

## Memorandum

*To: Coastal Regional Water Planning Council*

*From: Rick Brown, Katherine Zitsch and Sue Morea*

*Date: 7/6/09*

*Subject: Council Meeting 2 Summary*

This memorandum summarizes the meeting of the Coastal Regional Water Planning Council (RWPC) Meeting 2 on June 25, 2009.

### 1) Welcome and Introductions/ Approve Agenda

Dr. Ben Thompson, the chair of the Coastal RWPC, welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Council members introduced themselves, as did others present at the meeting.

It was noted that the agenda was slightly different than the earlier version emailed to Council members, as visioning was moved forward in the agenda. Dr. Thompson asked if there were any objections to accepting the agenda. Bill Hatcher moved to accept the agenda; Keith Post seconded the motion. There was no dissent and the revised agenda was accepted.

The Planning Contractor (PC) provided a summary of the first Council meeting questionnaire results. Statewide results were presented and overall all Councils felt the process is meeting expectations. The Coastal Council rates the meeting slightly higher than the state average.

The Council meeting #1 summary was previously emailed to the Council and was posted on the website for the Coastal meeting as well as other RWPC meetings. Dr. Thompson asked if there were any objections on accepting the meeting #1 summary as delivered. There were no objections, so the meeting summary was accepted.

The PC asked the Council to identify the specific date and location for the next meeting. The timeframe for the next meeting is between September 8<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>. The goal is to set the date by the end of the meeting. It was decided that Richmond Hill is a good place for the next meeting, as it's convenient for Council members and it's a nice facility. The location can be moved around once we get into resource issues so that the public from around the region can participate. Council members will provide available dates throughout the meeting and the date will be scheduled at the end of the meeting.

The PC provided an overview of the goals of the meeting. These included:

- Finalizing the Council's operating procedures and rules for meetings. Executing the MOA with the Department of Community Affairs and the Environmental Protection Division
- Reviewing the population and employment forecasts and providing input on the developments affecting employment in the region and developments affecting population and housing in the region
- Gaining a broad understanding of Georgia's current agriculture water use and demand
- Identifying the purpose and nature of the water resource assessments that EPD is conducting for regional water planning
- Continuing the process of creating a regional vision

## 2) Creating a Regional Vision (continued)

Prior to the beginning of visioning, it was agreed that Council contact information should be distributed to Council members. A presentation was given by the PC on the next steps in the visioning process. Visioning sets the framework and key issues for the management of water. The goal of the next steps of visioning is to answer the question: "What do you want your rivers, lakes and groundwater to do for you and the citizens in your planning region?" Think about the region and what is important to you; but keep in mind that water and other resources cross planning council boundaries. So as you think about resource management needs and issues you should also think about how management and use in other regions also may affect things that are important to you. As a Council we want to think about this in terms of the future and how we sustain our resources and still provide for a strong local

and state economy? How do we manage Coastal Georgia waters in terms of these factors? Think about ports, recreation and tourism, etc. We want to establish specific goals and consider sustainability. Think about where we're going to be in 2050. What do you want to protect? What do you want to achieve with water resources? How do we utilize the resources for beneficial use, without overuse so you're not harming some other values that are important to you, the region, and the state?

The purpose of the next step is to answer the "what" is important to you not "how" we will get there. For instance, an example of what is important to you might be the goal of "providing a reliable water supply" not the "how" answer of "through a new reservoir." The Council has a homework assignment between Council meeting #2 and #3 to develop some possible goals that describe what is important to the region. The PC then provided some additional examples of possible water management goals/objectives to assist the Council in coming up with region specific goals and objectives. Realizing that everyone values water differently, for instance a farmer thinks about and uses water different than someone in an urban environment or a recreationalist that may enjoy flat water recreation. Everyone's viewpoint should be considered. The PC then went through some examples of the trends, forces and factors that the Council had identified in Council meeting #1. The PC mentioned that in some cases for instance in regard to desalinization while this is a possible future trend and/or technology, it is not necessarily a water management goal/objective. In this case the objective may be providing adequate water supply for the regions needs; one way of accomplishing this might be through desalination or water reuse. A correlating objective may be optimizing water supply and this might be accomplished via water conservation or joint/coordinated water delivery systems.

The following comments were provided by the Council and addressed:

- My thought to you would be that in the coast, how we manage storm water is important because it gets very rapidly to the saltwater estuary. The connection is unique to us. The perfect cycle of water should capture storm water. We need to protect our estuaries and seafood industry, which are sensitive to storm runoff issues. Storm water that goes onto the ground here goes into the rivers, not into the aquifer.
- Along the coast, the larger manufacturers have substantial permit authority to withdraw groundwater. If you look at the trends technology has brought

with new process equipment, you see a large reduction in groundwater use over a short period of time. Somehow, we need to try to capture this trend. The gap is widening between permitted levels and actual usage levels. *PC Response – It sounds like you are talking about not just optimizing future water supplies, but also optimizing processes to sustain water resources. There can be discussion about creating incentives for facility upgrades to ensure efficient and sustainable use of water.*

- Everyone loves to come to the coast. This puts pressure on the coast and brings both converging and diverging interests. There needs to be a balance between land use and water and urbanization. It's not necessarily bad either. There is an economic tension between pressures of development as opposed to the desire of a farmer to continue business. We need balance – the comprehensive plans address these in broad issues. The only place for cities to grow is agricultural forest. What does that mean for some of the water management examples that were presented? It's not just water we're talking about, but is there enough water to sustain that growth? We need to consider balance between trees and people. *PC response – this is a discussion about smart growth and sustainable growth. There is a nexus between land use and water use that is significant. The question is "What does the Council think about these issues in terms of what we're doing with resources – and does that promote sustainability?"*
- Land use in the flat woods that we live in has a great impact to the water quality in our region. We've talked about storm water. Land use dramatically affects the ecology in this area. This needs to be addressed. Each county has completed a land use plan. This needs to be pulled together into a better regional plan instead of individual county plans. Water crosses political boundaries. *PC Response – We're talking about how land use affects water resources – estuaries, recharge and water quality. It sounds like these are three things the Council may want to accommodate with water planning.*
- Last year, there was \$40 million in the state budget for water reservoirs across state. Where does that funding stand? *PC – There is a reservoir prioritization study on the Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority (GEFA) website. The prioritization work was completed through GEFA.*
- The challenge at the coast is the reservoir for us exists below the ground. The economic balance of resources becomes very important. In the 120 miles between Savannah and Jacksonville, we need to balance the industrial

complex that exists and land use needs of the ports if we are going to sustain or grow our economic circumstances. If we move a little further west towards our agricultural friends, there is a different use of the groundwater reservoir. The real work is how to take the groundwater reservoir and balance competing interests against that use. It comes down to the reality that we need to keep those jobs on both ends – ports and land use – and that really becomes our challenge.

