

Georgia Department of Natural Resources

Environmental Protection Division, Watershed Protection Branch
4220 International Parkway, Suite 101, Atlanta, Georgia 30354
Linda MacGregor, P. E., Branch Chief 404/675-6232
FAX: 404/675-6247

To: Coosa-North Georgia Water Planning Council
From: Becky Champion, Assistant Branch Chief, GA EPD
Rick Brownlow, CH2M HILL
Subject: Meeting Summary: Council Meeting 5 on March 31, 2010

The council meeting was held on March 31, 2010, at the Calhoun Depot in Calhoun, GA. The list of attendees is attached. In addition to these minutes, all the presentations (slides) discussed in this meeting will be posted on the Coosa-North Georgia website (<http://www.coosanorthgeorgia.org/>). The public sign-in sheet is included as an attachment.

Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Bennett welcomed the group and thanked them for attending. He thanked council member Kelly Cornwell, City of Calhoun Director of Utilities, for arranging the meeting accommodations. Mr. Cornwell welcomed the group to Calhoun. He offered local information and provided background about the Historic Calhoun Train Depot, the site for the meeting.

Chairman Bennett asked for everyone in the room to do introductions, including the elected officials and other attendees.

Rick Brownlow set the stage for the presentations today and made reference to the State_Water_Plan_Timeline brochure (http://www.georgiawaterplanning.org/documents/State_Water_Plan_Timeline.pdf) that council members can use to communicate details about the State Water Plan to their local communities. He then went through the timeline for the overall process and noted that going forward the focus of our council meetings will be on developing the plan and updates and revisions to the planning inputs (forecasts, resources assessments, etc.)

Responding to the agenda, one council member stated that they thought Georgia Power was going to make a presentation at this meeting. Mr. Brownlow explained that the topic of costs would be more relevant to future meetings and that Georgia Power had been invited and had agreed to present at an appropriate future meeting.

Water Demand Forecasts (Municipal, Industrial, Agricultural, Energy)

Brian Skeens presented the results of the water demand forecasts. Chairman Bennett asked him to clarify the differences between light and heavy industry. Mr. Skeens noted that it was by

industrial category and overall water use. When asked why EPD did not use the total water use data rather than per capita approach, Mr. Skeens noted that the methodology was developed by EPD to be consistent across the entire state and stated that the team has worked closely with local utilities to update the per capita water use rates. Don Cope read an excerpt from a letter that Dalton Utilities sent to EPD that asked why the methodology was based on existing use rather than permitted capacity. Mr. Cope's primary concern was that utilities that have invested in infrastructure may be penalized in this process. It was noted by other council members that other counties and utilities should not be penalized where others have over planned for future water need.

One council member asked about the updated population projections and how adjustments will be made to the population projections if they have concerns about their specific projections. Mr. Skeens noted that the OPB has posted the revised population projections on the OPB web site and that any additional comments on the population projections should be directed to OPB. Chairman Bennett noted that at this point the updated population projections are what we will use for our planning purposes, but that each council will use regional specific inputs to determine the water needs for their council regions. Council member Dr. Jerry Jennings announced that the NW GA Regional Partnership (15 counties) recently completed a study that he would make available to the council that showed population projections that are significantly higher than the OPB data. Council members expressed some concerns about using the census data for planning, due to the current economic conditions they expect that the census may underestimate future growth.

On the per capita data, Mr. Cope was concerned about the combining of municipal and industrial use. He indicated that the 224 gpcd was not correct for Whitfield County. Mr. Skeens stated that the contractors have used the data that was provided by county staff and he agreed to reconnect with the utility staff. One of the council members asked if they could get the data for their county to review. Mr. Skeens said that a spreadsheet was developed for each county and that he is happy to further discuss these spreadsheets with individual members. Chairman Bennett noted that the institutional use that is included in the per capita number may increase some county per capita values. It was suggested that this council would like to have the residential, institutional, and light industrial data be presented separately. Chairman Bennett suggested that for consistency across the state our council will need to follow the existing approach.

On municipal wastewater projections, the council asked if EPD has looked at the ability to accommodate additional septic tanks in a given area (based on soils and geology). Vice-Chairman David Ashburn noted that Walker County has been working with Mr. Skeens to clarify the data on existing water use for their area and he encouraged others to look at their data and get back to him if they have concerns.

