

Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint Stakeholders Governing Board Meeting Summary

Columbus, GA

June 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 the sponsors and thanked them for their support. Gail Bingham asked the GB members to introduce themselves and then turned to Billy Turner to introduce Eddie Lowe, Mayor of the City of Phenix City, AL to welcome the Governing Board.

Billy Turner then reminded the group of ACFS' Mission and Goals and offered a word of encouragement to the membership to keep making progress toward completing a Sustainable Water Management Plan. Slides from Chairman Turner's presentation will be available on the website after the meeting. He then turned the meeting over to Gail Bingham. Gail reviewed the materials packet and the agenda.

Old Business and Annual Report of the Secretary

Tim Thoms made a motion to accept the April 2013 GB meeting summary and Brad Moore seconded the motion. ***The motion was approved by consensus.***

SWMP/IFA Workplan and Possible Revisions

TOCWG Chair Brad Moore provided the GB an update on SWMP progress since the last meeting, including an overview of technical documents to be discussed in more detail during the afternoon. The slides from his presentation will be posted to the website following the GB meeting. Major items covered in the presentation included:

- Change in scope to meet a \$1.3 million budget and December 2013 deadline
- Components of proposed SWMP Phase F
- Reminder of the TOCWG charge and policy on accepting SWMP deliverables
- Deliverables accepted by TOCWG and EC to date:
 - Water demands and returns
 - Unimpaired flows report
 - Instream flow assessment (*Gordon Rogers presented this topic*)
 - Performance metrics (pending GB acceptance at this meeting)
 - A question was asked if GB acceptance of the metrics meant that they were ACFS' formal recommendation on flows and levels
 - Clarification that acceptance did not mean that each member agreed with all the metrics presented. Rather, they represent what members agreed to use to evaluate in the model runs;
 - Also, metrics may be modified after Round 1 of the iterative modeling

- Clarification that the performance metrics, and all other technical deliverables, were not absolutes, but tools that ACFS can use to determine if management practices make the situation in the Basin better or worse
- A follow-up that the disclaimer language included on all the technical deliverables would be removed on the final SWMP, since it will be a consensus of ACFS and not a technical input;
- Billy Turner reminded the group that, while still a work in progress, the performance metrics table represents the first time that stakeholder suggested metrics or the Basin were compiled in one place
- Current conditions (pending GB acceptance at this meeting)
 - Mark offered a clarification that the results of all the current model runs will be made available online.
- Water management alternatives
 - Gail described how the iterative modeling and consensus building is integrated, what the change from three to two rounds means, and commented that the two rounds of modeling proposed represent a good value to ACFS and will provide a significant learning opportunity
 - Clarification that the WMA submitted on West Point Lake was to raise the winter pool 2ft, not the full pool by 2ft; also comment that WMA on Lanier did not imply raising the dam, just modifying the top rule curve by 2ft; for the WMA in Round 1, releases will be modeled using existing rules
 - Comment that the WMAs should be realistic (e.g. likely not realistic to add 2ft to top rule curve on West Point but it is for the winter pool)
 - Comment that the proposed WMAs for West Point and Lanier could have the same impact as adding a new reservoir
 - Clarification that the iterative runs will be made using the full period of record with a drought-year focus via post-processing
 - Comment that there are no water supply augmentation WMAs that have been submitted other than those related to IBTs.
 - Clarification that the WMAs on municipal demand were based on reducing future (2050) demands
 - Several members commented that they were uncomfortable using the 2050 demands as a basis for the model;
 - Suggestion to increase existing consumption by a certain percentage rather than use 2050 demands and work backwards
 - The TOCWG will take up clarification of this issue at their next meeting on June 27¹
 - Steve Simpson clarified that WMAs will be run based on consumptive use, by node, at a low, medium and high range of alternatives;

¹ Note: Based on the TOCWG discussion, the technical consultants modified the WMAs on municipal demand, using existing consumption as a base and increasing and decreasing consumptive uses from that base by various amounts.

BREAK FOR LUNCH

SWMP/IFA Action Items

Brad Moore introduced the Performance Metrics Technical Memo and Current Conditions Executive Summary for GB consideration and acceptance (the Performance Metrics Table and Current Conditions Executive Summary were provided to members in the pre-meeting materials). Brad reported that both documents had been thoroughly reviewed and accepted by the TOCWG and EC. Gail Bingham then facilitated the following discussion on accepting these two technical deliverables:

Performance Metrics

- There were a handful of corrections offered by the hydro and thermal power stakeholders for nodes in the Middle Chatt to clarify those nodes that are applicable to their permit and those that are not; they proposed modifying selected nodes from “N/A” to “no numeric criteria identified.” Gail Bingham will coordinate with Black & Veatch to ensure changes are made in the final table
- A question was asked about the “6% reduction” terminology referenced in the Environment and Conservation columns
 - Calculated from IFA; 6% reduction in flow on a monthly basis for dry years translates to a 12-13% habitat loss
- Correct West Point row to read “Apr – Oct” rather than “Apr – Sep.”; also make the same change for Woodruff and Walter F. George
- Clarification that the term CMA stands for “Centered Moving Average”; used for smoothing of data usually to eliminate negative flows in the dataset
- Remove the word “spawning” from Flint E&C column of Flint

