

Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint Stakeholders

Governing Board Meeting Summary

Apalachicola, FL

April 25-26, 2013

Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Objectives and Agenda

The Governing Board (GB) meeting started at 9:00am. Billy Turner welcomed the GB and thanked everyone for their attendance and all the work they have put in to make ACFS a success. He recognized Betty Webb and others in Apalachicola for helping put the meeting together. Gail Bingham asked the GB members to introduce themselves and then turned to Frank Cook, Mayor Pro Tem of the City of Apalachicola to welcome the Governing Board. Next, she reviewed the materials packet and the agenda.

Old Business and Annual Report of the Secretary

Vince Falcione made a motion to accept the December 2012 GB meeting summary and Brad Moore seconded the motion. ***The motion was approved by consensus.***

ACFS Secretary Bill McCartney presented the 2012 Annual Report of the Secretary. Gordon Rogers made a motion to accept the Annual Report and David Dixon seconded the motion. ***The motion was approved by consensus.*** A copy of the Annual Report is shown in Appendix A.

Issues Committee: 2013 Annual Plan

Issues Committee Jim Phillips presented the draft 2013 Annual Plan that was provided in the pre-meeting materials. The Plan was accompanied by a summary outline (pg 1) and implementation chart (pg 12).

A comment was made that ACFS should try to develop some summary material of accomplishments that would help in recruitment of new members. There is an 8 page summary on the ACFS website. Further comment was made that ACFS should look long-term and that the organization, in some form, will hopefully be around for many years.

Betty Webb made a motion to adopt the 2013 Annual Plan, with the understanding that the Issues Committee will incorporate mentions of the Institutional Options Study and Bay Evaluation, and Wilton Rooks seconded the motion. ***The motion was approved by consensus.*** A copy of the approved Annual Plan is shown in Appendix B.

BREAK

University Collaborative Report

Chad Taylor reminded the GB of the work of The University Collaborative (TUC) on Institutional Options and introduced Shannon Bonney (UGA) of TUC who provided a report on the

DRAFT – Pending approval by the ACFS Governing Board.

completed Institutional Options Study – Phase 2. The Phase 2 report was provided electronically to the GB and is available on the ACFS website. Slides from the TUC presentation will be posted to the ACFS website.

Discussion on the Phase 2 Report and potential Phase 3 agreement included:

- Independent revenue sources – some of the institutions do have independent revenue sources including the Susquehanna River Basin Commission; TUC is looking at other options including some frameworks based on usage fees
- Alternative supply should be included in the final report
- Clarification that the TUC does have faculty from universities in all three states but the student support has come from UF and UGA
- All except \$5,000 of the first Phase of the Institutional Options study has been done via fundraising outside of the Operating Budget; If Phase 3 is approved, some additional funding will be required, likely through sub-basin caucuses. We have commitments from the Apalachicola and Flint Caucuses

Charles Stripling presented a motion to approve the Letter of Service Agreement for the Institutional Options Study – Phase 3. The Motion was seconded by Homer Hirt. **The motion passed with consensus.** A copy of the motion and approved Letter of Service Agreement is shown in Appendix C.

SWMP Overview

Brad Moore provided an update on progress of TOCWG. Slides presented to the GB will be posted on the ACFS website. Major items covered in the update include:

- Water Demands – Report and external review is complete. Report is pending acceptance by the TOCWG
- Instream Flow Assessment (IFA) – Reviewed by TOCWG and external reviewers. Environment and Conservation Caucus working with contractors to determine applicability of IFA and other sources of information for setting performance metrics.
- Unimpaired Inflow Dataset (UIF) – Decided to proceed with existing UIF dataset for modeling.
- Bay Evaluation – Agreed that we need to evaluate effect on the Bay of water management alternatives in the SWMP/IFA. Ad Hoc Committee is now working to determine how to proceed with Bay Evaluation. Woody Hicks will be presenting an update on the Bay Evaluation Committee’s work later in the meeting.
- Performance Metrics – ACFS members have contributed through the caucus meetings, and a few more are anticipated. The GB will be asked to approve use of these metrics for modeling purposes at the next meeting.
- Water Management Alternatives (WMAs) – To date, we have received over 40 WMA submissions. Still open to submissions from members through May 10, 2013. The TOCWG will then work with B&V on a screening process to select a manageable number of WMAs for model runs