On the industrial demands, an elected official asked if the methodology includes data related to the location of potential future industrial growth. The auto and auto parts industry was specifically mentioned. Chairman Bennett noted that Rome has been tracking this potential industry and the auto manufacturers do not use nearly as much water as other industries –

especially textile. The council asked how water was being reserved for future industrial water use. Mr. Skeens noted that even if the employment forecasts suggest that a specific industry might decline in the future that their future industrial water use remains constant. Temple Inland noted that they felt their wastewater use was under estimated, which may be due to the assumed return flow. Mr. Skeens asked the Temple Inland representatives to contact him directly.

Don Cope asked who determined that an LAS site would be considered 100% consumptive use. Mr. Cope stated that this is not based on good science and he has written letters on this topic to EPD indicating that water from the Dalton LAS is returned to the river in 30 days. Mr. Skeens noted that the current modeling approaches for water quantity and quality did not have information on the returns by geography. However, the models do include actual stream flows so the LAS flows get captured in the existing conditions through unimpaired flow estimates. Mr. Cope noted that he has a federal judge's ruling that the Dalton LAS is not 100% consumptive.

The council asked how the future reserved industrial water use would be determined and how it would get transferred from one industry to another. Mr. Skeens noted that this would be captured in the future updates to the plan (5 year increments). The council also asked whether the agricultural forecasts include the return flows from irrigation. Mr. Skeens said that we would get back with the council on how the agricultural forecasts address returns. Because there are a number of "zeros" in the estimates, the council asked what the threshold was for including an animal production facility in the estimate. Doug Baughman noted that the data is based on the last "farm gate" data. Some of the council members had questions about livestock data and water use by county. Irwin Bagwell asked if there had been any updates to the farm irrigation data based on comments. Mr. Skeens said that he would check with Cliff Lewis with EPD, but the updated numbers are available on the website. Mr. Bagwell also noted that they had turf farms in Floyd County that have been converted to row crops. He asked if we could correct that in the irrigated crop water used estimate. Mr. Skeens said that we would check with the UGA staff responsible for the demand data.

On the energy forecast, there were some questions about consumptive use and whether evaporative loss was included in the consumptive use estimates. Mr. Skeens said that it was – for example the facilities with cooling towers use more water than facilities with only once through cooling.

Chairman Bennett asked if these presentations would be posted on the website. Mr. Brownlow said that they would be posted and emailed.

Metro Water District Presentation

Mr. Brownlow introduced Matt Harper with the Metro North Georgia Water Planning District. The District was the first to develop a water plan for the 15 county area around metro Atlanta. He presented information about how the District is organized, and how it is implemented. The plans were adopted initially in 2003 and revised and adopted recently. He stated that groundwater is not readily available in the Metro area so surface water is the main source of

supply. The Metro Atlanta area that the District encompasses was settled along the ridges and therefore, the water sources are mainly in the headwaters of the river basins. He said that interbasin transfers are inherent in water supplies for most of their cities and counties.

He also said the District is committed to using aggressive water conservation as a means of meeting its future water needs. He reviewed a chart illustrating the amount of water conservation that is planned to help extend the life of current supplies. During the updates of the plan, additional conservation measures are included to help keep up with technology and available programs. Mr. Harper then reviewed the current water conservation program, and what was revised in the latest update to the program. The original program included water conservation pricing; plumbing fixture replacement; pre-rinse spray valve replacement for restaurants; irrigation rain sensors; submetering for multi-family/commercial buildings; residential and commercial water audits; retrofit kits; and education and public information programs. The latest plan update includes additional measures: irrigation meter pricing, high efficiency toilet (HET) retrofits, minimum education requirements, government building toilet and urinal retrofits, and car wash water recycling. He explained that they are proud of their conservation plan and are always looking for ways to enhance or improve it. He said between adoption of the original plan in 2001 and the new plan in 2005, the District has reduced its per capita usage by 20%.