- Dr. Thompson [chair] – I think what we’re going through is “getting on the ride in the middle” and we may need to step back for a second. We’re throwing out ideas, throwing out bullets. We need a chance to understand why we’re all in this room together. From the time we were brought together at the aquarium we’ve completed exercises that were helpful. But there has not been a chance to understand each other and begin to work together. I’d like to spend time slowing down and getting to know each other and why we’re here a little better. The EPD has noted to the Council that **we should feel empowered to make any and all recommendations on how water is handled in the region.** That is an important statement so let’s talk about why we’re here from a big picture perspective with that point in mind.
- We’re here to make recommendations and decisions on where we go with our water. If we don’t have that authority we need to get up and go home.
- If I’m on a Council, I want to know is this top-down or bottom up. I want to be sure that this Council will work with EPD on the water plan and not that EPD will dictate to us how they want it. If EPD is going to allow us to put a plan together and abide to our suggestions, then I’m on board. We must be doing a bottom up process.
- I don’t think coastal Georgia has a water problem. I think coastal Georgia has a water management problem. There is more than enough water in coastal Georgia for coastal Georgia. Let’s talk about the Upper Floridan Aquifer – the State needs to embrace the idea of ASR (aquifer storage and recovery). That way we can recharge aquifer and have plenty of water for years to come. Technology can enhance our water production and supply. Let’s agree that we need to take charge of that process and tell folks in Atlanta what we’re supposed to do. *PC – You just hit on an important objective – optimizing groundwater and surface water use is important for our future.*

- The problem with this process is we're going to have very little impact on what we get in terms of surface water on the coast if storage units keep being built upstream. Managing the groundwater here can be done effectively, but surface water is more challenging. This Council has very little impact on that. We need to get that message across to the powers that be. We need a solution for that. *PC – That's an excellent point for where we go in process. Some management practices in other regions will have an impact on resources downstream. Thinking about how solutions such as – conservation and reuse might perform better than storage in some circumstances. Maybe water storage is not always the only solution.*
- It's important for this body to understand its charge. We are to develop a long-term plan for the coast. We need to understand that we should have the ability to do that. This is not a leading process that we're following, we should be driving it. We should also understand there are nine other councils plus the metro Atlanta area. In terms of where the coast is on the curve of regional planning, we might be a little further along the curve. This is good for us, but what we go through here should be mirrored in the other regions from a process perspective. It should be ultimately what is good for the coast is good for the coast, what is good for other regions is good for other regions, but we need to understand implications statewide. Whether we agree with them or not, we need to understand.
- Dr. Thompson [chair] – We're downstream of other regions. We need to be speaking with one voice to other regions. One of the things that the chair/vice-chair can take to future Joint Council meeting(s) is to share concern about impacts upstream.
- The next resource to be valued in the world is water (currently oil). What we're setting the stage for here is the process to manage resources in future. We need to protect the citizens of Georgia and surrounding communities and other states. We're putting something in place here to avoid OPECs of the future. Otherwise, we'll have resource disagreements over who owns what, where, and how. We need to look down the road to water being more than just what we buy off the shelf. I project that moving forward, we'll be fighting over water, like how we are now fighting over petroleum.

- The political pressure related to water disputes got so great, something had to take place for there to be a way to resolve these disagreements. We are waiting on sound science on how this reservoir should and can be utilized. This is a management issue – or may be a mismanagement issue. I'm not sure which. We know wells are going salty on Hilton Head Island, maybe in Brunswick. Now the threat of saltwater intrusion is real. There is a threat of a lawsuit from South Carolina. We need to keep in mind how we ended up here today. We need to craft strategies on how we manage this in the future.
- *EPD Comment: If the Council needs updates on certain efforts such as the TMDL on the harbor for pollutant loadings, or updates on the saltwater intrusion on Hilton Head Island, we can get people here to present updates. By all means, let us know and we can work it into the agenda. There are a lot of people at EPD and elsewhere that have information that could be useful. For instance, in regards to reservoirs upstream of the coast, the US Army Corps of Engineers could come in and tell you how they're operating the reservoirs. The water plans are, in a way, your ability to say to somebody "this is what we need delivered downstream." The plans all need to come together. To make sure you've planned everything through, you may want to talk to the Atlanta district sometime. We want Council plans to come together into a State plan to show that water is holistically being managed appropriately.*
- Population growth in the region and a demand for housing and subdivision developments has been stifled by EPD policy since the 1997 moratoriums. Is it proper to restrict withdrawals from the aquifer? EPD response is yes. That engages a full round of debate on the proper utilization of the aquifer. What are the alternate sources? The City of Savannah has an I&D plant to withdraw water from the Savannah River to potable standards, but there are costs associated with it. Why would heavy industry want to pay \$650,000 / year to save groundwater withdrawals? But, that groundwater withdrawal could provide for X number of houses. We need to engage in these discussions. The numbers are not that huge, but we need funding sources. The resources are there. It's a question of allocation, management and cost.
- Let me tell you why I'm here. There are water problems in Richmond Hill and Rincon. What I can't understand is this – EPD will allow Savannah to drill wells anywhere, but we can't get permits. Savannah is drilling wells in Bloomingdale, but we can't get any water in Bloomingdale. The only way we can get water is to buy it from Savannah through Pooler. I can't put in an

irrigation well, but we can put in wells 3 miles from my farm to develop communities. We need water to be equal. I know we have problem with a shortage of water, but there is no shortage for Savannah.