- Model runs – Current conditions model runs are complete; Aris Georgakakos will present results later during this meeting
- SWMP is on track to complete project by May/June 2014
- Gail will step into role of facilitating TOCWG as well as EC and GB meetings
- Priorities:
 - Complete plan in time for meaningful comment to USACE for Water Control Manual update
 - Bay Evaluation
 - Funding
- Future efforts may include
 - Corrections to UIF
 - Additional environmental study and monitoring
 - Update to water demands data

Next, Gordon Rogers provided an update on the environmental performance metrics after thanking Brad Moore for his leadership on the TOCWG. Topics covered included:

- Reminding the group that even within the E&C Caucus there are dissimilar interests that complicate agreeing on performance metrics
- The E&C Caucus has held meetings with Atkins and the Georgia Water Resources Institute to help in setting their metrics
- The Caucus is very close to setting their performance metrics and will meet the May 10th deadline set by the TOCWG

SWMP: Status Report and Presentation of Current Conditions Modeling Results

Steve Simpson of Black & Veatch presented an update from the SWMP contractors. The slides presented will be posted to the ACFS website following the GB meeting. The presentation included an update on:

- A status on the SWMP timeline
- Solicitation of performance metrics for each stakeholder interest and each node within the flow model
- Solicitation of Water Management Alternatives
- Updates Water Demands Memo
- Existing conditions

Next, Aris Georgakakos and Martin Kistenmacher from the Georgia Water Resources Institute, subcontractor to Black & Veatch, presented the purpose and methodology of the current conditions modeling runs. A Current Conditions Executive Summary was provided to the GB prior to the meeting and the slides from Dr Georgakakos' presentation will be available on the ACFS website.

BREAK FOR LUNCH

The GB reconvened and the GWRI team presented summary results of the current conditions modeling runs and comparisons to performance metrics. The slides showing the current conditions results will be posted to the ACFS website. Discussion included:

- Clarification that the net evaporation in the model is not constant and will change depending on rainfall
- There could be other options for evaluating environmental flows other than the IFA (median flows) or the USFWS PAL guidelines (low flows).
- Is there a similar dampening effect of reservoir operations lower in the Basin on the Chattahoochee side as it appears on the Flint side?
 - Will need to look more closely at the data to see how they compare
- Comment that the IFA could be run for just dry years similar to how GWRI extracted a series of years for their “dry years” run; could be that the existing IFA would be violated more frequently if the errors in the UIF are corrected.
- Comment that we need to include, or investigate, agricultural use within the Apalachicola sub-basin; also that it is curious to see a relatively large impact of ag in December
 - Impact of ag in winter months is due to lag time from the impact of pumping during the growing season
 - It is known that there is a large amount of ag development in the upper part of the Apalachicola but additional data is needed; B&V did get data from the NW FL Water Management District on ag water use
 - The surface water impact of groundwater use was calculated from Georgia EPD modeling efforts in support of their state water plan
- Does the data in the model take into account the conditions of the SW permits in the Upper Flint?
 - The data assumes no conditions on the Upper Flint permits
- Dr Georgakakos answered a few questions on the display of data on certain graphs including the navigation metrics and flow levels at Carsonville and Montezuma on the Flint River.

BREAK

Small Group Discussion: Current Conditions Results and WMA Ideas

The GB divided into several groups based on stakeholder interest rather than sub-basin caucus. Group topics included understanding:

- effects on lake levels and recreation
- effects on the Flint
- effects on environmental flows, seafood, etc...
- effects on water supply
- effects on power, navigation and other interests

A member of the technical contracting team met with each group to discuss results of the current conditions modeling and ideas for Water Management Alternatives (WMA). A

worksheet was provided so each stakeholder could record points of discussion and make notes on potential WMAs.

