

## Memorandum

*To: Coastal Georgia Regional Water Planning Council*

*From: Rick Brown, Katherine Zitsch and Denise Funk, CDM*

*Date: 07/01/10*

*Subject: Council Meeting 6 - Summary*

This memorandum provides the meeting summary of the Coastal Georgia Regional Water Planning Council Meeting 6 (CM6), held on June 23, 2010 at the Coastal Electric Cooperative (EMC) in Midway.

1) Welcome and Introductions/Recap CM 5/Approve Agenda/Approve CM5 Summary

Chair Ben Thompson called the meeting to order and asked Council Member (CM) John McIver to welcome the council to Midway. CM McIver expressed his welcome to the council members and the many public attendees at the meeting.

Chairman Thompson provided an overview of the agenda and kicked off the meeting. The CM6 agenda was then accepted by consensus. Next, the CM5 meeting summary was accepted by consensus.

The Planning Contractor (PC) then provided an overview of the CM 5 meeting summary and Council feedback regarding the meeting. Overall the Council felt CM 5 was very useful. The PC also noted that we are minimizing handouts at each council meeting to save paper. The presentation slides are available on the Georgia Water Planning website after the meeting. Council members should let the PC know if there are specific items that they would like to have printed and sent to them.

The meeting continued with an overview of the objectives for Council Meeting 6. These included:

- Review water and wastewater forecast results;
- Review current and future conditions resource assessment model results as they relate to indentifying water and wastewater needs/gaps;
- Gain an understanding of joint resources shared by neighboring regions;

- Discuss management practices subcommittee work on management practices, screening and decision making process; and
- Discuss initial subcommittee work on water plan development, and plan schedule.

The location and possible dates for Council Meeting 7 were discussed. The PC suggested that Council members think about a location, date and a time in August that would work best for a meeting and it was agreed that Council would finalize the date and location at the end of the meeting.

The PC then proceeded to the next major agenda item.

2) Review Water Plan Schedule, Status and Next Year's Work

The PC presented two schedules. The first schedule outlined the major tasks and timeline for the various activities that need to be completed to develop the regional water plan. The second schedule focused specifically on completing the various plan sections that will need to be written. The PC mentioned that a report out on the Council subcommittee that is assisting with plan development will occur later in the day. In addition to drafting the individual sections, the schedule identifies the major review processes including producing two intermediate drafts of various sections and a final draft; each of which will be submitted to EPD for review and input. Once a final draft is completed in the November-December time frame there will be a formal public comment period of about 45 days. Following public comment, Council will need to consider the comments and make relevant changes if needed. Following public comment, EPD is charged with making a final determination to approve the plan, approve the plan with conditions, or request revisions to the plan that would allow it to be approved.

The PC emphasized the significant amount of work that needs to be completed over the next 6 months and mentioned that to complete the work it is recommended that we continue to use subcommittees to keep work progressing between full Council meetings. Currently the Council has two active subcommittees: Management Practices Development and Water Plan Drafting. The PC mentioned that if during today's discussions these topics pique the interest of any Council member, then please feel free to volunteer for the subcommittee(s). The PC also mentioned that we can add additional subcommittees if they are needed. One area/topic for which we may need a small committee is to engage in inter-council discussions on shared resources.

3) Review Water and Waste Water Forecast

The PC presented an overview and consolidated summary of the regional water and wastewater forecasts. The following items were presented and discussed:

The revision made to the baseline industrial forecast was presented. During review and analysis of the industrial surface water withdrawal permit database, a misalignment of data was discovered for 19 of 331 industrial surface water permits statewide. For these 19 permits, withdrawal data from one company was inadvertently associated with another company. Five of these permits are located within the Coastal Georgia region. Once the data was corrected, the total surface water industrial forecast was revised. The correction reduced the numeric value of the industrial water demand, but not the forecast methodology so the growth projection remains flat in the baseline forecast.

Next, the development of the alternate industrial forecast was presented. The PC began by recapping the council's concerns over the lack of industrial water growth in the baseline industrial forecast expressed during CM5. The PC also explained how the alternate industrial forecast was developed since that time. The PC explained how data was gathered from CMs, the Coastal Regional Commission and research to identify locations for potential future industrial growth. Distribution of additional demand was based upon availability of water supply source, current level of infrastructure development, proximity to ground transportation corridors and sea ports. The alternate industrial forecast includes an additional 35 mgd over the planning horizon with approximately 60% added by the year 2030 with the remainder by 2050. The available information regarding future industrial growth indicates that it will most likely occur outside the current top 15 water-using industries so the growth will be placed in the "Other and Unidentified" industrial category. The PC presented maps and tables explaining the distribution of the anticipated increase in water demand both geographically and over time.