He then described planned water facilities, including six (6) new reservoirs, and some expanded reservoirs. He discussed local planning and the District's requirement for emergency plans and interconnections and explained the criteria for water supply and watershed protection, as well as asset management. He then talked about the District's extensive education programs and described how the District implemented a toilet rebate program with 16 utilities participating in the Metro program, and 16 others administering their own rebate programs. As of March 19, 2010, over 36,000 toilets have been rebated. The Metro District website is www.northgeorgiawater.org.

Question: How do utilities pay for these conservation programs when it reduces their revenues?

Answer: That is the problem with water conservation. However, water conservation is the right thing to do.

Mr. Harper discussed the implementation schedule for requirements in the District plan and that EPD works to require utility participation through the permitting process.

He also noted that wastewater is an issue in the District and that funding for wastewater plants is difficult. He said septic tanks are 100% consumptive because it's not measurable flow and that the District commissioned a study in 2005 to learn more about septic systems in the District area. To get a handle on managing the growth of septic systems as well as maintenance and life of the septic tanks, the District tracks the percent of new homes by county that are using septic tanks. He showed a chart of septic flow by county as forecasted into the future and discussed the amount of septage produced from the maintenance and regular pumping of septic tanks noting that in the future the loadings of BOD and TSS will be decreasing because there will be fewer

septic tanks. The District has requirements for sewer system mapping and modeling, capacity certification, inspection and maintenance programs, grease management, and training of staff. He also discussed requirements for management of septic systems including homeowner education, critical area identification, private system ordinances, and health department coordination.

Question: What about trust indentures for private systems?

Answer: It is a bit of a hole in the system, but there is an example in Walker/Dade County (Canyon Ridge). The District has further requirements to make up for this.

He then discussed the importance of wastewater master planning, including policies for connection to public sewers.

Next Mr. Harper discussed stormwater and the high percentage of existing impervious surface in the District. He said they are attempting to produce a plan to manage the stormwater through various means. He also discussed the importance of watershed planning, including land use planning, floodplain mapping, greenspace and watershed protection tools. He discussed asset management and stormwater system maintenance and inventory and then showed the schedule for implementation.

Mr. Harper noted that the District is in the middle of the state, cutting across river basins and must coordinate with the 10 new Water Planning Councils. The District is compliant with the State Water Plan, and is required to do everything in the State Water Plan. A major difference between the District and the Water Planning Regions is that the District is allowed by its enabling legislation to charge each county membership dues in which are used to finance staff that assist in implementation (currently the Atlanta Regional Commission).

Question: You mentioned six (6) new reservoirs, what action has been taken on that, and are they located within the District?

Answer: Page A-2 of the water supply plan lists the reservoirs and they are all in the District.

Question: How do you identify the conservation measures and identify the reservoirs?

Answer: The District hired a consultant to develop a very detailed model that identifies water conservation strategies and plans to meet future needs. The identified reservoirs were already in the planning process by local governments and utilities: the District did not identify additional reservoirs independently.

Question: Has the District evaluated Aquifer Storage and Recovery in the District?

Answer: Groundwater is not plentiful as a source, and we do not believe it is feasible.

Question: I heard that Clayton County manages its water system better than anybody?

Answer: Clayton County designed and engineered a constructed wetlands treatment system that recharges their reservoirs (For more information see the following web site: <http://www.ccwa.us/operations/water.reclamation.aspx>). The District encourages utilities to evaluate putting their water withdrawals downstream of their wastewater discharges.

Question: So, the District commissions folks to identify reservoir sites?

Answer: No, the District does not commission anyone, most local governments and utilities have done that on their own, and the District encourages that to take place, especially where there are needs.

Question: You identified 6 new wastewater treatment plants. In deciding the geographic location of those, there should be a strong consideration for returning the wastewater to the basin of origin.

Answer: The District has a goal to minimize consumptive uses and interbasin transfers. In the original District plan, there were mega-sized wastewater treatment plants designed to replace existing smaller treatment plants. After further consideration including pumping costs and stream capacities, the newly adopted 2009 plan encourages strengthening many of the small treatment plants and upgrading their treatment capabilities. Basically, place the treatment plants as close as possible to the population.

Question: Is there a strong consideration to returning the water that is withdrawn from the Etowah for example, to the Etowah.