Initial Observations from Small Groups

- effects on lake levels and recreation
 - presentation from GWRI is a valid baseline to move forward with comparative runs; need to focus on “dry year” data
 - desired lake levels are not being met during drought years; modifications to RIOP should be considered; ag use in the Flint during drought is a significant concern; ramp down rates at Woodruff should be investigated
 - need to focus in on drought management within the RIOP
- effects on the Flint
 - model is good for planning; appears to be very sensitive to assumptions
 - ag data in the model is likely the best available and the ag community is much more engaged in water issues; how the model handles impact to SW of GW pumping is problematic...may not be able to fix these issues but need to understand the direction of the bias; drought stress may be understated...may consider 90th percentile ag use numbers
 - evaporation from impoundments other than 11 in current model could be roughly double; USACE estimate could also under-estimate actual evaporative losses; look to existing storage for what operational changes could be made to improve flows
- effects on environmental flows, seafood, etc...
 - seems to be operations that most impact environmental flows; in upper ACF, operations have drastically changed flow regimes. On Flint and Apalachicola, consumptive use also has impacts
 - timing is critically important for some environmental metrics
 - group needs additional information on demands to feel comfortable with recommending a WMA with a demand management focus; need better flood prediction capability; need a better way to characterize “dry conditions.”
 - There is no consensus among group on setting a target for environmental flows vs. “just trying to improve conditions.”
- effects on water supply
 - need to focus on dry years; not sure that all “demands” are being met ; needs to be a strategy for the Flint River, not just Chattahoochee
 - try to structurally fix the entrenchment in the Apalachicola; target flows in the river to areas of most environmental stress; reverse IBTs
 - looks like we can do something with demands or operate better...given time/money constraints, perhaps ACFS should focus on operations
- effects on power, navigation and other interests
 - need to see results on flow duration, not just level
 - if we know releases for other uses, navigation could be planned to coincide; predictability is important

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

ADJOURN FOR THE DAY

RECONVENE FOR THE DAY: Friday, April 26

Open Discussion

Billy Turner welcomed the group back for day two and Gail Bingham reminded the group of the agenda items for the day.

Group Discussion: Current Conditions Results and WMA Ideas

The stakeholders discussed WMAs based on the following topics:

- USACE operations
 - Change rule curve for West Point Lake (628 winter pool to 632.5 winter pool)
 - 632.5 is the first recreation impact level
 - The GWRI model can evaluate this alternative's impact to flow;
 - evaluation of flood risk is important but would be a separate study
 - There has been some flood modeling done by local interests to look at this alternative; USACE does a good job of flood modeling
 - Any change in zones must also be concurrent with a change in the RIOP or benefits could be nominal;
 - Idea of raising West Point 2 ft would require structural change to the dam and is not likely a realistic alternative
 - High flows are important downstream and returning to a more natural hydrograph is optimal
 - Cost to changes in operations is relatively nominal when compared to alternative supply such as new reservoirs or aquifer storage
- agriculture
 - conservation efficiencies in ag are likely to keep more water in the river than other sectors; TOCWG needs credible information to help determine what levels should be included in the model runs
 - You can't conserve 100%. There are impacts to conservation policies in metro areas similar to those experienced in Apalachicola;
 - a lot of new ag use in Jackson County, FL; a lot of conservation in agriculture is offset by new withdrawals
 - the Lower Flint is under a moratorium for new agriculture withdrawals...not for other uses; there have been advances in conservation in SW GA.
 - There have been big changes in agriculture in the last 30 years and more changes are likely; growth of vegetable production in that region is on the rise and could impact water use; biggest threat to agriculture would be mid-season suspension
- water returns; IBTs returned to basin of origin
 - WMAs that focus on the Upper Flint are not likely to make a large impact in flows at the FL line;

DRAFT – Pending approval by the ACFS Governing Board.

