair of the TOCWG or TUC desires or finds it necessary to establish initial communication, as a representative of the ACFS, with any state, federal or other agency representative to exchange information, documents or related material required to complete their project task, the IGAC recommends the following procedure:

- TOCWG or TUC Chair will contact the EC Chair to inform him of the agency they wish to contact and the objective of the communication.
- EC Chair will make initial contact with agency via written communication, specifically naming the lead ACFS representative that will coordinate the interaction with the agency.
- EC Chair will inform all EC Board Members.
- EC Board Members will inform their respective caucus members in the best manner they deem appropriate to assure full and complete coordination with all ACFS Governing Board Members and to offer an opportunity for comment.

**Task 2:** Develop a long-range strategy plan for ACF Stakeholder interaction and communication with state, federal and other agencies, for recommendation to the Executive Committee (EC) for confirmation by the Governing Board at the September 12-14, 2012 Meeting.

**Recommendation:** Consistent with the ACFS Charter and Bylaws, in the event an ACFS Governing Board Member desires or finds it necessary to establish initial communication, as a representative of the ACFS, with any state, federal or other agency representative to exchange information, documents or related material, the IGAC recommends the following procedure:

- ACFS representative will contact the EC Chair to inform him of the agency they wish to contact and the objective of the communication.
- EC Chair will make initial contact with agency via written/email communication, specifically naming the ACFS representative that will coordinate the interaction with the agency.
- EC Chair will inform all EC Board Members.
- EC Board Members will inform their respective caucus members in the best manner they deem appropriate to assure full and complete coordination with all ACFS Governing Board Members and to offer an opportunity for comment.

**Recommended Motion for Consideration at September 12-14, 2012 GB Meeting:**

Move to adopt interim and long-range strategy plans for ACFS interaction and communication with state, federal and other agencies, as recommended by the IGAC, in an effort to assure full and complete coordination with all ACFS Governing Board Members and to offer an opportunity for comment.

Tetra Tech, Inc.  
61 St. Joseph Street  
Suite 550  
Mobile, AL 36602-3521

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The ACF Stakeholders (ACFS) is a non-profit corporation created to provide a forum for diverse interests throughout the basin to work together to understand the water resources of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) River Basin and find collaborative solutions to their water management conflicts. The ACFS mission is to change the operation and management of the ACF Basin to achieve equitable and viable solutions among stakeholders that balance economic, ecological, and social values and ensure that the entire ACF Basin is a sustainable resource for current and future generations. Additional information about the ACFS's organizational history and operating procedures is attached.

ACFS formed after the previous scoping process in 2008-2009 and welcomes the opportunity to make comments now during this update to the original scoping document. These comments have been approved by consensus of the 56 member ACFS Governing Board.

The ACFS has appreciated hearing updates at its meetings from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and looks forward to future similar opportunities to learn about progress on the Water Control Manual update and to serve as a truly basin-wide, multi-stakeholder sounding board. In addition, ACFS can serve as a source of in-depth and collaboratively developed information and analysis during the course of the Water Control Manual update. ACFS has already shared information with USACE on water demands and consumptive use and a report concerning the unimpaired flow data set, generated as part of the ACFS Sustainable Water Management Plan initiative. Over the next 12 to 18 months, ACFS, with assistance from its consultants (Black and Veatch, Georgia Tech, and Atkins) anticipates producing a series of additional documents including: performance criteria based on stakeholder interests and concerns, existing conditions model runs, an instream flow assessment, and a range of water management alternatives. The chair of the ACFS Technical Oversight and Coordination Work Group will share this information with USACE as it is developed. Further, ACFS would be pleased to designate a liaison with USACE to coordinate the exchange of information.

Specifically, ACFS urges that the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for the update to the USACE Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin address the concerns of all stakeholders. The ACFS Charter and By-Laws identified 14 general areas of stakeholder interest to be considered in its mission to provide sustainable water resources management in the ACF Basin. These functional areas have been aggregated in ACFS planning documents into six major

objectives, as follows, and ACFS asks USACE to evaluate the update to the Water Control Manual with respect to these stakeholder interests:

- A. Ensure and/or maintain adequate water supplies for public supply/municipal uses including wastewater assimilation needs of current and projected future populations.
- B. Maintain existing and promote future water availability and access for water dependent industries, power generation and recreational interests.
- C. Promote the optimization of the use of water for agricultural irrigation including: types of irrigation technology, selection of crops, sustainable and resource-based permitting and water withdrawal monitoring.
- D. Determine the nature and extent of commercial navigation that the ACF Basin can effectively support.
- E. Protect the natural systems and ecology of the ACF Basin by defining and implementing desired flow regimes and lake levels, water quality enhancements, including wastewater and stormwater management and best management practices to maintain a healthy natural system and support a productive aquatic ecosystem in the Basin and the estuary.
- F. Create and support relationships with local governmental institutions and other public bodies within the ACF Basin to promote sustainability of the water resources and also to enhance the historical and cultural resources of the basin related to the management of its water resources.