Various CMs discussed that both the baseline and alternate forecasts do not consider the existing unused permitted capacity of industry within the region. One CM pointed out that these industries might not change their water use in the immediate planning horizon, but may in the future. Perhaps a set of triggers should be established for when the forecast needs to be reevaluated and plan revised. Several CMs expressed concern that the plan might impede industry's ability to fully use their unused permit capacity for expansion or for an unanticipated economic development opportunity in the region. Several CMs suggested that the plan should document unused permit capacity for industry as well as municipal.

Then the PC presented the total regional water demands for municipal/publicly-supplied; municipal/domestic-self supplied, industrial; and agricultural. Demands were presented for both surface and groundwater for each sector. The PC showed how the alternate forecasts for both industrial and publicly-supplied municipal increase the forecast water demand over the baseline forecasts. Finally, the PC mentioned that the energy forecasts are continuing to be developed and will likely be presented on a more statewide versus regional level.

The PC then presented an example table, which summarized the above information for each of the demand sectors for each County in the region. There are 9 counties within the Council's boundaries and to save time and reduce redundancy from the previous meeting each table was not reexamined. However, the PC mentioned that data from each county can be viewed in the CM6 presentation available at the Council's website <http://www.coastalgeorgiacouncil.org/>.

Next, the PC presented an animated summary of bar charts for each County by each demand sector highlighting the source of supply, total and incremental demand.

The following additional questions and comments were raised by Council.

CM: Does the industrial forecast include industry's efforts toward water conservation?

PC: The industrial forecast is based upon industry's 2005 average daily water use and does not include any reduction in water use due to water conservation/improved efficiencies since that time.

CM: How often the water plan will be updated?

PC: The state is generally considering updates every 5 years, but there may be a need for specific triggers for updating at other times.

Chair Thompson: I would like to see triggering language for changes in agricultural water demand as well and perhaps this should be included for all forecast sectors.

CM: I don't think the forecasting charts reconcile with reality because the Chatham County chart shows increases in groundwater demand, but EPD has reduced and capped groundwater pumping in that county.

PC: This is exactly what we wanted to show the Council and point out as a gap that the water plan needs to address. The forecast is based upon continuing past water use practices into the future. The Council's role is to identify gaps and management practices to solve these gaps in the future.

The PC then asked for the Council to consider action to accept the alternate industrial forecast and the agricultural forecast.

CM: Larry Stuber motioned to accept the alternate industrial forecast. The motion was seconded by CM Jim Thomas. Motion was passed unanimously.

CM: Michelle Liotta motioned to accept the agricultural forecast. The motion was seconded by Keith Post. Motion was passed unanimously.

#### Surface Water Availability Resource Assessment (RA)

The PC presented a summary of the surface water RA focusing on current conditions. First an overview of the river basins and local drainage areas (LDA) was provided. It was noted that the LDA is a smaller watershed that contributes surface water that is measured by long term river gauges, which for planning purposes have been designated as planning and basic nodes. The PC highlighted areas of major withdrawals and major returns and described how flow regimes are calculated for regulated (areas that have major upstream reservoirs) and unregulated watersheds/LDAs. It was noted that the flow regime is the minimum flow that needs to be maintained during dry conditions to protect instream needs. It was noted that this is a minimum level of protection and does not necessarily provide for all ecosystem needs. The flow regime is defined three ways: 1) flow requirements from reservoirs with permit or instream flow release requirements; 2) in unregulated systems, the unimpaired monthly flow (modeled flow with human uses removed) 7Q10 which is the monthly lowest 7 day flow period that occurred during a 10 year period; or 3) in unregulated systems the daily unimpaired flow if it is lower than the 7Q10.

The PC showed several flow graphics that illustrated the flow shortages to the flow regime and in some cases demand shortages, which are shortages to meeting forecasted future demands. Flow shortages to the flow regime are denoted as "gaps" in planning terms and the PC presented tables showing current gaps at the Claxton, Eden and Kings Ferry nodes. Current gaps were not found at the Clyo, Savannah, Doctortown and Gross nodes. The surface water availability model results for the future forecast demands should

be completed soon and are expected to be presented to the Management Practices subcommittee in July.