Answer: Yes, as much as possible, but county boundaries cross over basin boundaries, so this makes the situation more complicated.

Chairman Bennett thanked Mr. Harper for his presentation and summarized that the District has done a lot for conservation. He also said the councils are very interested in the intersection of District and Council planning with respect to reservoirs, water withdrawals, and water returns (recognizing the complications of interbasin transfers). He also mentioned that the Coosa-North Georgia council is interested in understanding in addition to the 6 reservoirs, how much more water the District plans to use from Carters Lake and Lake Allatoona. Chairman Bennett said that the council would also like to hear if the District would be interested in using reservoirs to contribute to assimilative capacity under drought conditions. Mr. Harper said that the District plans commit to working with neighboring regional councils. The District feels confident that it is set in terms of water supply out to 2035, but beyond, there is not a plan. The District wants to work with other councils to understand how to meet future water needs.

Chairman Bennett mentioned that the District has a process in place to continue planning into the future, but the planning councils do not yet know how or if they will exist in the future. Mr. Harper pointed out that per its enabling legislation the District has staggered Board member terms.

Resource Assessments (Water Quantity, Groundwater, Water Quality)

Mr. Brownlow introduced Doug Baughman who explained the resource assessments. Mr. Baughman emphasized that the results are focused on existing uses, and that results under permitted capacities and limits will be coming later. Mr. Baughman asked who had been to the

joint meetings in January, and most council members indicated that they had. Mr. Baughman said he would concentrate on results without emphasizing methodology.

Surface Water Quantity: Mr. Baughman discussed the scale of the modeling including the concepts of planning and basic nodes. He discussed the development of the flow regime used for modeling and the use of monthly 7Q10 and the unimpaired flow. (See page 25 of the DNR Water Issues White Paper for more detail http://www.georgiaepd.org/Files_PDF/gaenviron/wateriss_wp.pdf) For each planning node in the region, the results were presented to show how often the flow condition falls below the target flow regime. Also, the extent of the violation of the target flow regime was shown in the presentation. Questions were asked about what the charts mean and how to interpret. Becky Champion pointed out that the target flow regime is a calculated minimum, but the council may choose to go above that regime as a target for regional planning. England, Chickamauga, Gaylesville, Heflin, and Newell nodes are showing violation of the flow regime based on existing demands during low-flow conditions. At Carters Lake and Lake Allatoona, there is some existing storage available, but Mr. Baughman pointed out that the available storage is already allocated to other purposes, and would need to be re-allocated for water supply.

Groundwater Availability: Mr. Baughman explained how Jim Kennedy, the State Geologist, defined the metrics which were based on the characteristics of each aquifer. The Paleozoic and Crystalline Rock aquifers are found in north Georgia. MODFLOW groundwater modeling software was used in the Paleozoic aquifers. Using a series of simulated wells, they evaluated how much pumping can be achieved without violating the metrics. There is between 27 and 70 MGD available depending on recharge and weather conditions. Next Mr. Baughman described the crystalline rock aquifers and that a “water budget” model was used, rather than MODFLOW. The “water budget” calculation is used to determine the yield of these aquifers. This water budget was performed for the Blue Ridge and Piedmont areas of North Georgia where the surface streams are connected to the aquifer so users must avoid drying up the surface streams by excessive pumping. It is difficult to identify large yield wells in crystalline rock, so the yield for planning processes should be on the low end of the range.

Don Cope mentioned that the technology of “fracking” could be used to open up the fractures and increase the yield, either for straight withdrawals or for Aquifer Storage and Recovery technologies. He would like to bring in some experts to educate the council about it.

There were some mentions of the Etowah Water Bank as a possibility for ASR in northwest Georgia. Mr. Cope mentioned that the Etowah Water Bank consultants contend that fracking is useful to supplement surface water flows for instream flow purposes or other downstream uses.

Surface Water Quality: Mr. Baughman referenced that the modeling is to determine assimilative capacity by two different types – watershed models and stream segment models. The models were run under critical conditions using current discharges. The standards for our region are cold-water fishing streams for trout – 6 mg/L DO, not less than 5. Freshwater warm water fishing standard is a bit lower. He then showed results for DO levels in stream segments, identifying that most locations are in good shape, except for Lake Allatoona, which has TMDL established. Chairman Bennett pointed out that Alabama is very concerned about what happens at their state line, but that state line numbers are influenced by everything upstream, not just Rome. There was discussion about the headwaters of the Conasauga River which show no additional DO capacity, but council members had no knowledge of point dischargers in that

location. It was speculated that it could be caused by septic tanks, but this needs to be investigated further.