In addition, ACFS asks USACE to address the following questions:

1. How will both consumptive use (withdrawals less returns) and instream or non-consumptive uses be addressed and the system managed in both wet and dry periods?
2. How will USACE define how returns are calculated, noting that not all users have accurate information about returns?
3. Given the significance of drought to stakeholders in the basin, how can USACE make better use of drought predication information and tools, factoring those into its water control manual, rather than relying only on current lake levels as triggers?
4. What time step(s) does USACE plan to use in modeling the system, when the system must be operated on a daily and hourly basis?
5. Will USACE consider other operating rules besides the current RIOP based on keeping more water in the reservoirs and still meeting the minimum required flow including raising the action zones in all of the reservoirs?
6. Will USACE re-investigate the unimpaired flow data set (UIF) and update it?

7. What portions of the Water Control Manual can be changed without legislative action, and which committees have jurisdiction for portions that can't be changed without legislative action?
8. What are the current triggers and procedures used by USACE for operational decisions in drought conditions?

Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

Charles Stripling  
Chair, ACF Stakeholders

DRAFT

## **SUMMARY OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY TRANS-BOUNDARY WATER MANAGEMENT INSTITUTIONS**

This summary is excerpted from *The Identification and Evaluation of Institutional Models for the Effective Trans-Boundary Management of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basin* prepared for the ACFS by the TUC in August 2012. This summary was compiled for the purpose of informing and promoting discussion at the ACFS Governing Board meeting in December 2012.

### **I. The Spectrum of Functions**

In contemplating the desirability of a trans-boundary water institution, the first step is defining opportunities for improvement and shared concerns in the basin and determining whether these are best addressed by working across jurisdictional boundaries and if so, whether the necessary political will to develop the institution currently exists or must be developed. The subsequent step is identifying the particular functions the institution will perform. Which functions are being satisfactorily performed by existing entities within the watershed and which could the trans-boundary water institution more appropriately or effectively perform? TUC's interviews have revealed a wealth of different functional arrangements. Some of these require concessions from traditional holders of that functional authority, be they state legislatures or agencies, local governments, federal agencies or other institutions.

Functions undertaken by trans-boundary water institutions occur across a spectrum— from information-based to authority-based management functions-- where many of the middling trans-boundary water institutions engage in functions that are not perceptibly different from each other. Information-based management focuses on educational, advocacy and advisory functions. These activities impose the least restrictions on the authority of existing institutions. At the other extreme are authority-based management functions, which are defined as the capacity to control or implement construction activities and regulatory actions. These often require that existing institutions cede some specified authority to the trans-boundary institution.

### **II. Functions**

#### **A. Coordinating and Disseminating Information**

Most trans-boundary water institutions, including those with an authority-based management emphasis, undertake information-based management functions. These functions include developing information through research, monitoring or other means of data acquisition; organizing this information to make it more accessible; making it available to stakeholders; and advocating its use by decisionmakers where appropriate. Solid data is essential for formulating policy, engaging in planning, and advising decision makers. The rigor of the process and reliability of the data adds to the weight of the final product, whether it is a recommendation or a decision. The gathering and dissemination of watershed-focused and functionally broad data is generally the first step in any form of trans-boundary cooperation.

#### **B. Coordination and Building Collaboration**

An organization helps to coordinate the efforts of various water stakeholders by facilitating the sharing of information and positive communication; developing opportunities for collaboration; encouraging the identification, discussion and resolution of conflicts; and facilitating the development and implementation of mutually reinforcing projects and activities.

### **C. Education**

Education includes the coordinated dissemination of information to inform individuals, stakeholders, and other interests. Through education, a trans-boundary water institution can motivate the members of its basin to become more involved in water issues and to engage in certain activities. One institution interviewed by the TUC provides grants to local universities for interdisciplinary research and development of water use-efficient technology, policy and communication strategies. It also develops and field-tests water-related curriculum for the primary and secondary schools within its service area. Another educates the public about best management practices to protect water quality through workshops, technical assistance and a targeted media campaign.