EPD: Jeff Larson mentioned that the future conditions model run for the Savannah River Basin will include South Carolina's future forecast demands as determined by various forecast assumptions regarding South Carolina water use (i.e., preliminary evaluations for Council planning purposes and discussion), followed by a more refined model run(s) based on specific water use demand data supplied by South Carolina. The current conditions model runs include South Carolina's current demands.

CM: Are we talking with Florida as well? Also, consider talking to industry groups that are following these inter-state coordination issues closely.

PC: These issues involve all the resource assessments and coordination is being done on several fronts. Dr. Kennedy will be meeting with Florida officials on groundwater uses across the state line. Also, a letter from Georgia EPD was sent to Florida in regard to the proposed EPA water quality standards. In addition, we need to be aware of the plans/activities that may affect the St. Mary's River (St. John's Water Management District activities in FL).

CM: During a joint water plan meeting in January, Linda McGregor stated that EPD would provide information on surface water availability to all regional councils. This information would answer the following question - How much water is available beyond what is needed based upon our forecast demands? She stated that they could run the models with increasing demand until a gap is created to determine just how much additional water is available.

PC: We are beginning to look at the 70 year period of record in terms of the mean, maximum and low flow year rather than just low flow condition. This information can be helpful in determining how much water is normally available, not just in drought conditions. Also, EPD modeling is currently set up to determine if gaps occur under the forecasted demands not determining maximum available. Other information or approaches may not be available by August, but perhaps part of the next round of planning.

CM: How much impact will the regional plan have on future permitting - especially in regard to water supply source?

PC: Council needs to grapple with those issues and decide how flexible their plan should be and how much they want to specify.

EPD Larson: The Coastal Georgia Plan should be considered a dynamic document that will be subject to revision, in part, because of all the other activities going on concurrently with this Council WDCP process, including the Savannah Harbor Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and the Salt-Water Intrusion issues (Coastal Sound Science Initiative). The outcome of these bi-state discussions and ultimate agreements will serve to inform and potentially fuel future iterations of the WDCP.

4) Surface Water Quality - Assimilative Capacity Resource Assessment and Current Impairments

The PC then presented information on the water quality RA highlighting the different modeling and other water quality assessment tools that have been developed to help Councils define their water quality needs/gaps. As part of the resource assessment, current permitted wastewater capacity was compared to the 2050 forecasted wastewater demand for each county. In the Coastal Georgia region, existing municipal wastewater permits in Camden, Long and Liberty cover between 50-75% of the 2050 forecast demand. In Chatham and Bryan, existing municipal wastewater permits cover between 75-100% of the 2050 forecast demand.

Then the PC provided an overview describing locations where assimilative capacity modeling has been developed. These locations include stream reaches where there are current discharges, and the model provides information on the amount of dissolved oxygen (DO) that is available in the surface water. The PC also highlighted areas where there are lake and estuary models and watershed/nutrient (phosphorous and nitrogen) models. It was noted that the dissolved oxygen results contain several somewhat conservative assumptions on the volume and concentration of effluent. Consequently local knowledge and follow up from Council will be needed. It was also emphasized that additional data collection can be an element of the selected management practices where information may need to be refined and/or improved.

Council members offered the following comments:

CM: The Altamaha River appears to have additional assimilative capacity. The Savannah River does not have assimilative capacity because it is a DO limited. What about the Saint Mary's River?

PC: There is limited assimilative capacity in the St Mary's River. Also, the Satilla River is shown to be limited and gets worse under permitted capacity model runs.

CM: Many reaches listed on the TMDL impaired list show assessment pending. What percentage of those stream segments with assessment pending actually end up with a cause rather than cleared and removed from the list?

PC: We will look into that and let you know what we find out.

CM: Do we know the timing of nutrient loading criteria in the harbors (Savannah and Brunswick)?

PC: We will ask EPD, but know that they did say nutrient criteria are coming. *Since the meeting, EPD provided the following timeline that comes from the nutrient criteria development plan agreed upon by EPA and EPD: lakes by 2012, rivers and streams by 2013, and estuaries and wetlands by 2014.*

The PC also presented information on future conditions modeling which included modeling of future permit capacity and summary maps comparing current and future conditions results based on the amount of dissolved oxygen available.