Gordon Rogers made a motion to accept the Performance Metrics Technical Memo as amended above. The motion was seconded by Lee Garner. **The motion passed with consensus.**

Current Conditions

David Dixon made a motion to accept the Current Conditions Executive Summary. The motion was seconded by Mike Criddle. **The motion passed with consensus.**

Bay Assessment Status Report

Gail Bingham reminded the membership of the history and activities of the Ad Hoc Bay Evaluation Committee including completion of the Delphi process and recommendation to the EC. At the request of the EC, Atkins developed a set of choices for ACFS to consider regarding completion of the Bay evaluation including (1) a statistical method that would be paired with expert judgment to determine impact on oysters from various salinity levels; (2) a 3D hydro-dynamic model and (3) an expert judgment process tied to projected salinity distributions produced by a modeler selected by ACFS.

The draft of Phase F has an additional \$40,000 for the Bay evaluation that would bring the total not-to-exceed amount for the Bay evaluation to \$76,800. If approved, Phase F will give the Ad Hoc Bay Committee and TOCWG time to review the options proposed, along with choices of modelers, and authorize the EC to execute a Task Order(s) to initiate work on the Bay based on recommendations from the TOCWG without additional GB authorization. Billy Turner commented that the EC thoroughly discussed and recommended adding the \$40,000 to Phase F.

A question was asked if the Bay evaluation was too focused on oysters. What about other species covered under ESA (mussels, sturgeon)?

- Criteria for freshwater mussels is incorporated in the IFA
- Experts from Delphi process suggested oysters are a keystone species for the Bay and, thus a good indicator, though sturgeon and blue crabs were mentioned by some experts. Insufficient information appears to exist about species other than oysters.

A comment was made that approving Phase F might also be of value in securing possible money from the state of FL or from US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mark Masters then presented a Budget Memo detailing ACFS' financial standing given a set of assumptions about technical tasks and a deliverable from the consultants of a draft SWMP and a draft motion to authorize Phase F of the SWMP. Discussion of the motion was as follows:

- Clarification that the Bay evaluation will be completed in Phase F; the \$40,000 will increase the amount of funds needing to be raised by September
- Comment that ACFS is somewhat stepping out on faith that we will raise the remaining funds need to finish the draft plan by December;
- Reminder that approving the Phase does not automatically expend the funds, rather, gives the TOCWG and EC authorization to issue a Task Order.
- Billy Turner reported that the EC would request GB approval before any government money would be accepted

A motion was made by Brad Currey and seconded by David Dixon to approve Phase F as presented. **The motion passed with consensus.** (Phase F, as approved, may be found in Appendix A).

BREAK

General Discussion

- A comment was made that ACFS has a good relationship with USACE and should work to cultivate a better working relationship with the states; ACFS should discuss ways to help "sell" our SWMP, that is, the agreement among stakeholders
 - Is it time to approach states about contributing money?
 - If we get the buy-in from the governors on our agreement, the money could follow

- Third phase of TUC Institutional Options study will address some of the issues discussed regarding interaction with states/feds
- Influence on USACE will be a key component of ACFS possible success; reminder that Action Plan adopted at April 2013 GB meeting included reference to a Water Control Manual Work Group; perhaps that WG should be expanded to one that focuses on communicating the Plan and getting buy in
- Wilton reported that there remains an on-going relationship with appropriate staff within USACE to ensure ACFS has an “audience” when the SWMP is complete; also will look to initiate a meeting between the directors of the respective state’s environmental protection departments
- Suggestion that a meeting of the legislative ag committee chairs among the three states might also be beneficial; also emphasis on tourism could be helpful in the state of FL
- Comment that we should not place too much emphasis on USACE, particularly since the Flint is not impacted by USACE impoundments
- Question about the level of Alabama’s involvement
 - Had tentatively scheduled a presentation from AL official on their recently initiated state water plan; will try to reschedule for October 2013 meeting
- Selling the Plan will inevitably transition from a technical to a political level
- Comment that we should not forget our stakeholders “at home.” We need to be able to sell our Plan to our constituents before we try to sell it to politicians
- Mitch Reid commented that ACFS could participate as a “stakeholder” in Alabama’s state water planning process; further comment that there are many more stakeholders in AL than those represented in the ACFS

SWMP Update – Elements of SWMP

Gail Bingham directed the group to the Draft SWMP Outline in the meeting materials. She provided a brief summary of the Outline and initiated a discussion regarding what elements ACFS might want to include in the SWMP in addition to those that will be analyzed through the modeling work.