- This is a management problem. Savannah has a huge allocation of water, so they can go anywhere they want and sell you water. Smaller communities don't have that allocation and can't get any more because they can't get the permit.
- This is a management issue at the state level. We need an equal and fair allocation of groundwater. Richmond Hill spent over \$1Million dollars to drill a well into the Lower Floridan aquifer because the Upper Floridan aquifer was capped. But Savannah could come to Richmond Hill and sell us water from the Upper Floridan aquifer.
- Dr. Thompson [chair] - We all come here with a lot of history. That is in fact the reason why we're all here. You all are the people that understand water issues. What's really good about this discussion is that we're starting to hit emotional and rational reasons while all of us are here. We have at least 2.5 years to come up with ways to address them. I certainly don't think we can solve these today - but we have time. But definitely these issues need to all come out. Thanks for sharing. We haven't talked much about what happens in the Southern portion of our region - Brunswick - where saltwater intrusion has been stable for 15 years. But there is dredging of the Brunswick harbor. We haven't talked about marsh die back. We've spent very little time over the last 30 minutes talking about environmental issues, but we're starting to hit on the edge of the common reasons why we're working together on these issues. I refuse to believe that state and EPD has put together a group of people like this to ask us to rubber stamp plan they've put together.
- I want to point out that this Council has been put together as a steering Council for how we're going to plan. We only have 2 - 2.5 years. I understand there's a certain process so we're all on common ground. But I'm looking to Ben [the chair] and Tom [the co-chair] to bring us together. Put us in various committees. I'm here for 365 days for the next 2 years. Put me to work.
- Mr. Tom Ratcliffe [vice-chair] - We went through this comprehensive plan and land use plan with DCA. Out of that process, the new Regional Commission (RC) will be seated on July 1. Many of the folks in this room

served on that commission by position, others to be appointed. One of the first things that came out of comprehensive plan was to do a comprehensive water/wastewater/storm water plan for the 10 county region. The challenge that we punted on was that you had to get a plan where people were willing to get hands away from individual bowls and see everything as a region. We need to recognize capital investments that have been made in the region. If a municipality has something in the ground, whatever we come up with needs to address that. If you decide how many folks the land can carry. The new RC has money to do an inventory and there will be a report coming to establish as a region what the existing capital resources are. If we go through this process for 30 months and don't fold in the new Regional Commission, we will burn up a lot of resources duplicating effort. *The Planning Contractor noted that from the first meeting, the Coastal RWPC would strive to get the RC to join RWPC meetings and vice versa.*

- There needs to be a regional answer to this problem. It can't be one entity controlling water and selling water to everyone else. If there is a Regional Water & Sewer Authority, I think that's a good idea.
- If we can work together to come up with plan, we can do what metro Atlanta did. If the PC has resources, then we can figure it out.
- Dr. Thompson [chair] – This is the end of our time for discussion today, but it's not the end of the discussion. Keep these thoughts in mind from this point forward. Remember that we should **feel empowered to make any and all recommendations on how water is handled in the region**. If we're not doing that as Council, we're not doing something right. We need to make sure we're doing what this group thinks is important for this region.

The Planning Contractor then finished the visioning presentation. Council members should keep in mind that any plan you develop is a living document. You are committing to something long-term. We should commend EPD for making that commitment. As homework, each Council member should outline ideas for the future of the region's water resources in terms of the question "what is important/what do you want to accomplish with rivers, groundwater, and surface water in your region?" This should be completed before the next meeting. We'll come back to this topic at Council Meeting #3.

Please keep in mind that eventually you will need to develop Management practices that will help meet the goals and objective we develop. As part of the planning process we will have to determine if they are regional or specific to counties/towns? This will not be a top down process but it will be iterative and other entities and regions may have input into our work. We'll put concepts of water management practices, but you as a Council are going to connect those pieces. We truly have our work cut out for us. Continue to think broadly and keep in mind that we will need to deal with interconnectivity of storm water, water supply, and wastewater.

### 3) Population and Employment Projections

A background presentation was given on population and employment projections. The PC pointed out that Dr. Warren Brown from the Carl Vinson Institute of Government (CVIOG) is scheduled to join the Council meeting to discuss the projections. Handouts were provided with some of the information from the website organized into a few pages. The PC discussed the process of getting information from the Council and the Local Government Advisory Body (LGAB). The members of the LGAB received a DVD and have been asked to review the information and submit comments on the state water plan website. Those comments are being forwarded to us as the Planning Contractor. We're consolidating the comments and sending them to CVIOG. What are not on the input sheets are questions about methodology or process and you are welcome to send those to use directly and we will consolidate comments.

- A Council member commented on the questionnaire that it is limited in the amount of commentary that can be included. *PC Response: You can also provide comments to us and we will forward them to CVIOG.*

Representatives of CVIOG, UGA, and the Georgia Office of Planning and Budget (OPB) joined the meeting via conference call. OPB pointed out that in the past, they have done projections in house, but the last time it was done was in 2004. OPB wanted to make sure they did a very good job and wanted to increase the level of expertise in this area. OPB hired UGA, and as part of the contract asked them to appoint an advisory board. The Advisory Board includes: ACCG, ARC, the Carl Vinson Institute, DCA, DOT, EPD, RDCs, GMA, OPB, and the State Fiscal Economist with Georgia State University. The numbers will be official projections and released in August. These will be used for health care, state water planning, and K-12 funding. OPB is hoping to have updated information every 2 years. There will be regular input from RWPCs as well as the advisory board. OPB mentioned that they appreciate the input from the water councils.

Dr. Warren Brown of the Carl Vinson Institute (CVIOG) provided some background, including the fact that he is new to Georgia. He started in January to develop the applied demography program at UGA. Prior to that he was at Cornell and also developed and ran a similar program in the state of New York. He's done this for a couple dozen years and has worked a lot with the census bureau as well. Since Dr. Brown didn't join the faculty and begin work until January, it was necessary to get going prior to that and UGA initially contracted with the University of Texas - San Antonio, which prepared the projections for the State of Texas. Preliminary numbers were produced using a similar approach as used in the state of Texas. This is a logical approach since both Texas and Georgia are major states, rapidly growing, and attracting population from other parts of US and abroad, especially Mexico. It was not unreasonable to use the Texas approach here.

Following the initial population projections these numbers we're moderated and influenced by tying them more closely to employment numbers. These are preliminary numbers and CVIOG knows there are adjustments that need to be made. CVIOG is getting tremendous feedback that is extremely useful, and some of that feedback applies to Coastal Georgia. We know that population growth in the coastal area may be strongly driven by retirees, so we need to add that component into our population projections. The primary method that we're using is to identify past trends and document those. The projections essentially assume those trends will generally continue into the future.

If there are major developments - military bases, etc. - that will alter the historic trend, CVIOG is especially interested in hearing from you on feedback forms. We'd also like to hear comments about whether you think our numbers reflect what past and current trends are. The more detailed, more factual you can be, the more help it will be to us as we make revisions.

Jeff Dorfman with UGA introduced himself. He has been here for 20 years and has worked in the economics of growth in and around the state. Workforce projections are based on statistical model using confidential data from the Georgia Department of Labor (DOL). DOL provided data on each region for 54 different industries. The data aren't available at the county level because in many counties, there are too few industries and DOL doesn't want to give away specific data that can be tied to a specific place. These data were incorporated into a statistical model of regional and state trends. The recession was imposed on model as a final step. This applied to construction and retail; other sectors were manually adjusted downward to address recession.