Finally the PC provide an summary of current surface water impairments based on the TMDL Listed segments and noted that most impairments are related to dissolved oxygen and fecal coliform. However, there are several impairments for mercury in fish tissue as well. The PC mentioned that Council is not required to address TMDL segments but at a minimum need to include the status of TMDL implementation in the region. The Council may elect to recommend specific segments and actions that could be taken to address impairments. The PC then showed paired comparisons between TMDLs and low or no assimilative capacity and indicated that this comparison will help use identify real versus potential issues and help us learn more regarding if the cause is point or non-point source. It was mentioned that the next steps would be to have the management practices subcommittee perhaps prioritize the segments and then get into greater detail on the most important segments.

#### 5) Ground Water Availability Resource Assessment

The PC provided a summary of the RA for groundwater describing the region-wide sustainable yield values for the prioritized aquifers. The prioritized aquifers include the Upper Floridan in the eastern coastal plains and south central Georgia and the Cretaceous Aquifer. The PC reaffirmed that under current demands the existing groundwater use is



below the aquifer sustainable yield. Under future conditions the demand gets close to the sustainable yield. It was emphasized that the modeling assumes a fairly uniform distribution of demands and that localized high-density well/groundwater withdrawals may need to be looked at in more detail to ensure that localized issues do not occur.

The PC noted that the eastern coastal plain model covers only part of the Coastal Georgia Council region, but did not include many of the counties. These counties are covered by other models including the Coastal Sound Science Initiative to deal with salt water intrusion issues and the regional groundwater model boundary. Sustainable yields values have not yet been determined for all areas, but the region's 2050 groundwater demand forecast by county will be submitted to the RA modelers who will be able to tell us whether they can be met.

CM: What about extending the forecast line out until it meets sustainable yield to find out when it will be exceeded.

PC: Yes, it can be done, but then build-out conditions or changes in agricultural needs may not be included.

6) Closing the Gap Guidance

The PC reviewed a recent letter from EPD Director, Allen Barnes and pointed out that Director Barnes appreciates the tremendous challenge that the Councils have in addressing regional needs and gaps. In his letter he emphasizes the need to be proactive and put in place plans and recommended actions to close gaps but also recognizes that in some cases additional data may be needed to more fully characterize needs and close gaps. Director Barnes recognized the iterative nature of the planning process and recognizes that some activities may need to be further addressed in future updates to the regional plans.

7) Shared Resources Discussion

Next the PC described specific areas where the Council shares surface water and groundwater resources. A preliminary list of potential neighboring Councils with whom the Coastal Georgia Council may need to have discussions was presented. The Council did not make any final decisions and it was generally agreed that the PC can work with a smaller group; perhaps the Chair and Vice Chair and maybe a few members to flesh this out. The initial potential coordination areas may include:

Surface water quality/quantity and groundwater discussions with Altamaha, Suwannee-Satilla and Savannah-Upper Ogeechee.

It was agreed that if we do need to meet, it is important that we define why we need to meet and what issue/problem we are trying to address.

CM: If we have excess capacity, we need to talk to our neighbors (across region and state borders) about helping them solve their problems and meet water need.

PC: We need to consider the forum and timing of broader joint meetings.

CM: We need to make sure we know what our management practices are going to be before we meet with others.

PC: That's why we have tentatively scheduled joint meetings for September. We also should consider that required flow in streams and rivers may not be enough for aquatic species and ecosystems. Perhaps we should have the Wildlife Resource Division and Coastal Resource folks from EPD speak at the next Council meeting to cover issues including: fisheries and environmental resources in the region.

CM: Does excess capacity evaluate only industrial and municipal use? It doesn't take into account our fisheries, which are hurting along the coast. Our economic engine which is our fishery is not doing well. We're not taking into account.

PC: These wildlife and environmental considerations are part of our vision and goals and we need to bring that back into our plan work. We will work with the chair and vice-chair on scheduling speakers and getting information to the council.

CM: Within our region, we need inter-governmental agreements/discussions to address our issues.

