

ACFS ACTION PLAN SUMMARY CHART

2013 IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- A. Immediate Priorities (completed ASAP)
 - a. Draft of SWMP including IFA and Bay Evaluation completed
 - b. Plan for utilization of SWMP and IFA developed
 - c. Scoping Guidance submitted to USACE
 - d. Fundraising
- B. Necessary Priorities (completed within calendar 2013)
 - a. Water Management Alternatives (WMA) developed and finalized
 - i. Sub-Basins (4)
 - ii. Interest Groups (14)
 - iii. Work Groups and Committees
 - b. Monitoring and response to USACE Water Control Manual revisions
 - c. Submission of WMA to governors of Alabama, Florida and Georgia
 - d. Strengthen relationships with state and federal political and policy-making personnel
 - e. Continue work on institutional options for trans-boundary water management with The University Collaborative

LONG-RANGE PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS (WITHIN 2-5 YEARS)

- A. Publicize activities and recommendations of ACFS
- B. Amend and improve SWMP/IFA on an on-going basis.
- C. Incorporate use of "BEST PRACTICES" methodologies.
- D. Incorporate (Operationalize) institutional options for on-going water resource planning and management.
- E. Recruit new membership.
- F. Define future of ACFS

KEYS:

- A. Consensus on Water Management Alternatives within ACFS
- B. Successful fundraising
- C. ACFS acceptance within state/federal governments

**APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT STAKEHOLDERS
ANNUAL ACTION PLAN –2013**

I. Introduction

The ACF Stakeholders (ACFS) is a non-profit organization created to provide a forum for members of that organization to work together to understand the water resources of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) River Basin and to find collaborative solutions to its 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. The ACFS Goals are stated below to provide context for this action plan:

- 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.

ACFS plans to take action on nine priorities in 2013. These actions are fundamental to the Future Planning Program to help accomplish the ACFS' overall mission to achieve equitable allocation of sustainable water resources in the ACF Basin. The near-term priorities for 2013 work initially toward meeting the defined needs of the 14 stakeholder interests identified in the ACFS Charter and By-Laws, captured in the following six inextricably-related planning objectives:

- 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 economic/commercial interests' water availability and access for water dependent industries, power generation and recreational interests.
- C. Promote the optimization of the use of water for agriculture irrigation including type 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 System 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 storm water 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.

The ACFS focus in 2013 will be to complete and utilize the Strategic Water Management Plan and the Instream Flow Assessment. These items are integral to understanding the capabilities and limitations of ACF Basin water management practices. The interface and liaison with the US Army Corps of Engineers, as they revise/update their Water Control Manual, will require close monitoring and interaction. Water Management Alternatives must be developed. Fundraising work and success will remain a critical component to assuring organizational sustainability.

The priority actions in 2013, in support of ACFS Goals and Interest Group needs, are as listed:

1. Work with Black and Veatch, Atkins or others (consultants) to complete the Strategic Water Management Plan including Instream Flow Assessment and Bay Evaluation.
2. Develop and implement a plan for utilization of the SWMP and IFA work products for use with involved government, professional, and decision-making residents within the three-state region.
3. Provide the US Army Corps of Engineers Scoping Guidance recommendations, liaison, and support as they update their Water Control Manual and Environmental Impact Statement.
4. Raise the necessary funds to support on-going budgetary needs for working with consultants, government and policy-making entities, and funding essential organizational travel, meeting and communication requirements.
5. Develop Water Management Alternatives, i.e., an essential set of options for operating practices to be considered and/or utilized by basin water management authorities within the region.
6. Work closely, on an on-going basis, with the US Army Corps of Engineers to assure thorough communications as they finalize WCM practices.
7. Deliver, as directly as possible, the SWMP, including WMAs (listed in priority No. 5) to the three governors.
8. Build and enhance relationships with key involved federal and state government decision-makers, both elected and professional personnel.

9. Continue work on institutional options for trans-boundary water management on-going with The University Collaborative

Should unanticipated developments create needed amendments during the year, the issues committee will provide communications to all Governing Board members. The Executive Committee will coordinate responses, as needed, to unanticipated developments affecting the interests of ACF Stakeholders.