### **D. Water Conservation**

Water conservation can be an information-based management function as it often involves educating consumers about how to use water more efficiently, or it can involve authority-based management functions. For example, one organization interviewed by the TUC educates the public on water conservation and how it is inextricably tied with energy conservation via regular media releases and seasonal reports on projected energy use and supplies. Another provides funds to utilities to distribute to water users to install water-efficient technology.

### **E. Agricultural Practices**

Agricultural practices may affect both water quality and quantity issues. In terms of water quality, agricultural runoff can contribute to nutrient impairment of water bodies. Water quantity is affected due to the high net loss of water through irrigation. Information-based management approaches involving agricultural practices usually take the form of education, through encouragement of best practices and the provision of technical services. Authority-based management approaches focus largely on reducing the consumptive use of water by agricultural interests. Others provide financial assistance to aid in the transition to best management practices or to install meters. The planning process is used by some institutions the TUC studied to provide a forum to ensure the longevity of agricultural water sources even in the face of drought or rival uses.

### **F. Recreation**

Many of the trans-boundary water institutions do not actively engage in recreation; however there are examples of indirect engagement with recreation. Most are engaged in this function in the form of authority-based management, through establishment and implementation of water quality standards to protect recreation interests or to prevent recreation-related water quality degradation; provisioning flows to support nurseries; stocking waterways with recreationally important fish; and through building and maintaining recreational facilities, purchasing land, or acquiring conservation easements to ensure public use in the future.

### **G. Restoration**

Trans-boundary water institution engagement in restoration can involve entire ecosystems, specific wildlife species, or particular geographical areas of concern. Restoration can entail both information-based and authority-based management. Information-based management includes the creation or review of data involving natural resources in the basin, providing restoration grants, or collaboration with agencies and groups that focus on restoration.

### **H. Flood Control**

Flood control falls on both ends of the functional continuum. Information-based management functions relating to flood control include the mapping of floodplains and watersheds, monitoring flows within

the watershed, and issuing public warnings about potential flooding. Authority-based management in terms of flood control includes planning, construction and maintenance of infrastructure for the abatement of flooding and its impacts, and the acquisition of lands which have a high risk of flooding.

### **I. Planning**

Like data acquisition, coordination, and dissemination, planning is a function that is engaged in by almost every trans-boundary water institution. The scope of planning is largely dependent on the institution's mission. Planning is used to achieve widespread institution-level goals, such as in the case of comprehensive water quality or water allocation planning or to address more specific issues, such as drought or flooding or even land use if that affects the institution's mission.

### **J. Regulatory Review**

Regulatory review is a point on the functional continuum where authority-based management practices begin to predominate. Regulatory review is inextricably involved in water quality and water quantity functions of many trans-boundary water institutions. The main ways in which regulatory review is carried out is through the establishment of standards and the review of permits. Permit review can take one of a couple of forms. Either the trans-boundary water institution has an advisory role in reviewing and commenting on water withdrawal or effluent discharge permits, or it actually determines whether a permit should be granted. Some institutions interviewed by the TUC issue withdrawal permits in congruence with a basin management plan and deny or modify permits in the case of drought or over-allocation.

### **K. Managing for Ecological Flows**

Managing for ecological flows is a newly developing function undertaken by trans-boundary institutions. Providing for ecological flows is often accomplished by modifying the operation of reservoirs, within an acceptable range, to mimic pulses of water characteristic of a natural flow regime. Most of the ecological flows programs involve an adaptive management and investigative component, where trans-boundary institutions collaborate with non-profit organizations and universities to develop flow prescriptions.

### **L. Hydroelectric Power**

Hydroelectric power is largely the function of quasi-governmental agencies such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, private utilities such as Alabama and Georgia Power, and treaty organizations like the Columbia River Treaty, which have been granted authority from the federal government to engage in building, maintenance, and facilitation of the full range of hydroelectric power production. While hydroelectric is mainly an authority-based function, there are some instances of information-based management of hydroelectric power. As large hydroelectric dams can have major effects on river continuity and wildlife, some trans-boundary water institutions coordinate their projects with environmental agencies to ensure that wildlife is not adversely impacted

### **M. Adaptive Management**

Managing watersheds in an adaptive manner involves an iterative process where the effects of management decisions are used to inform future management strategies and objectives. Adaptive management uses an experimental approach to policy design and implementation. It is a style of management that accepts complexity and uncertainty, and continually aims to improve through "learning by doing."