The PC asked if construction and retail were adjusted downwards or upwards.

As population and employment were brought into balance, the retail employment was adjusted to track along with population growth. If there are 10% more people, then there should be 10% more retail employment. To handle the recession adjustment, the finance and construction industry in 2010 was adjusted to be somewhat below 2008 levels. The retail industry was adjusted to be no higher than 2008 levels.

The following comments were provided by the Council and addressed:

- I have a question about methodology. I received a call from the Chairman of the Chatham County Commission. They are concerned about the transient population, specifically students and the military. There is an art college in Savannah and there is the Hunter Army Airfield. How are you handling large student and military populations? Also prisons? *CVIOG: Population projections are based on the census count of the residential population. Persons that live in group quarters (college students, military, prisoners) are included in the census counts. So, our numbers should include those populations. If you know of a change that's occurring, please provide as much detail as you can. The transient, seasonal population (2nd homes) is not counted as part of the residential population. This represents a challenge for water resource planning. This population puts a demand on water resources. If that's proportionately growing faster than the residential population, it will be big issue for you folks.* The Council member noted that the Chatham staff member here says college and military not included. Dr. Thompson (chair) stated that someone needs to confirm this.
- There are also 14,000 hotel rooms that on any given night are 75% occupied. Was that population included at all? *CVIOG - seasonal and transient population are not included. PC - Since the coastal region has a heavy amount of tourism, should the Council members provide information on the transient populations they're seeing? Would that be useful? CVIOG - this is a horse of a different color, but it needs to be watered nonetheless. Hotel population should be reflected in employment trends in those sectors of the economy. As numbers are applied to planning water resources, what you're pointing out is that population projections are not the whole picture, that you need to include them as well. We can't include that in population projections because we don't have any trend data in terms of numbers. You need to pay attention to this as you do planning.*

- *PC: to confirm, there is not a clear way statewide how to do this. This is something for our Council to think about and amend to their approach. This will come up when looking at wastewater, too, in terms of peak daily flows.*
- *There is a way to track tourism. Each hotel room has \$3 per night in taxes. This is tracked and the information is available across the state.*
- *There is a Federal law enforcement training center in Glynn County that trains 60,000 students per year that probably doesn't occur in this count. The stay varies from several weeks to several months, but it is 60,000 total. Even if one student is not there all year, the daily numbers are the same. CVIOG: How we treated this depends on how the students answered the census question and whether they report that as their normal residence. We will need to develop a specific procedure to address this. We rely upon the census, which is primarily produced for representation in Congress. Transient people won't be counted. That's a limitation that the tourism industry lives with. There would be a different approach and different model that needs to be developed for people that are there on a seasonal basis. Your point is excellent – always this number of people, just a different "category" of people. So, this needs a different procedure. If you know that, that should be added down the road when you're doing water resource planning because it puts a demand on water.*
- *What about the military. How would they be considered in term of the census? CVIOG: Generally, people assigned to a military base are residents of that area. The tricky part is a base where troops are on rotation to overseas assignments. The folks who are overseas for a year at the time of the census would be counted as residents of the United States, but would not show up in a county where their home military base is. Soldiers at the base at that time and have been posted there for several months to a year would be counted.*
- *I think that becomes very difficult if you consider a naval installation – are you counting folks on a submarine? CVIOG: Crews on ships is a category in the census.*
- *This is a critical question in Liberty County. A declining population came out of a failure of the census to accurately deal with Fort Stewart's population. If they're in Baghdad, they don't count. CVIOG: What you raised are a host of complex issues. We need to accurately represent troops stationed there – those living in barracks since those living off base are part of regular household census. Were the*

*troops in the barracks accurately counted? The next issue is how does the census bureau estimate that population in years subsequent of the census. I know that's a major area of error of census. For instance, Jefferson County – Fort Drum – while that base was expanding, the census bureau was estimating the population decreasing. Every two years we challenged census bureau estimates. The census bureau has a way to challenge estimates. In Georgia, Fulton County was the only one to take them up on that. In our new program, working with OPB, we want to actively review county estimates that census bureau has and help them make projections. The military is a tough one since they are not residing in typical home.*

- Do you have this assignment for the full state of Georgia? CVIOG: *Working with OPB, we are tasked with challenging and documenting population projections.*
- That'll be true as we do this planning. Military institutions across the state will have this issue. If CVIOG is on this assignment, we need to deal with how to do this statewide and it'll apply to our bases and the law enforcement training center.
- One important reason is that if the baseline numbers are being used for allocations other than water planning, there is a critical need to be right. If these numbers are driven to Federal levels, we really have a problem.
- *PC – To reiterate, because this is affecting funding allocations, if the census bureau is not reflecting what is a reality, we need to make sure we capture the reality. Also, since the census bureau is not as nimble for population projections for water planning – do we need to make some adjustments to make sure the numbers work will for water planning? Would that still be within scope?*
- *CVIOG – I can't answer that today. The issue would have to be carefully studied. It raises a lot of issues. What we're doing is identifying trends in the resident population. And what we need is the best quality data that we can get. Trying to build in other populations would not be necessarily easy, although it may be necessary. If this is a serious issue in this region, it should be looked at and discussed.*
- *OPB – We appreciate feedback we're hearing with regards to military bases and institutions. With Warren on board, it gives him the ability to challenge some of these assumptions. We look forward to working with Liberty County and Warren to challenge these issues and get the core issues addressed.*

- As another comment, assuming employment projections are based off population projections, this would have a tremendous impact.
- I understand the scope of Dr. Brown's work and limitations with the census. Given the timeliness of his work and the fact that we won't get another set of projections until two years from now, we need to get another way to get information because this is not valid for us.
- *PC – I would not recommend that the Council abandon the projections wholesale. Perhaps we just need to consider an "other" category and list what falls in that – the training facility, the transient populations etc. We need to get placeholders in and work with Vinson/OPB to acknowledge them.*
- How does the study account for localized knowledge/projects? We do have a mega-site outside of Wheeler/Pooler that may become occupied. It will have a significant effect on population. *UGA – How we deal with large influxes of workers from things like the new Kia plant in West Point, Georgia or something from the new Pooler site starts with this process. Any sort of big project needs to be turned in as part of the feedback by June 30. We will add those numbers. Some of that will get added in based on feedback. Then, with our two year update cycle, we can address any surprises. We will add in those sorts of pleasant surprises since the last set of numbers. We need to know that the project is going forward. Some counties had a lot of growth that has stopped in construction. We have thousands of permitted lots, and counties argue we should count those. But that's not enough. If you've signed a contract, held a press conference, and know the approximate number of jobs, then we want to know about it. But it needs to be a hard fact.*
- We are going to make a point that we went through this exercise with the coastal planning process over the last three years. We made the determination that using census data has shortcomings when applying it to what we're seeing on coast. We received updated population figures in a study provided by Georgia Tech and that's the basis by which the coastal planning process moved forward. Dr. Couch acknowledged that the Georgia Tech numbers would be used as the basis for water supply and wastewater projects on the coast. She was satisfied with that study and said it should be applied for coastal planning. I have concerns with the population projections presented right now. Rather than replicate the process, we have a set of projections in use that are not dated. We need to be able to integrate these population data into the coastal regional planning process. *CVIOG – We are familiar with that*