Discussion on elements and the table of contents was as follows:

- Comment that the order of the sections should be reworked in order to better sell the Plan (i.e. starting with recommendations with the technical analyses coming after to provide the rationale; mention of state and federal governments up front; etc)
- The Executive Summary is critical part of report; should move Vision of ACFS up front
- Point of plan should be “continuous improvement”; how can steps be taken to make the situation in the basin better?
- Encourage ACFS to provide as much specificity as possible in the Plan
- Need to provide detailed explanation of the stakeholder involvement in developing the Plan
- Plan should include components of the Plan that cannot be modeled

- It is key that for each recommended element in the Plan, ACFS have buy-in from experts and local stakeholder groups (e.g. state regional water councils and Metro North GA Water Management District, utilities, extension agents, etc...).
- Need to formally acknowledge Bay assessment; need more clarification on the summary of the technical deliverables
- Important to provide the context of the education the stakeholders have received throughout the ACFS process; what are the various things ACFS is trying to balance?; emphasize the product and not the process
- Ensure Section 3 provides detail on the modeling assumptions; take care that Executive Summary is descriptive of the results since few people will read anything else in the Plan
- Plan should be grouped according to actions that can be taken by interest group, impacted agency, etc...
- SWMP may be more than one document
- Suggestion to include draft Table of Contents and Performance Metrics table in the next report to ACFS donors and select legislators
 - Some concern was expressed in releasing Performance Metrics to donors or legislators without the proper context; there is a difference in making something publically available in the website vs. putting it in their hand
 - Need to ensure ACFS has a consistent approach in conveying technical materials

Committee and Work Group Status Reports

Finance and Fundraising

Mark Masters presented the financial statement current as of June 17, 2013. He offered a clarification that the SWMP funds outlined in the budget memo were kept separate from the unrestricted operating funds raised from membership dues.

He then explained a recommendation from the Finance Committee to modify the 2013 Operating Budget.

A motion was made by Brad Currey to accept the recommendation from the Finance Committee. The motion was seconded by Lee Garner. **The motion passed with consensus.** The recommendation as passed by the GB is shown in Appendix B.

Brad Currey presented an update on SWMP fundraising efforts. He indicated that we have commitments from an additional \$75,000 not reflected on the donor report. There are requests out for another \$250,000 that would provide ACFS funds into 2014.

Professional Services and Contracting Work Group

Chad Taylor reported that the TUC would be presenting results from Phase 3 of the Institutional Options study.

Membership

Jim Poff updated the group on the level of membership and encouraged all GB members to continue to recruit additional members. He also encouraged members to make plans to renew current membership prior to the December 2013 GB meeting.

Intergovernmental Affairs

I-GAC will work with the Issues Committee on implementing the Annual Plan. Chair Betty Webb requested the EC provide guidance as to what role the I-GAC should play in “selling” the SWMP.

Education and Outreach

Deron Davis has resigned from the Education and Outreach Committee and will be replaced by Greg Euston, a media specialist that has some limited background on ACFS activities. A comment was made that whoever is leading the Education/Outreach Committee should be a regular attendee at the GB meetings.

Public Comment

No public comment

The next meeting of the ACFS Governing Board will be October 1-3 at the Unicoi State Park near Helen, GA.

The GB meeting adjourned at 5:10pm.

Appendix A

Motion to Authorize Phase F of the Sustainable Water Management Plan (SWMP)

Move that the ACF Stakeholders Governing Board (GB) adopt as Phase F of the Sustainable Water Management Plan (SWMP) and to 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 contractors for completion of the Tasks in this Phase. The cost of these cumulative arrangements shall not exceed \$249,971.

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.

PHASE F of the SWMP/IFA

Tasks	Cost	Estimated Completion
Black and Veatch SWMP Sub-Tasks 6.2 and 7 – as revised (costs and deliverables revised per B&V Tasks 6-8 Proposal dated June 3 2013; in addition to \$50,000 for Task 6.2 previously approved in Phase E)	\$165,746	Dec 2013
Additional funding for Bay Evaluation (in addition to the \$36,800 allocated in the 2013 Operating Budget modified April 26 2013)	\$40,000	Dec 2013
Additional facilitation and staffing costs for Gail Bingham (July – September 2013; current contract ends June 30, 2013)	\$38,600	Sep 2013
Additional TOCWG support and staffing costs for Mark Masters (July – September 2013)	\$5,625	Sep 2013
TOTAL amount desired to be approved at June 2013 GB Meeting	\$249,971	

DRAFT – Pending approval by the ACFS Governing Board.

Appendix B

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

1. Modify the SWMP/IFA FUNDRAISING and UNCOMMITTED SWMP line items to reflect the level of fundraising as of June 17, 2013 (\$229,122);
2. Increase the FACILITATION line item by \$38,600;
3. Increase the ORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS line item by \$5,625;
4. Increase ITERATIVE MODELING by \$165,746;
5. Increase BAY EVALUATION by 40,000;
6. Decrease MEETING SUPPORT by \$32,652;
7. Decrease UNCOMMITTED SWMP line item by \$217,319.