Chairman Bennett pointed out that Alabama has no controls or standards on Lake Weiss, but wants Georgia to decrease their loadings. Mr. Baughman showed a chart of real-time water quality data that validates the results of the model at the GA/AL state line.

Mr. Baughman then showed the watershed modeling results of nonpoint sources in dry and wet years for “total phosphorus” and “total nitrogen.” He also reviewed the Lake Allatoona water quality standards, and pointed out that not all lakes have those kinds of standards.

There was a question about where nitrogen comes from and why it is a source to Lake Allatoona. In the Little River arm, it comes from wastewater dischargers, but in more rural areas, it can come from chicken houses or agricultural fertilizer. Historically, wastewater plants have been designed to selectively remove phosphorus, but do not necessarily remove nitrogen. The issue of nitrogen removal will affect utilities increasingly in the future.

There was a question about the Chattahoochee River modeling results as well as the Soque River. Mr. Baughman showed the quality modeling, but also showed the quantity results for the Chattahoochee River below Lake Lanier.

Water Management Goals (follow up from CM4 brainstorming exercise)

Rick Brownlow discussed the Goals for the Coosa-North Georgia planning region. He asked the council to review the eight (8) goals and consider adopting them. These goals were developed based on feedback from the council members. Council Member Jerry Jennings mentioned some revisions to the goals and suggested some strategies for regional planning beyond the development of this plan. Mr. Cope also suggested revisions. Vice Chairman Ashburn made a motion to adopt the goals as amended, and Council Member Bethel seconded. After a brief discussion, the motion passed adopting the following goals:

1. Plan for appropriate levels of water storage, water sources, and long-term supply to meet anticipated need for local communities.
2. Minimize adverse effects to local communities and adjacent regions, and, when possible, enhance, natural systems,.
3. Ensure that management practices support economic development and optimize existing water and wastewater infrastructure.
4. Promote alternative technologies that conserve, return, and recycle water; protect water quality; and ensure adequate capacity for water storage within the Coosa-North Georgia region.
5. Promote properly managed wastewater discharges.
6. Educate stakeholders in the region on the importance of water resources, including water conservation, efficiency, and pollution prevention.
7. Identify practices that reduce nonpoint source pollution and control stormwater to protect and enhance water quality and ecosystems in lakes and streams, particularly those in Priority Watersheds and listed streams.
8. Develop an ongoing adaptive management approach to measure, share, and evaluate water use data and information.

Introduction to Management Practices Selection

Brian Skeens and Doug Baughman presented the proposed approach for development of management practices. Mr. Skeens led the discussion on the approach for water quantity practice selection. He noted that the water quantity and quality practices are closely linked and need to be considered in tandem. The first step is to consider the demands for each sector – municipal, industrial, agriculture, and energy and then consider the following: existing use, permitted capacity, and conceptual projects to meet the remaining needs. Michelle Vincent noted that EPD will be running the models for permitted conditions within the next month or so. EPD will be calling these model runs – initial future conditions. These results will be provided to the Planning Contractors for use by the councils in the initial management practice selection process. John Bennett noted that there is a cost associated with these management practices and he would like some discussion on this topic at the next meeting. Don Cope noted that one example would be for some of the small, older systems to replace meters but that this would be very costly and the costs may not be recovered. Mr. Skeens noted that we hope to have some additional guidance on costs from EPD that can be used in the evaluation process.

Mr. Skeens continued that we would start by looking at the “no regrets” water demand management practices (water conservation) to help reduce the overall demands first. He reviewed the example for municipal, industrial, agricultural water use in the example planning area (by node). The next step is to include the existing planned projects and compare how these projects will help meet the future demands. Finally, the council would look at the conceptual management practices to meet the future remaining demands. Chairman Bennett asked how ‘free’ the council was to adjust the future demands. David Ashburn suggested that if we have better data in a specific location that we document that and use it as appropriate. One member asked how we will go forward from here to make sure that we are getting all the existing plans incorporated. He noted that we do not have every entity involved and need to make sure we capture their planning efforts.