# Discussion Guide: Trans-boundary Water Management Institutional Functions

December 2012

---

## Introduction

The ACFS Governing Board requested that the TUC follow up the Institutional Options Report (“the Report”) at the Governing Board’s December 2012 meeting, to answer questions prompted by the report, particularly about functions a Tri-State institution in the ACFS basin might provide, and to give the ACFS an opportunity to identify additional information about those functions they would find helpful in the future. A synopsis of the functions identified in the Report have been provided to the Governing Board (“GB”) in the advance materials for the meeting.

Our goal is to develop two products during this roundtable discussion. The first is a list of the five functions that the ACFS believes are most important to study at greater depth at this stage, with an eye toward how this investigation might inform future consideration of a trans-boundary water management institution w/n the ACFS, along with specific targets for study for each of these functions. The second is an annotated list of those organizations within the ACF Basin that are currently providing water management-associated functions.

## Discussion Guide

**Plenary Session (25-30 min):** The TUC will review the potential functions of trans-boundary institutions with the GB as a whole. The TUC authors will explain each function in more detail and provide examples of how it is undertaken by various trans-boundary institutions. They will answer questions in order to ensure everyone has a level of clarity about and a common understanding of the functions. Individuals will have an opportunity in the small group discussions that follow to share their views about these functions.

**Small Group Discussions (40 min):** GB members will be divided into four smaller groups to discuss specific functions. The facilitator(s) will move through the list of functions assigned to that group and will take notes on a flip chart.

For each function, the group will be asked:

1. What would the value be in the ACF basin if a trans-boundary institution provided this function? Is this a high, medium or low priority to you? Why?

2. What further information would you like to know about this function and how trans-boundary institutions are performing it in other basins? How would this information help the ACFS?

3. What existing organizations are undertaking this function w/n the ACF? Who is the best contact person for this organization? What is this organization's scope? What specifically are the gaps that a trans-boundary institution could fill in here?

***Final Plenary Session Reports from Small Group Discussions (20 min):*** The breakout groups will report their findings back to their colleagues and we will elicit feedback from the whole GB as time allows.

After all the breakout groups have reported, we'll ask the GB:

4. Are there any lingering questions the group has about the functions or anything else that are still unresolved?

ACF Stakeholders, Inc.  
Statement of Activity (accrual) - December 7, 2012

	Prior Yr Actual 2011	Year to Date 2012	Current Budget	% Budget to Date
<b>REVENUE</b>				
Unrestricted				
Membership Dues	\$ 55,025.00	\$ 49,625.00	\$ 45,650.00	108.7%
Interest Income	\$ 22.29	\$ 791.98		
Txfr from Restricted <sup>B</sup>	\$ 111,563.43	\$ 574,274.97		
<b>Total Unrestricted</b>	<b>\$ 166,610.72</b>	<b>\$ 624,691.95</b>	<b>\$ 45,650.00</b>	
Temporarily Restricted <sup>A</sup>				
SWMP/IFLLA Fundraising	\$ 638,100.00	\$ 503,354.75		
University Collaborative Fundraising	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,541.67		
Meeting/Other Directed Support	\$ 17,597.99	\$ 17,175.00	\$ 15,000.00	114.5%
(Transfer to Unrestricted) <sup>B</sup>	\$ (111,563.43)	\$ (574,274.97)		
<b>Total Temporarily Restricted</b>	<b>\$ 549,134.56</b>	<b>\$ (48,203.55)</b>	<b>\$ 15,000.00</b>	
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 715,745.28</b>	<b>\$ 576,488.40</b>	<b>\$ 60,650.00</b>	
<b>EXPENSES</b>				
Business Expenses	\$ 404.33	\$ 927.68	\$ 450.00	206.2%
Operation Expenses	\$ 139.11	\$ 314.00	\$ 5,000.00	6.3%
Board Meeting Expenses	\$ 17,929.06	\$ 10,601.52	\$ 21,200.00	50.0%
Contract Services				
Accounting Services	\$ -	\$ 2,925.00	\$ 4,000.00	73.1%
Legal Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000.00	0.0%
Facilitation (RESOLVE)	\$ 80,434.37	\$ 75,301.74	\$ 93,300.00	80.7%
Org Needs (Masters/Rowles/Other)	\$ 13,200.00	\$ 116,371.71	\$ 142,000.00	82.0%
SWMP (B&V)	\$ -	\$ 214,000.00	\$ 333,000.00	64.3%
IFLLA (Atkins)	\$ -	\$ 148,000.00	\$ 148,000.00	100.0%
Other (TUC, Coxe-Curry)	\$ 2,116.34	\$ 18,288.52	\$ 5,000.00	365.8%
<b>Total Contract Services</b>	<b>\$ 95,750.71</b>	<b>\$ 574,886.97</b>	<b>\$ 727,300.00</b>	<b>79.0%</b>
Committee Expenses	\$ 5,126.66	\$ 2,319.71	\$ 15,000.00	15.5%
Work Group Expenses	\$ 2,918.35	\$ 231.27	\$ 4,500.00	5.1%
Other Expenses	\$ 3,900.00	\$ -	\$ 3,500.00	0.0%
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 126,168.22</b>	<b>\$ 589,281.15</b>	<b>\$ 776,950.00</b>	<b>75.8%</b>
<b>Total Change in Net Unrestricted Assets</b>	<b>\$ 40,442.50</b>	<b>\$ 35,410.80</b>		
<b>Total Change in Net Restricted Assets</b>	<b>\$ 549,134.56</b>	<b>\$ (48,203.55)</b>		
<b>Total All Activity</b>	<b>\$ 589,577.06</b>	<b>\$ (12,792.75)</b>		