*study. We looked at it carefully, and it's useful. You as a Council should look at the Georgia Tech numbers in combination with the numbers we'll be producing. We're not finished yet – we have preliminary numbers. The Georgia Tech report came out and they were adjusted upwards. Our numbers will likely be adjusted upwards. Looking at the two, I don't think we're that far apart. We're looking for your input. When we come out with our final report, you can look at both reports and form an opinion.*

- I want to go back to the military aspect. Liberty County took the initiative to participate in a complete count. I have concerns about the military and troops deployed. There were 12,000 troops out of Ft. Stewart. We don't want to see those numbers unaccounted for because they are out of the country. We need to make sure that those numbers are captured. The population projection is for the purpose of determining how Coastal Georgia and Liberty County are growing and this is used for water resources allocation. If we lose that many/number of citizens that are using water, then our projections for water usage will not be accurate. We're already resource limited. We cannot lose any population numbers. We have to make sure we get the numbers there because coastal Georgia and Liberty County cannot grow without these numbers.
- Fort Stewart also has a transient population – the National Guard that comes in the summer for training. We need to think about those personnel that come from other states to our county and use water. We don't want to lose sight of that.
- One of the key things that I'm hearing is that you're doing a study for the whole state. We're doing a study of the number of times water flushes and we can't base our decisions on population because it is irrelevant (hotels and transient population flush, too). When it comes to sewer/water, we need to account for the transient population that will affect our planning. Also, the Navy base has its own water/sewer. They want to give it up and give it to the city.
- *The following comment is on record from Larry Stuber. As a follow-up on the Georgia Tech study – since you're taking comments, the Georgia Tech numbers for year 2030 for our region are 817,382. That's about 5% higher than CVIOG numbers. I would recommend that you add 5% to your projections to*

the coastal region. Georgia Tech excluded military and transients. When we get to water allocation, we need to deal with that by adding in a safety factor to account for the transient population/other water users. If you make those corrections, then this Council would be good to go in my opinion.

- There has been a lot of time spent talking about population projections. We also need to focus on employment projections. There are serious issues there. I can't understand the methodology because it's sourced confidential data that can't be shared. At a county wide basis now across state, we're able to pull industrial classifications for planning purposes. In looking at what you've shown for baseline employment - you're zeroing out the paper industry that's been here for 100 years along coast. We have invested and are currently investing significant dollars of capital in future operations, and looking at projections in 11 years, the industry is virtually gone. I'm concerned about where you would draw these projections. Even if they could be tweaked a little, that is not enough. The message that this sends to the workforce of this industry - it raises questions for a lot of folks that are dependent on the state providing good information. *UGA: This is a good question. I'll start by giving a general overview. There are 11 regions and 54 industries and I cannot look at magnifying glass at each one. I think the issue relates to how the employment model is handling the recent industry trend. I see it is certainly headed to zero. Interestingly, this is the only region that happened in. All others stay stable and grow slightly. My guess is that it had substantially more employment and declined rapidly, so the model continues that. Please provide me with input such as - we reduced our employment in paper manufacturing from this number of people to where we are today, but we expect this level moving forward. Then, I can go in and adjust that during revision.*
- Durango would have done that. Durango went out of business with 900 employees.
- *Even with existing numbers along the coast, those are the numbers of what's there today and they are higher than 2010 projections.*
- Building on total employment, in my mind I'm thinking about the methodology and a gut check of how you double population over a period of time, but cut down on utilities and the number of employees for electricity, medicine. I understand with technology, we won't need as many employees as we need now, but we still expect increases. Especially with retired people

moving here, medical will be booming. I believe infrastructure growth wasn't in line with population.

- The numbers show huge decreases in warehousing, but transportation and trucking flat-lined. My recommendation is now that we've seen the big picture, look at the interrelationships between connected industries to make sure they track.
- *UGA – Utilities didn't grow much, likely due to improvements in technology. Warehousing doesn't grow a lot, but I don't see where there's a problem that we're missing. These are not necessarily jobs in Georgia. Warehouses are along I-95, so trucker's homes may be FL, SC, VA, etc.*
- My only question is whether the method included communication with the Port Authority or existing industries for the projections. The best way to know what employment is planning for existing businesses is to ask. Is our method capturing what the existing industry believes its future is? Particularly, have we captured the Port Authority's projections of its future? *UGA – We have not contacted employers throughout state. That process is through things like today where the water Council members would know things. We can ask them and pass that information along through the feedback process. Also, this is not necessarily particularly helpful. If we asked the financial industry two years ago, they would have predicted continued growth. Businesses are not necessarily accurate predictors of long range employment. If the Port Authority knows of an expansion to current facility – if we can get good information on that, we want to include it.*
- The problem is the Port Authority is not part of this Council, but a different state agency. They would probably be happy to comment if asked.
- Because of the importance of this, is there any chance to extend June 30 deadline? *CVIOG – We can't rule on that. We're under the same deadlines that everyone else is. We have to answer to OPB and they have to discuss things with EPD. We're the contractor; we're not making the rules.*
- *PC – A reminder, if the Council has comment, submit it to EPD and OPB.*
- *OPB - If some comment doesn't make June the 30 deadline, they could send a letter to us. OPB would be more appropriate than EPD. We can reach out to all agencies and notify them of this process. We would be happy to do this.*