Eventually the council will need to incorporate all of the information on recommended management practices so the water quantity and quality models can be used to evaluate compliance with state standards or guidelines. Information on where the withdrawals and discharges would be located, the concentrations of loadings will also be pertinent.

Doug Baughman introduced the approach for water quality management practices noting that it is slightly different than water quantity. He explained that we should be looking at management practices from individual sub-watersheds and stream reaches. He noted that we should understand what the primary sources of pollutants of concern are, and then what are the management practices that can reduce the pollutants. We are presenting an approach of how to evaluate each location for areas of concern. Then the council must determine by subwatershed, whether point source or nonpoint source needs to be targeted. For example, is the total P or N loading in a watershed supplied by nonpoint or point sources. Specific management practices can target reductions in either pollutant (or others) to meet the water quality goals or requirements. Considering point sources, the council can recommend practices that reduce the loadings by increasing treatment technology. For nonpoint sources, the council can evaluate and recommend best management practices for watershed management. Different levels of implementation of these practices will have different reductions in pollutants. He also discussed watershed based permitting and water quality credit trading as integrated management strategies for watershed and water quality management. Mr. Baughman discussed the way we interact with the modelers on how the loadings by point or nonpoint sources are identified in the future.

Mr. Brownlow introduced the concept of management practice selection. He asked whether subcommittees would be a good method to address complex information in a manageable fashion. He explained that we will have the opportunity to refine our first selection of management practices, if the initial portfolio is not sufficient to meet the goals or water quantity or quality requirements. Mr. Brownlow then showed that some alternative decision processes are available to determine the right mix of management practices. Mr. Brownlow also explained that the next meeting will be in mid-July, and suggested that subcommittees be appointed and recruited so that they might meet prior to Council Meeting 6 and present ideas at the July meeting.

Chairman Bennett recommended that noted that since we have 18 counties committees could be formed based on watersheds: Upper Chattahoochee, Tennessee, Etowah, and Oostanaula. He also suggested that the sub-committees consider the following topics : water quality, water quantity, agriculture, and water need projections. The group discussed whether each council member should be a member of a subcommittee. Also non-council members could be asked to participate and provide input to the subcommittees. Chairman Bennett and Vice-Chairman Ashburn will draft an initial assignment of council People to specific subcommittees and will recommend these to the council. They explained that anyone who would like to change or add folks, especially counties or sectors that do not have council representation, should notify Chairman Bennett.

Draft Plan Review and Table of Contents

Rick Brownlow pointed out that the TOC was in the handout and solicited the council to provide feedback.

Public Involvement Plan

Rick Brownlow and Chairman Bennett discussed the PIP. Vice Chairman Ashburn made the motion to adopt the PIP. The motion was seconded and passed without exception.

Elected Official and Public Comments

Chairman Bennett asked for public comments.

Joe Cook was introduced and pointed out that there is legislation pending that would address and legislate interbasin transfers. Joe Cook proposed that the council produce a resolution to urge the legislators to take action and legislate interbasin transfers. He said that the leadership in the legislature states that they are waiting for the water planning process and water councils to provide information. However, he doesn't think that the council is in a position to create a state policy, and that the council is looking to the state for guidance. He again urged the council to write a resolution. He pointed out that the legislation does not prohibit interbasin transfers, but does require certain considerations as listed in the State Water Plan.

Bill King, Woodard and Curran, introduced that Paulding County has water that comes from Cobb, which crosses many jurisdictional boundaries and would be opposed to such recommendation.

Chairman Bennett would like to respect that the legislature wants to see what the water councils do about this issue. He noted that the councils have been telling the legislature to wait until the councils do their work. He does see some merit in the legislation, but is concerned about giving the legislature the message that they should make these decisions prior to the development of regional plans. He explained that he would like to go through the process this first time, before urging the legislature to make this requirement. He explained that he was also concerned about the effects of this legislation on existing systems. Chairman Bennett thanked Joe Cook for being present at the meeting and pointing out any potential situations that the council needs to be made aware of.