<sup>A</sup> Denotes funds received for specific purposes with limitations stipulated by donor.

<sup>B</sup> Journal entry to demonstrate funds used for stipulated purpose and released to Unrestricted. Items will include Facilitation, Admin Contract, SWMP/IFLLA/TUC Contracts, GB meeting expenses, etc....

ACF Stakeholders, Inc.  
Balance Sheet - December 7, 2012

	Unrestricted	Temporarily Restricted	Total
<b>ASSETS</b>			
Checking/Money Market/Brokerage	\$ 98,854.05	\$ 594,896.45	\$ 693,750.50
Accounts Receivable	\$ 66,000.00		\$ 66,000.00
<i>Total Assets</i>	\$ 164,854.05	\$ 594,896.45	\$ 759,750.50
 <b>LIABILITIES AND EQUITY</b>			
Accounts Payable	\$ 96,450.49		\$ 96,450.49
<i>Total Liabilities</i>	\$ 96,450.49		\$ 96,450.49
 <b>NET ASSETS</b>			
Beginning of Year	\$ 32,992.76	\$ 643,100.00	\$ 676,092.76
Change in Net Assets	\$ 35,410.80	\$ (48,203.55)	\$ (12,792.75)
<i>Total Net Assets</i>	\$ 68,403.56	\$ 594,896.45	\$ 663,300.01
<i>Total Liabilities and Net Assets</i>	\$ 164,854.05	\$ 594,896.45	\$ 759,750.50

## ACFS Fundraising Campaign - November 30, 2012 Status Report

Name	Amount
Woodruff Foundation	\$ 250,000.00
R. Howard Dobbs, Jr. Foundation	\$ 100,000.00
Cox Foundation	\$ 100,000.00
AFLAC Foundation	\$ 75,000.00
Brad Currey	\$ 50,000.00
The Kendeda Fund	\$ 50,000.00
Bradley-Turner Foundation	\$ 50,530.00
Total Systems Services	\$ 50,000.00
Coca-Cola Foundation	\$ 50,000.00
Goodrich Foundation	\$ 50,000.00
American Proteins (not yet received)	\$ 50,000.00
Rock-Tenn Company	\$ 25,000.00
Imlay Foundation	\$ 25,000.00
SunTrust - Thomas Guy Woolford Charitable Trust	\$ 25,000.00
Tull Charitable Foundation	\$ 25,000.00
The Waterfall Foundation, Inc	\$ 25,000.00
Georgia Power	\$ 25,000.00
Tri Rivers Development Association	\$ 22,500.00
Turner Foundation, Inc	\$ 20,000.00
Morgens West Foundation	\$ 15,000.00
AGL Resources Private Foundation	\$ 10,000.00
Alabama Power/Southern Nuclear (not yet received)	\$ 10,000.00
Munson Foundation (additional \$7,500 payable in 2013)	\$ 7,500.00
Meadwestvaco	\$ 7,000.00
Columbus Water Works	\$ 5,000.00
Riparian County Stakeholder Coalition	\$ 5,000.00
SW GA Farm Credit (additional \$2,500 Payable in 2013)	\$ 2,500.00
Procter and Gamble	\$ 2,500.00
Oglethorpe Power Corporation	\$ 2,500.00
ACFS Membership Donations - Total (list on Pg. 2)	\$ 6,425.00
	\$ 1,141,455.00