- We had a conversation with the Chairman for Macon/Middle Georgia and they're having the same problems with the numbers. Other areas around the state are also confused and concerned.
- We can proceed with the June 30<sup>th</sup> deadline however this is like engineering a nice house. If we build it on fault line, it's going to get destroyed. We need to step back, take a breath, and look at the underlying information that will support our efforts.
- *PC to Conference Call Participants – On behalf of the Council, we want to thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.*
- *CVIOG – Come this fall, probably mid-to late October/early November, we are going to do day-long workshops on county population and employment projections. We will be coordinating with the RC in each area of state. This is an excellent opportunity for the 2-way flow of information. We will be not only extending this step of projections, but also thinking about what we need to do better in next set of projections in 2011. We are committed to an ongoing relationship with leaders and planners within each region. We look forward to meeting with you face-to-face.*
- *PC - To wrap up, we have heard some excellent comments. Don't lose energy as you go out the door. We need to get the comments in writing. Write down your issues in your own words and email them to us and we'll consolidate them. Most of what you talked about really falls in the category of methodology but don't forget to look at the "mining for local knowledge" feedback form. In terms of the Georgia Tech study, make sure you articulate why you think the numbers are different.*
- This is a question for Ben and Tom [chair and vice-chair]. You are going to a meeting with the other 10 regions. This leaves out the north metro Atlanta area. I compared their plan with the other 10 regions. Currently, the state population (US Census) is 8-9 million, with 50% in the Atlanta metro region and 49% in the other ten regions. In 2050, 58% of 15.7 million people are in the Atlanta metro region, with 42% in other 10 regions. I just heard future state population might have been 20 million in 2050. Those issues need to be resolved and discussed at the meeting you go to. We don't already want to have an issue with the statewide plan because we don't agree on population issues.

- Dr. Thompson (chair) - 62% of employment is in Atlanta in 2050. There are a lot of things to work out. I will remind you that regardless of how this went today, we are wedded to how this goes forward. In the short term, we have three business days to get comments on record. Enter your comments and talk to folks in your locality. In the long term, however we feel about this, it will be long term conversation between us and Carl Vinson. We will never stop questioning the numbers (and other Councils will probably too). I think this conversation suggests we need these people to come here and spend time with us. We need to have them in front of the full Council at the next meeting. It can be much more efficient face-to-face.
- The Council then held a conversation where they encouraged the chair and vice-chair to draft a letter to the Governor and Carol Couch and OPB, reasserting the fact that we've been through this already in the coast and we've discussed this issue. Regarding the June 30 deadline, we need more time to provide data and information that they're going to need to get it right.
- Dr. Thompson asked if the Council as a whole agrees with this. There was no dissent.
- We heard we need to add these points. They are the experts they should be doing this.
- Plus, the baseline information is so off-base in so many categories. I question the data.
- If their scope is different than ours, Georgia Tech more closely mirrors what ours is. Each one of us should contact our legislative representatives by phone and email. All of them.
- A discussion was held on how much extra time should be asked for. It was agreed that Dr. Thompson would ask for a 45 day extension to the deadline.
- Keep in mind the fact that we've done this on the coast and Carol Couch herself said the Georgia Tech data are the best available.
- Dr. Thompson (chair) - If okay for the Council, hearing no objections, I will draft this letter ASAP. I will copy folks on Council as well as chair and vice-chair on other Councils.

- But remember don't use this as an excuse to not follow up in the next three days.

#### 4) Resource Capacity

EPD introduced that the next agenda item is to spend a few minutes to take a big picture look at what we are trying to do in the water planning process. A presentation was given on resource capacities, and EPD mentioned that this sets the stage for how everything adds up in forecasting for this region. The Council's charge is to develop a water development and conservation plan. That's why you're all impaneled. A discussion followed related to assimilative capacities. EPD noted that the slides in the presentation weren't based on actual data, but were example "schematics" of what we'll be doing moving forward. They noted that what we don't want is to breakthrough current capacities. It was pointed out by a Council member that the "schematic" slides should say "hypothetical" before being posted to the EPD website. The following comments were received from Council members and answered by EPD:

- It seems to me there is something missing in both this slide and last slide in terms of water quantity and that's the environment. There is a need on the coast for a certain amount of water to meet needs of estuaries. No one knows how much that is. *EPD Response: we try to look at that from a water quality standpoint in terms of assimilative capacity and in the modeling ensuring for the protection of aquatic life.*
- If you take care of assimilative capacity, water quality needs will be met, but not water quantity. *EPD Response: That's also built into the water quality modeling and low flow scenarios for sustaining aquatic life (mid-tide estuary modeling) which later can be discussed by the modelers, but estuary flow amounts are also something you all can address in your planning desires and visioning.*

#### 5) Agricultural Forecasting

Cliff Lewis, Assistant Branch Chief, Georgia EPD presented an overview of agricultural water use. He discussed how agricultural wells were permitted and metered. It was noted that in terms of the coastal region, there is not a heavy number of agricultural permits. There are some that are permitted. In the coastal area, what we're seeing is a trend towards specialty crops (blueberries, carrots). It's important to point out that specialty crops are not included in agricultural forecasts. Agricultural forecasts include the five main crops (soy, cotton, corn, peanuts, and pecans) because that accounts for

85% of Georgia agriculture. There also are no long range data for specialty crops. In the future, we may have more data on specialty crops and can incorporate those.

The following questions were asked and EPD responded:

- How are free-flowing artesian wells treated? *EPD Response: If they withdraw over 100,000 gallons per day, they would need to be permitted.*
- But when it hits the air, it's considered surface water.
- You're looking at what is applied to the land, not withdrawn from well. In my County, they apply water to ponds and to small agricultural plots. All they are reporting to you is what is on the plot. *EPD- This is correct. This is how it's legislated.*
- This means there is significant withdrawal that is not included. *EPD - I understand your comment/concern. EPD's role is as a repository of data. The Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission (GASWCC) is tasked with installing and maintaining the meters. You could ask for folks to come speak to you about this.*
- Why are you not including specialty crops? *EPD: There are no long-range data on trends. We can't project something from data that are non-existent. We know members of this Council may have these data and that's exactly why you were chosen for the Council. Institutional knowledge of business is invaluable to the Council since this is not included in the forecasts.*
- Instead of the Council just seeing dots on a map, can you let us see information within our region so that as we go through this process we'll have better process for what in this region? *EPD - we can provide information on permits in this region. That's a matter of public record. But there is no way to take agricultural forecasting data back to an individual permit for confidentiality issues.*
- We're not looking to pinpoint how much water each farm is using, just looking to see where these withdrawals are. *EPD - We can provide by County a list of permit holders. Note that you have to get a permit if you are capable of withdrawing 100,000 gallons, but whether you use it or not is why it's difficult to forecast agricultural use. If someone is using less than 100,000, then we don't see it. Anyone could go put a pipe into groundwater or surface water at 99,999 gallons and this is not regulated.*