- In Upper Flint, returns are only about 25% of total withdrawals; some systems are extremely efficient but discharges go to another basin; other systems discharge into the Flint but are not as efficient
 - Potential of 22-23cfs if withdrawals returned back to Flint
 - Clayton County is looking to return 6-7mgd to the Flint rather than the Ocmulgee; engaged in permitting process; estimated cost of \$15 million
 - This WMA has land-use planning and lifestyle considerations
 - Another WMA could include returning Chattahoochee water, that is returned to Ocmulgee, back into the Upper Flint
 - Need to be aware of unintended consequences when discussing IBT returns; in comes cases, may actually reduce flows in ACF
 - ACFS may be able to compile a list a strategic public works projects
- raising level of Lake Lanier
 - change the rule curve to allow for more storage; similar to WMA proposed for West Point Lake
 - flood control is a top priority for USACE at Lanier; lake has been as high as 1077

Bay Assessment Status Report

Woody Hicks, Chair of the Ad Hoc Bay Evaluation Committee, provided an update on the process to select a method for evaluation of the Apalachicola Bay and Estuary. Slides from his presentation will be available on the ACFS website. Key points from the presentation included:

- A summary of the Ad Hoc Bay Evaluation Committee's task to recommend to the GB a method for evaluating the Bay as part of the SWMP
- The Committee utilized a two-round Delphi process to solicit input from a wide array of experts. A limited number of hard copies of the Round 1 and 2 Delphi results were available. Additional copies are available on request. A portion of the recommendations include:
 - Any bay assessment tool should be put in an ecological context
 - Evaluate salinity distribution on oyster productivity (and possibly another species such as sturgeon)
 - Focus on resource targets when asking "what is better for the Bay" rather than try to return to some historical condition
 - Use existing models (calibrated, 3-D, ecological linked hydro-dynamic model)
 - Use statistical methods for generating questions and calibrating models
 - Adaptive management which requires additional monitoring
 - Consider impact of climate change
 - Further evaluation of what happened to Bay in 2012
- Ad Hoc Committee will work to develop a scope of work and recommendation to the EC/GB

Discussion on the Bay Evaluation:

- Concern that some key people invited to participate in the Delphi process didn't submit information; request that the results of Delphi process be sent to those experts for their reaction.

DRAFT – Pending approval by the ACFS Governing Board.

- Unclear that further information and resulting delay would be of any benefit
- Comment that ACFS has completed the process ourselves for far less than what was originally proposed
- The Ad Hoc Committee will discuss if they want to reopen the Delphi process; Gail will determine if additional comment can be gathered within the Committee's original timeline
- The Ad Hoc Committee was made up of Woody Hicks (Flint), Dan Tonsmeire (Apalachicola), Greg Elmore (Mid Chatt) and Wilton Rooks (Upper Chatt), who provided the names of experts to include in the Delphi process. The largest number of Delphi participant names were provided by Dan; also input from experts from the Seafood Management Assistance Recovery Team (SMART)
- Comment that there was a lot of effort to contact all the experts provided, there is no reason to delay the process to solicit additional input.
- Comment that the Ad Hoc Committee has been good stewards of ACFS' resources
- There are existing models with ecological components; the latter are not as accurate as the hydro-dynamic components

Information Session: Ecosystem Health of the West Florida Shelf: Contributions to Fisheries Productivity

Felicia Coleman, Director of the Florida State University Coastal and Marine Laboratory, presented the group information on the health and productivity of the northern Gulf of Mexico. The slides from Dr. Coleman's presentation will be posted to the ACFS website.

Report from the Flint Caucus

Robin Singletary, Flint Caucus Coordinator, provided the GB a perspective from the Flint Caucus. A written copy of the comments is provided in Appendix D.

A motion was made by Gordon Rogers for the GB to commend Kristin Rowles for her service to ACSF over the last two years. The motion was seconded by Betty Webb.

- There were a number of comments that were very supportive of the motion. Several GB members expressed their appreciation for Kristin's support.

The motion passed with consensus. A copy of the commendation adopted by the GB is provided in Appendix E.