II. Implementation Considerations – Priorities and Recommendations

Tasks and/or deliverables anticipated in 2013 for each of these priority actions are described briefly below, along with notations about who is responsible for each. The notation “ALL” indicates that each and every Governing Board member should strive to embrace responsibility when an opportunity arises or a need for personal initiative is evident.

There are also two new Work Group proposed:

1. WCM (Water Control Manual) WG
2. DB2 (Do-Better 2) WG

First, the WCMWG is to provide continual liaison with the USACE as Scoping Guidance and Water Control Manual revision and update proceeds. The objective is to establish and maintain a relationship with responsible Corps personnel to assure that ACFS input, ideas and recommendations are understood and considered. Attention throughout 2013 will be necessary. Secondly, the DB2WG is to build on the work done previously by the Do-Better Work Group. Assurance that “best practices” are incorporated to improve water quality as well as increase conservation and water use efficiency throughout is necessary.

Note that each proposed description of the nine 2013 priorities requires validation by listed Committee or Work Group. Events and progress will dictate changes as the year unfolds. Amended plans should be discussed and reviewed at 2013 Governing Board meetings. These priorities are divided into both Immediate and Necessary categories, with noted completion dates.

IMMEDIATE...ASAP

1. Work with Black and Veatch and Atkins (consultants) or others as appropriate to complete the Strategic Water Management Plan including Instream Flow Assessment and Apalachicola Bay and Estuary Evaluation.

Work to date has been extensive and has been coordinated through the TOCWG with both Black & Veatch (SWMP) and Atkins (IFA). Completion dates for the original scope of work are anticipated within months, with the target being ASAP. Complexities are numerous and in both cases there will likely be a need for supplemental work and reports. Hence, any enhancements and updates will be conducted in the realm of FUTURE PLANS, with funding (\$) requirements dictating the extent of additional activity.

LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES-TOCWG

CONTRIBUTING ROLES - Financial Committee
-Professional Services WG

2. Develop and implement a plan for utilization of the SWMP and IFA work products for use with involved government, professional and decision-making residents within the three state region.

These reports will lead to modeling runs to check feasibility of incorporation. The use of the reports should then become a significant step in creating more awareness of ACFS and its value to decision-makers and residents in the region. Hence the need for a structured utilization plan to present to various collaborative groups and audiences. By the end of June, 2013, the utilization plan should be ready for disclosure and implementation.

LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES-TOCWG

CONTRIBUTING ROLES- Education and Outreach Committee

3. Provide the US Army Corps of Engineers Scoping Guidance recommendations, liaison, and support as they update their Water Control Manual and Environmental Impact Statement.

This work entails an initial letter to the Corps outlining what ACFS recommends for inclusion as regards issues and questions that should be addressed in the revisions to the operating manual. This letter was submitted to the Corps following the December, 2012 meeting of the Governing Board. It also provides an opportunity to initiate a proactive liaison relationship with the Corps. Hence the recommendation of a new work group to develop and support a collaborative effort to the extent that federal regulations allow. Clear communications and timely efforts to develop an updated operating document that would equitably serve all stakeholders in the three state region should be the ACFS goal.

LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES-WCM* Work Group

CONTRIBUTING ROLES-InterGovernmental Affairs Committee

4. Raise the necessary funds to support on-going budgetary needs for working with consultants, government and policy-making entities, and funding essential organizational travel, meeting and communication requirements.

Fundraising success is essential to the sustainability of the organization. Efforts to date, through the dedicated work of a number of key Governing Board

members, have provided the funds to carry ACFS through the current year. Much more is needed and all Governing Board members (56) must provide support, through direct or indirect involvement to secure funding. This vital component will be a permanent and recurring need of ACFS in each year moving forward. New sources of support are essential. Current and past contributors must be recognized to assure their understanding of the role ACFS is serving to assist in the economic and ecological benefit to the region.

LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES-Financial Committee

CONTRIBUTING ROLES-ALL

NECESSARY...BY YEAR-END, 2013

5. Develop Water Management Alternatives, i.e., an essential set of options for operative practices to be considered and/or utilized by basin water management authorities within the region.

Building from the SWMP draft and IFA, the Water Management Alternatives are composed of various operating methods, conservation measures, best practices, processes and technologies that will provide sustainable water supply with the basin. Sustainable water supply will afford sufficient quantity and acceptable quality to nourish economic growth and both human and environmental health.

LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES-ALL

CONTRIBUTING ROLES-ALL

Note –All involved will necessitate each of the 4 sub-basin caucuses and each of the 14 Interest Groups to reach agreement on selected alternatives. In turn those selected alternatives will become an integral part of the SWMP that will be delivered to the three governors.

6. Work closely, on an on-going basis, with the US Army Corps of Engineers to assure thorough communications as they finalize WCM practices.

The Water Control Manual practices will impact the entire three state basin. It will be an outgrowth of the Scoping and EIS deliberations with various state and local governments as well as other citizens and residents not necessarily represented by ACFS. It is therefore essential that our organization maintain clear and effective dialogue and relationships with the Corps as they select practices to be implemented.

LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES-WCM* Work Group

CONTRIBUTING ROLES- InterGovernmental Affairs Committee

7. Deliver, as directly as possible the SWMP (including WMA) recommendations (listed in priority No. 5) to the three governors.

Dealing directly with the three governors will insure that their respective staffs and policy makers will give significant and serious consideration to the SWMP developed by our organization. The level of direct communication with each respective state government will likely determine the degree of acceptance of ACFS as a significant entity within the region. Our recommendations will be the result and product of extensive study and debate and therefore should deserve high profiling.

LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES- InterGovernmental Affairs Committee

CONTRIBUTING ROLES-Education and Outreach Committee

8. Build and enhance relationships with key involved federal and state government decision-makers, both elected and professional personnel.

Relationships will play a major role in determining the receptivity of key government personnel to the work and recommendations of ACFS. We should strive to identify key decision-makers and initiate dialogue accordingly to establish and enhance relationships.

LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES- InterGovernmental Affairs Committee

CONTRIBUTING ROLES-ALL

9. Continue work on institutional options for trans-boundary water management on-going with The University Collaborative

LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES – TUC Sub-Committee of Professional Services WG

CONTRIBUTING ROLES – All

2013 COMMITTEE AND WORK GROUP BUDGETS

ISSUES	\$500
INTER-GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS	\$2000
FINANCE	\$500
MEMBERSHIP	\$1000
EDUCATION/OUTREACH	\$2000
EXECUTIVE	\$3000
TECH OVERSIGHT & COORDINATION	\$2500
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	\$1000

III. LONG RANGE PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS (2-5 Years)

1. Publicize activities and recommendations of ACFS

LEAD RESPONSIBILITY-Education and Outreach Committee

- Develop key messages
- Highlight Accomplishments
- Target audiences

2. Amend and Improve SWMP/IFA on an on-going basis

LEAD RESPONSIBILITY-TOC Work Group

- Utilize consultants/contractors?
- Target audiences for utilization
- Budget requirements

3. Incorporate use of “Best Practices” methodologies

LEAD RESPONSIBILITY-DB2* Work Group

- Inventory “best practices” for water resource management
- Support proactively the selected “best practices”

4. Incorporate (operationalize) institutional options for on-going water resource planning and management

LEAD RESPONSIBILITY-Professional Services Work Group (TUC)

- Work to assure acceptance of selected institutions
- Work to assure cooperation and collaboration within those selected institutions...budgets required (\$25,000/year) and grant requests to be submitted

5. Recruit new membership

LEAD RESPONSIBILITY- Membership Committee

- Monitor GB turnover
- Proactively seek new members
- Develop incentives for prospective members

6. Define Future of ACFS

LEAD RESPONSIBILITY-ALL

- Do we have consensus on SWMP?
- Is funding sufficient for sustaining organization?
- What is acceptable level of effectiveness with state and federal governments?