Vice Chairman Ashburn mentioned that the Savannah-Upper Ogeechee basin has already stated that they are adamantly against interbasin transfers.

Wrap Up/Council Meeting Evaluation

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10pm.

Members Present

1. Mike Berg
2. David Ashburn
3. Irwin Bagwell
4. Kenneth Beasley
5. John Bennett
6. Charlie Bethel
7. Tim Bowden
8. Don Cope
9. Keith Coffey (alternate)
10. Kelly Cornwell
11. Willard Ferguson (on behalf of Gerald Dunham)
12. Pat Gober
13. Stephen Gray
14. Jerry Jennings
15. Sherry Loudermilk

16. Tim Mercier
17. Lamar Paris
18. Sam Payne
19. Todd Pealock
20. David Pennington
21. Jimmy Petty
22. Frank Riley

Members Not Present:

1. Doug Anderton
2. Katie Dempsey (ex officio)
3. Haynes Johnson (alternate)
4. Dick Martin
5. Tom O'Bryant
6. David Westmoreland
7. Chip Pearson (ex officio)

Elected Officials

1. Richard Monroe, Habersham County
2. Gary Pichon, Dawson County
3. Randy Waskul, Whitfield County
4. Denise Wood, City of Dalton

Partnering & Other State Agencies

1. Jennifer Szabo, Department of Community Affairs (<http://www.dca.state.ga.us/>)
2. Keith Gilmer, Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission (www.gaswcc.org/)
3. Bret Albanase, GA DNR

GA Environmental Protection Division

1. Becky Champion, Assistant Chief for Coosa-Tallapoosa-Tennessee Basins
2. Deron Davis
3. Michelle Vincent

CH2M HILL

1. Doug Baughman
2. Rick Brownlow
3. Brian Skeens

Sign In for Partnering Agencies and General Public (Please Print)

Coosa-North Georgia Water Planning Council

March 31, 2010

Name	Address	Email	Phone #
Brooke Anderson			
Katharyn Brazier	238 Mansbridge Rd Rome GA	kbrazier@temple inland.com	(706) 290-8499
Eric Walker	11	ericwalker@templeinland .com	(706) 236-5323
Richard Monroe			706-839-6301
Brandon Ashley	1620 Bass Rd Macon GA 31204	brashley@gfb.org	800-342-1196
Randy Lakeskul	PO Box 248 Dalton, GA	Rwlskul@kmi.kelleygarcia.com	706-275-7566
Tony CARROLL	PO BOX 180 SUMMERVILLE GA 30747	ccs@rectorwindstream.net	706-578-2258
REID DYER	3630 EAST FIRST ST. BLUE RIDGE, GA 30513	RDYER@HAYESJAMES.COM	706-632-4981
Bill King	Duluth, GA	bkings@bbabescurran.com	770-329-0363
Katey Murray	122 Cathy Lane Calhoun GA 30701	KMurray@gfb.org	706-629-8549
Elizabeth Crumby	815 W. LIME ST. Calhoun, Ga.	ecrumby@	706-629-2231

(calhounbms.com)

Sign In for Partnering Agencies and General Public (Please Print)

Coosa-North Georgia Water Planning Council

March 31, 2010

Name	Address	Email	Phone #
CYNTHIA M.W. DUNN	Shaw Industries, Inc.	cynthia.dunn@shawinc.com	706.279.8485
Denise Wood	Mohawk / of Dalton	denisewood@mohawkind.com	706-928-8118
GARY P. DUNN	Dawson County		706-531-6188
Trish Reiferberger	Brown and Caldwell	TReiferberger@Brunald.com	770-673-3630
Ernest W. Eaver	Cobb County Water Sys	ernest.eaver@cobrcwa.com	770/415-6336
Bcky Nixon	Cobb-Marietta Water Auth	bnixon@cmwa.org	770-544-5208
Kathy Nguyen	Cobb County Water	kathy.nguyen@cobrcwa.org	770 770-919-6244
David Kubala	CreekCoast Water	dkubala@cwater.net	770-479-1813
Gene Holmes	Holmes Associates, Cumming	etholmes35@gmail.com	404-906-3541