Committee and Work Group Status Reports

Finance and Fundraising

Wilton Rooks presented an update on SWMP fundraising efforts. He reminded the group that without Brad Currey's support, we would likely not be where we are. The Fundraising Committee feels relatively comfortable about ACFS reaching \$1.35 million in fundraising. There is an additional \$100,000 that is promising. A written report from Brad Currey on fundraising activities is shown in Appendix F.

- Bill McCartney reported that there is \$500,000 pending in the FL budget for work on Apalachicola flow and Bay evaluation.

DRAFT – Pending approval by the ACFS Governing Board.

Mark Masters then presented the financial statement current as of April 19, 2013.

He then explained a recommendation from the Finance Committee to modify the 2013 Operating Budget. The Finance recommendation should be considered within the context of the Professional Services Contracting Work Group recommendation that will be presented next. The main points of the recommendation are as follows:

- Increase the funding available to maintain relationship with Coxe-Curry for assistance with SWMP fundraising
- Transfer funds from Organizational Needs and Bay Evaluation into the Facilitation line item to allow for implementing the recommendation from PSC to increase support from Gail Bingham and Mark Masters for SWMP staffing.

Chad Taylor then explained a recommendation from the PSC Work Group regarding changes to the contracts with Gail Bingham and Mark Masters to provide additional support to the TOCWG and overall SWMP project. The Details on this recommendation may be found in the “SWMP Staffing Memo – April 17, 2013” that is available on request.

A motion was made by Chad Taylor to accept the recommendation from the Finance Committee and the Professional Services Contracting Work Group. The motion was seconded by Jerri Russell. **The motion passed with consensus.** The recommendations as passed by the GB are shown in Appendix G.

Membership

Jim Poff updated the group on the level of membership and encouraged all GB members to continue to recruit additional members. He also followed up on comments made by Chairman Turner for members to educate proxies and/or potential replacements for service on the GB.

Intergovernmental Affairs

I-GAC will work with the Issues Committee on implementing the Annual Plan; Betty then reminded the group of the procedures for contacting state and federal agencies and that members should adhere to that policy.

Education and Outreach

ACFS has had a number of good outreach opportunities since the last GB meeting including the GA Water Resources Conference, Georgia Trend Magazine and others.

Public Comment

No public comment

Announcements

Chairman Turner again thanked Betty Webb and her team for all the work in setting up the meeting. He thanked everyone for attending and reminded the GB that they are the true experts on the Basin and encouraged everyone to keep working toward consensus.

DRAFT – Pending approval by the ACFS Governing Board.

The next meeting of the ACFS Governing Board will be June 26-27 in Columbus, GA at the Columbus Trade Center. Chairman Turner reminded the group that these dates are a Wednesday and Thursday.

The GB meeting adjourned at 11:55 (Motion was made by Steve Davis, with a second from Tim Thoms.)

ADJOURN MEETING

Appendix A

ACF Stakeholders Annual Report of the Secretary

ACFS Governing Board Meeting - April 25, 2013

This report covers ACF Stakeholders activities during the calendar year of 2012. During this time period, ACFS convened four in-person Governing Board meetings and one Annual meeting. The location of the Governing Board meetings was rotated throughout the sub-basins to allow stakeholders to experience the geographic diversity of the ACF basin and to provide equity for members with respect to travel requirements. Additionally, individual caucuses, committees and working groups held several meetings and hosted conference calls throughout the calendar year.

Charter Performance

Charter directives were satisfied during the period covered by this report and no changes to the Charter were identified during 2012. Additionally, no changes in the membership structure were made during this period.

Financial Performance

A financial statement for 2012 was presented to and approved by the ACFS general membership at the Annual meeting held at Lake Blackshear, GA, on December 13, 2012.