**List of ACFS Members (alphabetical)**

Betty Webb

Billy R. Mayes

Billy Turner

Brad Moore

Carole Rutland

CCT & Associattes, Inc. (Chad Taylor)

Dan Tonsmeire

David Dixon

Deron Davis

Frank Stephens

Friends of Lake Eufaula

Gina and Gordon Rogers

Glenn Page

Jerri Russell

Jim McClatchey

Jim Phillips

Jim Poff

John A. Heath

Marilyn Royal

Mark H. Masters

Robert B. Ragland Foundation, Inc.

Robin Singletary

Steve Davis

Stripling, Inc. (Charles Stripling)

Tim Thoms

Wilton Rooks

# APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE FLINT STAKEHOLDERS 2013 MEMBERSHIP RECRUITMENT PLAN

12-4-12

**Purpose:** Membership recruitment is vital to the continued growth and success of any organization. People feel the need to belong and know through experience that they can achieve more through group efforts than as individuals. This plan will seek to add depth and talent to this organization so that all interest categories in all sub-basins have members willing to fulfill our mission and vision.

**ACF Stakeholders Mission:** To change the operation and management of the ACF Basin to achieve:

- Equitable solutions among stakeholders that balance economic, ecological, and social values.
- Viable solutions that ensure that the entire ACF Basin is a sustainable resource for current and future generations.

**ACF Stakeholders Goals:**

- To provide leadership in developing a consensus-based basin-wide vision and a unified voice for the ACF Basin.
- To enhance communication among stakeholders in the ACF Basin.
- To develop a common scientifically valid understanding of the ACF Basin, including the interrelated nature of water management in the basin, the needs of all of its stakeholders, and the limitations of the system.
- To implement solutions that are based on the best available technology and science.
- To pursue appropriate change to institutional structure, policies, and procedures in implementing the solutions set forth by this entity.

**Why Recruitment is Critical:**

- Revenue from membership dues helps to provide a variety of diverse offerings and also offers a chance to increase membership services.
- The size of the membership of an organization determines the size of the voice.
- More members can lead to more opportunities. A large membership base creates opportunities for our members and any partnerships that may exist.
- The size of the membership increases the organization's presence and credibility in the community.
- Successful recruitment contributes to retaining members – people enjoy being part of a successful organization. Membership can function as a support network and a large membership base provides chances for its members to explore a variety of interests.

**Elements of Successful Recruitment**

- Recruitment is an ongoing project that is the responsibility of all members of the organization.
- Be energetic and excited about ACFS membership. When members talk about the association, they should express how they honestly feel about being an active member and what opportunities membership has provided.
- Members should be prepared to explain what ACFS membership has to offer and be very familiar with mission and goals of the organization.
- Make it as easy as possible to become a member.
- Membership & Outreach Committee chairs will coordinate these efforts and educate membership on on-going basis.

Working Copy – Not for general release. Content may not express opinion of ACFS membership.

### **2013 Membership Recruitment Plan:**

It was decided after two failed attempts at membership recruitment events held in conjunction with Governing Board meetings that a new approach was needed. The new approach will be more a selected and targeted membership recruitment that will occur in each of the four sub-basins. Here are some proposed ideas for this new plan:

- Each Caucus Chair, Caucus Executive Committee members, Membership Committee members should be very familiar with members and their stakeholder interest groups represented within their Caucus.
- First of all, all sub-basins should have as many of the stakeholder interest groups represented as possible. Next goal would be to have at least two members from each stakeholder interest group in each caucus. This will meet the goal of increasing depth in this organization.
- Recruitment of Associate members shall be the focus of this campaign since membership cost is so low (\$25) and benefits are greatest. This would fit together with next bullet item.
- This may difficult to institute, but one method to increase associate membership is to institute rules about who may be allowed to serve as proxies for Governing Board members. It should never be allowed to have GB members holding more than one GB vote at a time.