- Are there caps on the amount of pumping that will be permitted? *EPD: Not for agricultural permitting, which is different than other permits.*
- Can you get a permit in Chatham County for agricultural use? *EPD: Yes. There is no limit – farm producers are highly protected. We must issue a permit for water use.*
- Do they expire? *EPD – They do not expire, except in areas in the Flint River basin that have 25 year limits.*
- Do you have permitted capacity by county? *EPD: Yes and it will be provided.*
- We may not be accounting for the withdrawals less than 100,000. Do we have a sense of how many users are between 0 and 100,000? *EPD – The municipal forecast will answer some of this question. Agricultural water users under 100,000 per day will be a relatively small amount compared to all of the data given.*
- In our region, we probably have 10,000-20,000 homes on private wells. There is no quantifying their withdrawals because they are under 100,000 per day. We need to know what that number is before we can accurately determine how much water is left.
- One of the ways that could be attempted to figure this out is that instead of looking at what is permitted, we could look at how many acres are being irrigated. *EPD – irrigated acreage in the State are being identified and accounted for.*
- *PC – another approach is that we'll get per capita water use. If we take population projections and per capita water use, we can then estimate what percentage people in county are served by public water systems versus non-public. We can take what's not served by public systems and add in their water use.*
- The Council called on Daryl Crosby. *Daryl: non- permitted semi-public systems under 100,000 still have to record water usage. We keep those records and have for the last 4-5 years. We have part of puzzle.*
- You can't drill a 6-inch well on the coast, but you can drill several 4-inch wells. *EPD– you can drill one 4-inch well, but if you drill more than one and connect them, that would be a system. But you could have one 4-inch well to irrigate one field and one 4-inch well for another without a permit.*

- Are we going to capture data that the RC is working on now regarding usage? We need that information in our hands. *EPD – those will be captured. And the PC will speak in a few minutes on different contractors and different data.*
- Big irrigation wells are metered now, so we have a handle on agricultural use. *Rhan (Georgia SWCS) – 60% are metered. Many of the others are “no pump present.” The Commission has sent out letters to those permit holders for information on their pump.*

#### 6) What is Modeling and an Introduction to Resource Assessments

The Planning Contractor provided a Power Point presentation which covered an overview of modeling. It provided information of what modeling is, what its limitations can be, and each of the resource assessments (groundwater availability, surface water quantity, and surface water quality).

Following the presentation the following Council question and answers were discussed.

- As you look at modeling and the relationship between withdrawal and saltwater intrusion if you lower withdrawal rate doesn't this impact the rate of diffusion? This should be looked at in modeling the issue.
- It would be valuable to know quantitatively the total volume of the Miocene and Lower Floridan and the sustainable yield.
- Do we have and/or will we have a strong understanding of both recharge and withdrawal and sound information about the aquifers? *PC Yes as part of the resource assessment work and the sound science initiative and this could be provided over time.*
- The aquifer(s) is very large how will it be characterized? *PC the modeling will be done on the overall characteristics of the aquifer; there may be localized site specific conditions.*
- I have heard that there is overall enough groundwater but in the short term withdrawal is exceeding recharge. *PC this does need to be considered and sometimes it is a timing related issue.*
- Is anyone modeling the freshwater needs of the estuaries? *The approach is more to look at minimum flows.*

- Laurel View River Studies and Skidaway Research Institute is look at some of the EPD models and there may be some suggestions for refinement.
- The Urban Land Trust has mapped numerous parcels to quantify wetlands and location and a Council member offered this information for Council review.
- The 7 day, 10 year low flow is often used as the standard for permitting; will other methods be considered/used? *EPD – yes it is possible that this could change.*

#### 7) MOA, Operating Procedures and Rules for Meetings

The PC mentioned that all Council members should have received copies of the MOA, Operating Procedures and Rules from Meetings prior to the Council meeting. These addressed changes that were requested by the Council. There were two main exceptions to the Council requests that were not addressed in the edits:

- The Council will not be able to remove members who have two absences. Instead, it's suggested that the chair will call the member and ask if he or she still wants to serve.
- The Council cannot determine who will replace a member that resigns. Instead, the Council and EPD can make a suggestion to the nominating person at the request of the Council.

The Chair noted that he had a conference call with staff and had discussions and didn't see anything that appears to be a deal breaker. He opened the floor to discussion.

- What's the purpose of alternate if they can't vote? *PC – Their primary purpose is to vote if needed for a quorum. Chair - If an alternate is needed for us to have a quorum to vote, then all alternates present get to vote.*
- In regards to public participation – I'm concerned about how information would flow out. There is a reference in here that the Council is relied upon to get information back to various folks. (pg 5 – participation of non-members). *Chair: I don't interpret this as us needing to do more for public input. We decided last time that in terms of public comment, there would be 30 minutes during each meeting. EPD is going to help us craft a public involvement plan. We need to take it upon ourselves a little more to ask for public comment and handle it the right way – both in meetings and outside meetings. PC: We're using the EPD website as a primary portal for information distribution and meeting summaries. There might be more proactive outreach. We as PC will help you accomplish that*

*piece if it is needed. The Council is responsible for obtaining public input at meetings. And the chair is responsible for making sure it is orderly and people have a chance to speak.*

The Chair then asked if all were okay with adopting the MOA, Operating Procedures, and Rules for Meetings as presented. There was no dissent and the MOA was adopted and signed.

#### 8) Public Involvement Plan

The Planning Contractor provided an overview of the status of the public involvement plan. EPD is developing a plan for the Council to review and comment upon. It was emphasized that there is a need to have open meetings and participation by the public, for communication with other Councils, and for involvement of the Local Government Advisory Body.

#### 9) Local Elected Official's Comments

Representative Hill noted that it was a pleasure to be with this group. She is pleased to serve you in the State House. She looks forward to any comments you have for her.

#### 10) Public Comment

Laura Walker, City of Savannah – I'd like to offer a comment and a request. My name is Laura Walker and I work for the Savannah Water and Sewer Department. Although I've only worked there for 2 years, I have basic understanding of history. With that history, I'd like to submit the following. I fundamentally believe and agree that Savannah's proactive planning process has served our region and our resource well. I look forward working with you in this proactive planning process in the spirit of comradery to sustain our resources for our residences, our business, and the environment. My request is that you consider two public comment periods – one in the afternoon and one at the end.

Pete Peterson – President, Georgia Association of Groundwater Professionals. The task is daunting for this Council. What I'm getting out of it is that the Council will be able to affect policy. We finally have information about the sound science that's been done on the Upper Floridan and Lower Floridan Aquifers. I want to make sure everyone is aware of that – those facts were presented last year, and the policy stayed the same. I

encourage you not to throw ASR under the bus, and look at the river and ask can it supply water? Like I say, this is a daunting task.