Significant Accomplishments

- The fundraising campaign to support the Sustainable Water Management Plan and In-Stream Flow Assessment initiatives was continued in 2012. As of 12/13/2012, \$1,141,455 in gifts/pledges had been received by ACF Stakeholders.
- Contractors delivered the following components of the Sustainable Water Management Plan:
 - Detailed work plan
 - In-stream flow assessment literature review
 - Developing a template for Water Management Alternatives
 - Water demands report
 - Unimpaired flows report
 - In-stream flow assessment.
- The annual and five-year work plans were updated and presented at the April 2013 Governing Board meeting.
- A summary report of the Institutional Options for Trans-boundary Water Management was completed by The University Collaborative and a second Phase of work focused on a subset of management options was authorized.
- The ACF Stakeholders website was maintained and a periodic newsletter of ACFS activities was distributed.

Appendix B

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

Appendix B

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

Appendix B

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.

Appendix B

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.

Appendix B

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

Appendix B

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

Appendix B

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

Appendix B

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?

Appendix C

Motion to Approve Letter of Service Agreements for Institutional Options Study – Phase 3

The University Collaborative Sub-Committee of the Professional Services and Contracting Work Group recommends the Governing Board approve Letter of Service Agreement to The University Collaborative for the Institutional Options Study – Phase 3 and further recommends the Governing Board authorize the Executive Committee to issue a scope, funding limit and Notice to Proceed to initiate work on Phase 3 subject to available funding.

DRAFT LETTER OF AGREEMENT FOR SERVICES Institutional Options Part III

Overview:

This agreement covers services performed by The University Collaborative (“TUC”), working through the Georgia River Basin Center (“RBC”) for the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint Stakeholders (“ACFS”), to (1) identify the water management functions that are currently underway in the ACF as well as water management functions essential for effective multi-state planning and sustainable management of the ACF basin that are currently not being undertaken (a GAPS analysis) and to begin to identify opportunities for a transboundary water management institution to undertake essential functions identified by the GAPS analysis; and (2) develop a proposal for the next phase of Institutional Options research and outreach. This agreement will become effective on May 15, 2013 and will end on or before December 31, 2013.

Services to be performed:

1. The TUC Academic Team agrees to perform a GAPS analysis based on a review of existing laws, policy documents, mission statements and other literature. The analysis will include identification of opportunities for a transboundary water management institution in the ACF. Estimated cost: \$10,000 to fund graduate students at the University of Florida School of Law and the University of Georgia School of Ecology. The University of Georgia will donate \$4,000 in services via contributions of their summer Butler Fellow and the University of Georgia, the University of Florida and Florida State University will donate approximately 100 hours of faculty time in overseeing these students.

Total estimated cost to the ACFS: \$6,000. Timing: May-September 2013 with draft GAPS analysis submitted to the TUC by September 15.

Appendix C

2. The TUC Academic Team will present a draft of the GAPS analysis to the entire TUC and any other members of the Governing Board the TUC and Executive Committee determine appropriate to elicit feedback and suggestions before finalizing the document. In addition, at this meeting we will identify and evaluate options for next phase/s of Institutional Options research and outreach, including moving the dialogue about a transboundary water management institution forward to stakeholders beyond the ACFS membership. Estimated cost: Travel expenses and lodging for the TUC.

Total estimated cost to the ACFS: \$1,500. Timing: TBD for some time in the fall of 2013.

Expected Total Cost to the ACFS: \$7,500

The work will be performed by a University of Florida law student, a University of Georgia Ph.D. student, a University of Georgia masters student, and staff at the RBC, under the direction of law professors Laurie Fowler, Tom Ankersen, and Richard Hamann, with input from Florida State University water planner Steve Leitman.

Payment:

The TUC agrees to perform these services for a fee of \$6,000 plus travel and lodging in the amount of \$1,500. The RBC shall submit an invoice in the amount of \$4,000 to the ACFS upon completion of service 1 and the ACFS' approval of the draft GAP analysis (late September 2013) and an invoice in the amount of \$2,000 after finalizing the analysis with input from the entire TUC and any other appropriate parties (after the meeting described as service 2). The ACFS shall pay invoices within 30 days of receipt.