Next the PC discussed the South Carolina Savannah River Basin Advisory Committee meeting on May 6, 2010 that PC and EPD staff attended as well as Chris Blocker from the Coastal Georgia Council. This was the second meeting for this South Carolina planning effort. South Carolina has done two water plans in the past, the first completed in 1983 and second done in 1998. They are currently beginning a third update. The first two plans were done by South Carolina Department of Health & Environmental Control (DHEC). This time they formed advisory groups for each of their four major river basins to help them with the process. To facilitate coordination between Georgia and South Carolina's water plans, a council member from both Coastal Georgia (Chris Blocker) and Savannah-

Upper Ogeechee are attending SC Savannah River Basin meetings. A member of SC Savannah River Basin Advisory Committee is also attending Coastal Georgia and Savannah-Upper Ogeechee meetings. There's also one non-voting member on the SC Committee from Georgia. Besides meeting attendance, pertinent information from South Carolina's planning process will be incorporated and considered in the Georgia plans as South Carolina move forwards with their current plan development. The next South Carolina Savannah River Basin Advisory Committee meeting will be August 2, 2010.

8) Management Practices

The PC presented an overview of the definition and purpose of management practices that can be used to address both Council vision and goals and gaps between current and future needs and available resources. The PC handed out an initial list of management practices and there was a report out from Council member John Godbee on the activities of the Management Practices subcommittee. John highlighted the topics that were discussed at the May 19<sup>th</sup> subcommittee meeting and he made several important points including:

- It is important that we manage the water resources wisely and use the tools available to us. We don't need to be taking tools out of the toolbox arbitrarily, but we can adapt as we get better information.
- Our plan should be information driven and contain flexible guidelines that evolve over time.
- The committee reached consensus on the alternate industrial forecast to distribute an additional 35 mgd at the key industrial sites in the region.
- Overall, groundwater availability does not look like a major issue, but the red zone cap is likely to remain in place and there's uncertainty regarding how much additional groundwater withdrawal may be prudent in the yellow zone. Location of the wells is a key issue.
- Surface water quantity does not appear to be a major issue; however there are gaps at the Claxton, Eden and Kings Ferry nodes. It should be noted that Coastal Georgia topography does not lend itself to storage reservoirs. We need more information and data to make decisions regarding surface water.
- The current list of practices is a good start to help Council select management practices.

- It is important for us to use the existing plans and information that have already been produced including the Regional Plan of Coastal Georgia, the Water, Sewer and Stormwater Inventory done by Thomas & Hutton, and the Coastal Sound Science Initiative.

Following John's report out the PC described a decision making process that can be used to screen and select management practices. A decision tree was presented that included screening of management practices based on implementability and effectiveness. The recommended process relies on the Council's operating rules and principle of consensus based decision making for those decisions where consensus can be reached. For more complex issues and/or if consensus cannot be reached the PC provided an overview of a "scoring" process that could be used that utilizes the Region's vision and goals as performance objectives and metrics to determine if the vision and goals are being met. It was emphasized that the scoring process does not make the decision, but rather it provides more information to the Council to aid them in the decision making process. The Council agreed that the process would be a good way to proceed.

CM: We have received volumes of information since the beginning of this planning process. It would be helpful if the core and most important materials were sent out to all Council members.

PC: We are in the process of creating a summary for both Council member use as well as a tool for speaking with local governments.

Chair Thompson requested that the Council members take time during the meeting to discuss management practices.

CM: Are we going to discuss only regional issues or look at sub-regional issues for example the red/yellow groundwater management zones?

The PC then discussed the possible scenarios which may occur within the coastal permitting zone. Other processes that impact availability of water sources will not likely be finished before the plan needs to be written. One approach would be to develop management practice scenarios to address possible outcomes. As an example, the PC asked the Council members to brainstorm for management practices ideas if there were no additional groundwater permits allowed in the future in both the red and yellow zones. The Council members came up with the following ideas for consideration:

- Develop additional surface water supply
- Supply yellow zone from the green zone by well fields from Long and/or other counties

- Utilize Lower Floridan or other aquifers (cost of drilling and treatment of Lower Floridan is not as expensive as originally considered, however we need to review regulatory aspects that add to the expense of developing Lower Floridan as a source)
- Switching over industry in Chatham county to surface water from Savannah I&D to free up domestic groundwater
- Water reuse and other 'green' concepts - for example cisterns to capture rainfall and use for non-potable uses
- Use more surface water for agriculture to free up 'higher quality' groundwater for domestic supply
- Water conservation - demand management
- Monetary incentives (from state government) to get smaller communities to practice water conservation and decrease leakage/reduce water loss
- Tertiary treatment for all wastewater. Then it could be used as reclaimed water and/or reduce pollutant loading to our streams. This could be a regional or statewide recommendation.