Daniel Parshley, Glynn Environmental Coalition- Great minds asks great questions. This Council asked great questions today. First, I'd like to clarify minutes from the last meeting. My comment was directed towards having Councils across five watersheds. I was questioning whether the structure of Councils is appropriate to address needs in Coastal Georgia with five watersheds covered by six Councils. Between now and September, ask yourself whether the parties here are the ones needed to manage watersheds. Are all interests represented at the table? Will this unite Georgia's citizens or divide them? Those are the questions that need to be answered.

A question today is whether this is top-down or bottom-up. If not all parties are at the table, there is the distinct possibility that various interests in watersheds will not be addressed in the direction communicating toward EPD. EPD will act as a mediator in making the decisions. I suggest this is top-down, not bottom up. Are we being directed? That's a good question - particularly when not all parties to express opinions are sitting at the table.

There was talk about the most important technologies. At the first meeting and at the second meeting, we discussed the need to discuss land use and how it affects water quality, recharge and the estuary. There were two individuals at the first meeting and two individuals today that indicated that how storm water entered the estuary affected salinity regimes which affect economies. I ask that along with conservation, water quality, recharge, and estuaries need to be added to the list of most important technologies.

There was one comment concerning surface water and this Council has little power to address surface water. Mr. Lewis' presentation was excellent.

Thank you very much.

T.D. Smith, Georgia Farm Bureau. Thank you all for what you're doing. I'll be here and appreciate what you're doing. We believe water policy should be done on a local/regional level. Ask us any questions you may have.

*The following statement was provided in writing and read aloud during the meeting:*

Will Berson, Georgia Conservancy. Regarding: Technology related to water management - - 5 most important points

While the 5 points mention “reuse” they do no mention conservation technology standards. Coastal Georgia counties have seen some of the highest growth rates in the state. They are also likely to rebound soonest because waterfront assets are prized nationwide. It is imperative that new construction be required to use the best conservation/efficiency standards.

Making the most of what you’ve already got makes sense for government, for taxpayers, for developers, and the environment. The water supply you have to create (surface or groundwater) will always be more expensive than being more efficient.

#### 11) Conclusions and Wrap-up

Dr. Ben Thompson (chair) – I agree with Daniel. This is an impressive group of folks and you ask insightful questions. I will work on a letter to extend the population/employment comment period. I will copy you on the letter.

I hope you feel comfortable emailing or calling either me or Tom. You should look for emails through us probably through the PC. Chairs are intending on meeting July 13<sup>th</sup> and I’m sure there will be information we need to share with you after that meeting. I’m hoping to do some interim business by email. Please be on lookout so we can get as much done between meetings.

PC – We’d like to thank Mike Melton for hosting us again. His staff has been very accommodating of us. This is a great meeting facility and we’ve really enjoyed being here.

It’s been noted that sometimes we need to end discussion to move onto another topic. If any Council member wants something included in the meeting summary, written comments can be included as an Addendum to the meeting summary.

The next meeting date was set for September 24 in Richmond Hill.

Meeting evaluation forms were distributed and filled out.

**Addendum - Council Member Comments Provided in Writing**

Frank Field, City of Darien, McIntosh County, 6/25/09

EPD increasing wastewater return standards to the point that it exceeds what is in the body of water being discharged into.

The effect:

- Rural areas must upgrade plants at great cost; although not financially capable and without grant assistance.
- This inhibits municipal systems and encourages septic.

**Coastal Georgia Regional Water Council  
Council Members Attendance List**

| <b>Coastal Georgia Council Member</b> |                    | <b>6/25/2009</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 1.                                    | Dennis G. Baxter   | X                |
| 2.                                    | Fred G. Blich      | X                |
| 3.                                    | Chris Blocker      | X                |
| 4.                                    | Kay W. Cantrell    | X                |
| 5.                                    | Frank E. Field     | X                |
| 6.                                    | Rick Gardner       | X                |
| 7.                                    | John F. Godbee     | X                |
| 8.                                    | William K. Guthrie | X                |
| 9.                                    | Duane Harris       | X                |
| 10.                                   | Bill Hatcher       | X                |
| 11.                                   | Cecily Hill        | X                |
| 12.                                   | Don Hogan          | X                |
| 13.                                   | Eric Johnson       |                  |
| 14.                                   | Michelle L. Liotta | X                |
| 15.                                   | Reginald S Loper   | X                |
| 16.                                   | John D. McIver     | X                |
| 17.                                   | Michael J. Melton  | X                |
| 18.                                   | Randall Morris     | X                |
| 19.                                   | Phil Odom          |                  |
| 20.                                   | Keith F. Post      | X                |
| 21.                                   | Tom Ratcliffe      | X                |
| 22.                                   | Tony Sammons       | X                |
| 23.                                   | Mark V. Smith      | X                |
| 24.                                   | Larry M. Stuber    | X                |
| 25.                                   | James Thomas       |                  |
| 26.                                   | Benjamin Thompson  | X                |
| 27.                                   | Bryan Thompson     | X                |
| 28.                                   | Horace Waller      | X                |
| 29.                                   | Marky Waters       |                  |
| 30.                                   | Roger A Weaver     | X                |

*Totals*

**26**

## Public Attendance List

| Public Attendee |                 | 6/25/2009 | Representing   |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|--|
| 1               | Deatre Denion   | X         | DCA  |
| 2               | Rahn Milligan   | X         | GSWCC  |
| 3               | Daniel Parshley | X         | Glynn Environmental Coalition                            |
| 4               | Rick Jeffores   | X         | G. Ben Turnipseed Engineers                              |
| 5               | Mike Phillips   | X         | Rincon City Manager                                      |
| 6               | Phil Odom       | X         | Liberty County   |
| 7               | Pete Peterson   | X         | Ga Association of Groundwater Professionals              |
| 8               | Sonny Timmerman | X         | Liberty County Planning Commissioner                     |
| 9               | Tas Smith       | X         | GA Farm Bureau   |
| 10              | Laura Walker    | X         | City of Savannah   |
| 11              | Al Burns        | X         | CGRDC  |
| 12              | Christi Lambert | X         | The Nature Conservancy                                   |
| 13              | Jackie Teel     | X         | Chatham County-Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission |
| 14              | Jimmie Martin   | X         | City of Walthourville                                    |
| 15              | Will Berson     | X         | GA Conservancy   |
| <i>Totals</i>   |                 | 15        |  |