Approval:

Date Laurie A. Fowler, Esq.
for
UGA River Basin Center and
The University Collaborative

Date
for
Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint
Stakeholders

Appendix D

Comments as prepared by Robin Singletary, Chair of Flint Sub-basin Caucus

Good morning, I have the pleasure of being the current chair for the Flint Caucus. I achieved this notable position by leaving our last meeting early. A lesson we all know but sometimes forget.

The Flint Caucus thought it important to inform you of the Flint's recent designation as number two on American Rivers list of most endangered rivers in the United States. The following is my attempt to do so and to give some perspective on how I think this affects our caucus and the ACFS. While I have had some wonderful input from other members of the caucus and all caucus members present have read what I have written these are my thoughts and words. That's my disclaimer. In the era of full disclosure I should point out that I am a founding member of Flint Riverkeeper and immediate past chair.

As you may already know, the Flint River was named the second most endangered river in the United States for the second time in five years. The combination of increased urbanization and water demands by communities in the upper Flint, agriculture water use in the lower Flint and more frequent droughts are causing more and more low flow problems on the main stem and no flows on some of the tributaries.

This is not a list that you want your river to be on or for that matter, any river in your basin. I do think though that it gives even greater impetus to what this group is about. The Flint Caucus is aware of these problems and in most cases that is what made us want to be a part of this group. We want to help find those solutions that allow us to protect our basins resources and our way of life. While I wish the Flint was not on this list, I hope the added publicity will help to raise everyone's awareness.

There are things that we can do. We can have a Flint River Drought Protection Plan that considers the whole river, its tributaries and all its users. If we have state monies, we should spend them on proven conservation methods. We could help municipalities upgrade treatment facilities, leading to the ability to return more flows to the river, from both LAS systems and IBTs. We could move some surface water users to wells, and help improve irrigation efficiency. These are things that we know will provide water savings. And we need to use the best science available to decide when the river can accommodate a new use.

Our riparian rights allow us the reasonable use of the waters under our property and that border our property. Having the right of reasonable use does not and should not carry with it the right of unreasonable use.

To me this is very important. Right now there is a moratorium on ag wells in the lower Flint Basin. If and when this moratorium is lifted I still will not be able to dig another irrigation well on my families property. Our land is located in what is called the red zone. The red zone is an area where it has been determined that another well would be an unreasonable use of the water under this property. Almost 20% of the irrigated land in the lower Flint is in the red zone. Our potential for more irrigation in the red zone is capped. It was science that helped establish the red zone. We need more and better science to be able to know where else and for what other purposes we need red zones. Ibts, new industry permits,

Appendix D

municipal withdrawals, more water for lawns and golf courses; surely the science we are using does not just apply to agricultural wells.

Understand, if it is best for the Flint that my family and many others cannot dig another well on our property, we can live with that. If being in that red zone decreases our property values but it is better for the wells we already have, we can live with that. But it can't just end with there, it has to go further. We need to make sure that all of our uses, whether for industries, cities or recreation are reasonable and not unreasonable. We may need 'red zones' expanded to all our uses and users.

We need help. We need the continued help of this group to find those ways that can better manage and save water, benefit our local economies and provide us with the profound enjoyment that our river systems offer. We need the help of our state governments in research, so that we can improve our knowledge and make better decisions. We need them to put in place regulations that follow the science we have and to implement best practices for water conservation state wide. These practices might not benefit me or you, but they benefit the resources that make the ACF basin one of the most diverse and wonderful places in all of America to live.

I grew up hunting, fishing and camping on the Flint River, never thinking about what this resource provided other than my enjoyment. Now, I make my living because of this resource. I operate a commercial hunting business that depends on the Flint for its beauty and natural resources to attract and keep my clients. I operate a peanut buying point. My farmers depend on the river and the aquifer that feeds it to produce the crops that provide for mine and their livelihoods. We can't live without it. And therein lies our situation, you need it just as much as I do. It may be for the power you need to produce and sell and that we all need, it may be water for your growing community, it may be water you need to operate your business that provides vital jobs in your area, the opportunities for recreation that a healthy river provides, all our needs are important and essential. That is why we need to use this most endangered river designation as inspiration for the task ahead of us. To find the best ways to use the resource that God gave us for the benefit of us all, understanding that without it we all suffer.