It was agreed that the council would continue to brainstorm a preliminary list of management practices and then begin refining the above list. The following comments were also made:

CM: We need an inventory of existing capacity to see what has already been invested in infrastructure.

PC: The Regional Plan and Thomas & Hutton report can be used to provide much of that information. An action item for the PC is to create a summary of this report pertinent to closing gaps for use by the management practices subcommittee.

Vice Chair Ratcliffe: We need a groundwater resource assessment by county immediately.

CM: The range of cost of each management practice is needed for evaluation and decision making.

Public Attendee: Enforcement of existing water conservation measures is not currently being done. DCA has a list of case studies showing how communities have implemented different conservation measures and the outcomes.

CM: The yellow zone limits our community's growth both economically and in population. Any gap may become a limiting factor for economic growth.

CM: I suggest we get input from citizens and communities within the red/yellow zones on management practices that would be important part of the process.

The PC encouraged that those in red/yellow zones sit on the MP subcommittee. CM John McIver and CM James Thomas volunteered to serve on MP subcommittee.

#### 9) Water Plan Development

The PC provided a summary of the items discussed by the Plan Drafting subcommittee. The subcommittee met on May 19 and provided the following input on the initial plan sections:

- It was agreed that a shorter plan with technical appendices is the preferred approach. This will increase the likelihood that local officials and other stakeholders will read the plan.
- However, it is also essential that methods and assumptions be well document in the plan/appendices.
- It is important to include "triggers" that would warrant revising the plan.
- Good feedback was provided on what type of clarifying language is needed to adequately describe issues unique to the Coastal Georgia region.

The next step will be for the PC to develop a revised draft. A second draft will be developed with the subcommittee over the next month. The PC mentioned that it is recommended that as we get more polished sections we have Council approve individual sections. This way the Council can build upon each section and then vote on approval of the plan as a whole knowing that the individual sections were approved and this will be less onerous on the Council members.

#### 10) Local Elected Official Comments

There were no local elected official comments.

#### 11) Public Comments

There were no public comments.

#### 12) Wrap-up and What to Expect Next Meeting

The Council agreed to hold the next meeting in Midway on August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

13) Council Meeting 6 Evaluations

The PC distributed the evaluation forms and members of Council filled out the forms. The PC collected the forms. The meeting was adjourned.

cc: Jeff Larson, EPD  
Brian Baker, EPD

Coastal Georgia Regional Water Council - Council Members Attendance List

Coastal Georgia Council Members		6/23/2010
1	Dennis G. Baxter	X
2	Fred G. Blich	
3	Chris Blocker	
4	Kay W. Cantrell	X
5	Frank E. Feild	X
6	Rick Gardner	X
7	John F. Godbee	X
8	William K. Guthrie	
9	Duane Harris	X
10	Bill Hatcher	X
11	Cecily Hill	
12	Don Hogan	
13	Eric Johnson	
14	Michelle L. Liotta	X
15	Reginald S Loper	X
16	John D. McIver	X
17	Michael J. Melton	X
18	Randal Morris	X
19	Phil Odom	X
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	X
26	Benjamin Thompson	X
27	Bryan Thompson	
28	Horace Waller	X
29	Marky Waters	
30	Roger A Weaver	X

*Total*      22



Coastal Georgia Regional Water Council - Public Attendance List

	<b>Public Attendee</b>	<b>6/23/2010</b>	<b>Representing</b>
1	Tim Barrett	X	GA DNR Fisheries Region VII
2	Doug Cheek	X	PARSONS
3	David Crawley	X	Effingham County
4	Deatre Denion	X	DCA
5	Sonny Emmert	X	DNR CRD
6	Phil Foil	X	GEFA
7	Don Gardner	X	UGA Coop Extension
8	Dennis Hutton	X	Chatham County - Savannah MPC
9	Vincent B James	X	Fort Stewart
10	Alison McGee	X	The Nature Conservancy
11	Gene Millard	X	Interstate Paper
12	Rahn Milligan	X	GSWCC
13	Brent Rabon	X	Fort Stewart
14	Tricia Reynolds	X	Coastal Regional Commission
15	Charles Sexten	X	BJWSA-SRBAC
16	Bryan Snow	X	Georgia Forestry Commission
17	Tas Smith	X	GA Farm Bureau
18	Sonny Timmerman	X	Liberty County Planning Commissioner
19	Laura Walker	X	City of Savannah

*Total*      **19**