I have always been reminded by an elderly gentleman that I work with that, "it ain't a problem til it can't be solved." We have work to do before it becomes a problem. The Flint River Caucus is resolved to work towards solutions that will require sacrifices from us all. We are also committed to working with our state regulatory agencies to apply the best science available to make sure that we are permitting reasonable, not unreasonable uses of our resources. If we can solve the situation in the Flint basin, we can solve the situation in the ACF basin. Our situation is your situation. Let's do our best to solve our situation before it becomes a problem.

My intention and that of the Flint Caucus in presenting this was two-fold. One, we wanted you to know that we know about our troubles on the Flint and that they have a huge impact on the ACF basin. Two, we know that our work here is not just for the Flint. We all need to remember that.

Thank you.

Appendix E

The Governing Board of the ACF Stakeholders wants to commend Kristin Rowles for her dedicated service to our organization for the past two years. Kristin contributed her expertise in many areas, providing valuable administrative service to the Governing Board, as well as small group facilitation, plus technical review and advice. As the technical coordinator for the Technical Oversight Committee & Work Group, she spent countless and many unbilled hours working between our contractors and work group leadership prior to and after meetings, and was an invaluable help to the leadership during the meetings. Kristin brought to us a great deal of technical proficiency along with personal integrity and fair-mindedness. She answered, or found the answer to, question after question from work group members, going above and beyond the call of duty in her willingness to work for the betterment of ACFS. We, the Governing Board of the ACF Stakeholders, salute Kristin for her assistance to our organization, and many of us look forward as individuals to working with her in other endeavors in the future.

Appendix F

Comments as prepared by Brad Currey, Chair ACFS Fundraising Committee

Fund raising summary:

Received to date - \$1,238,500

Promises Made - \$1,338,500

Additional Asks Outstanding with Reasonable Expectations - \$1,463,500

There are about a dozen additional calls to be made with new prospective donors.

We can reasonably expect to get to \$1.5 million, and with some luck, \$1.65 million. We cannot count chickens before they hatch! Almost all of our requests, even when unsuccessful, have been received with understanding of the importance of the issue and words of support.

Our splendid relationships with the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, our fund-raising successes and our ability as a group to hang together for more than three years augers well for coming to a common consensus on a sustainable water management plan that we can all live with. Onward and upward!

Regards

Brad Currey

Appendix G

The ACFS Finance Committee recommends the Governing Board modify the 2013 Operating Budget as follows:

1. Show Coxe-Curry and University Collaborative contracts as separate line items in the budget;
2. Modify the UNCOMMITTED SWMP line item to reflect the level of fundraising as of March 31, 2013;
3. Increase COXE-CURRY line item by \$15,000;
4. Decrease UNCOMMITTED OPERATING by \$15,000.
5. Increase the FACILITATION line item by \$46,233;
6. Decrease the ORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS line item by \$33,047
7. Decrease INITIATE BAY EVALUATION line item by \$13,200

The Professional Services Contracting Work Group recommends the Governing Board authorize the Executive Committee to modify existing 2013 professional services contracts with Gail Bingham and Mark Masters as follows:

	Existing Contract Amount	Period of Performance	Recommended Increase	New Contract Amount
Gail Bingham	\$46,656	Jan 1 – Jun 30	\$50,316 ^a	\$96,972
Mark Masters	\$56,608	Jan 1 – Dec 31	\$4,275 ^b	\$60,883

^a \$33,033 for additional SWMP/TOCWG support; \$13,200 for Ad Hoc Bay Evaluation Committee support (funds taken from Initiate Bay Evaluation line item in Operating Budget; \$4,083 for support of Environment and Conservation Caucus meeting (funds secured from E&C caucus donation).

^b Additional TOCWG administrative support.