



**Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
WATERSHED MANAGEMENT - STORMWATER SUBCOMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY
May 21, 2014**

The Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District Stormwater Subcommittee of the Technical Coordinating Committee met on May 21, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Amphitheater at the Loudermilk Center, Atlanta, Georgia.

Members Present

Bob Bourne, Cobb County Water System
David Breaden, Cobb County
Tara Brown, Henry County WSA
David Chastant, Johns Creek
Charles Corbin, Keck & Wood, Inc.
Bruce Coyle, Paulding County
Tammie Croy, Hall County
Catherine Fox, Fox Environmental, LLC
Kristina Garcia, City of Atlanta
Mary Gazaway, GAEPD
Horace Gee, City Gainesville
Dane Hanson, City of Sandy Springs
Marjorie Hicks, Cherokee County Government
Robert Hill, City of Newnan
Rachel Jones, Hazen & Sawyer
Kelly Russell, Paulding County Water & Sewer System

William Klahr, City of Newnan
Brice Martin, Coweta County
Will Martin, Bartow County
Betsy Massie, CH2M Hill – Atlanta
Kevin McInturff, Hall County
Anderson Mycroft, Fulton County
Shayla Nealy, Clayton County Water Authority
Michele Robbins, City of Sandy Springs
Anup Shah, Metro Atlanta Chamber
Kelen Shostak, City of Woodstock
Robert Stachler, City of Alpharetta
Julie Owens, City of Atlanta
Michelle Vincent, Jacobs
Wade Wilson, City of Cartersville
Emily Wingo, GAEPD
Harold Harbert (Education), GAEPD

Welcome and Introduction

Chris Faulkner opened the meeting by welcoming the Watershed Management – Stormwater Subcommittee.

Public Comment Period

No public comments.

Plan Update Process and Schedule

Danny Johnson provided an overview of the plan update schedule and process for gathering the goals and objectives from the BACs and TCC that helped define the discussion points for the meeting. District staff, with input from the BACs, TCC, and Governing Board, will be finalizing a scope

Watershed Management Stormwater Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary

Page 2

of work for the consultant over the next three to five months. The District hopes to have a consultant selected by the beginning of 2015. The District's plan update is required to align with the State's Regional Water Council Plan updates which are both due by November 2016.

The preliminary planning phase began in January 2014 with the BACs who helped develop a vision for the plan update. During March and April 2014, the BACs and TCC held meetings where all attendees were broken into five small groups. Each small group provided input into the following five categories: Planning and Policy, Public Education, Water Supply and Water Conservation, Wastewater, and Watershed. All together, these groups generated almost 1,400 individual goals and objectives for the plan update. The comments were compiled and emailed to TCC members one week prior to the May 21, 2014 meeting. Mr. Johnson noted that the compiled comments will continue to serve as a reference for the plan moving forward and will be provided to the consultant.

Mr. Johnson also introduced Bennett Weinstein as the Natural Resource Division's new planning and policy advisor. Mr. Weinstein came to ARC / Metro Water District from 8 years with the GAEPD where he led the state water planning effort. Mr. Johnson then turned the floor back over to Mr. Faulkner.

Review of "Goals and Objectives" and Discussion of TCC Recommendations

Mr. Faulkner started his presentation by reviewing the TCC and BAC work during the March and April meetings in which these groups detailed their goals and objectives for the plan update. Throughout these five meetings we received 112 comments from the TCC and 165 comments from the BACs on Watershed Management.

Mr. Faulkner clarified that the goal of the day's discussion was to begin working with a small handful of these goals and objectives to receive clarification and feedback from the TCC so they can be packaged as a recommendation to the Governing Board for inclusion in the RFP for the Plan Update Consultant(s). Mr. Faulkner also clarified that depending on the outcome of the conversation; the TCC might opt to detail the conversation and raise it to Board for discussion and further input or take that topic offline to a small working group for additional work and consideration.

The group reviewed examples of outcomes from the goals and objectives exercise that are central to the plan update that were not in need of further clarification for RFP development. These examples included:

- Updating land-use and river basin information, this will be done in concert with State guidance.
- Recommendations from Utility Climate Resiliency Study. Mr. Johnson updated the group on the progress on this project. Current status is that staff is currently negotiating the final scope with the selected consultant and expect to begin the work within the next few weeks. The Study is anticipated to be completed in early 2015 and will include recommendations for how utilities can become more resilient in the event of severe flooding and extended droughts. Recommendations from the study will be brought to the TCCs and Board for consideration and integration into the plan. The scope of work for the plan update will reference this process.
- Updated Funding Opportunities. The consultant will look beyond traditional programs and identify more creative funding options such as 1) new funding sources as well as existing funding options and 2) ways to develop projects that take advantage of a mix of funding sources.
- Septic and F.O.G. Education and Outreach. This element received extensive input during the goals and objectives exercises.

Watershed Management Stormwater Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary Page 3

Comments and questions from TCC:

- Funding opportunities will you be looking at stormwater utilities? Yes we will be looking at those
- What about impervious surface? That would probably be part of any land-use analysis.

Summary and Outcomes of TCC discussion of specific items from Goals and Objectives exercise:

- Item 1: Septic Management
 - Mr. Johnson gave a summary of the last meeting with the 2 members of the 2005 septic committee: at the time there was a senate subcommittee on septic as well, there has been a lot of attempt at septic ordinance and hauler regulation doing manifests and which never got very far. There is work going on right now with GAWP doing some work with septic and hauling and what is going on.
 - Result: Follow through with the consensus from last meeting to report to the board for additional clarification on how to proceed.
- Item 2: Watershed Improvements
 - Mr. Faulkner explained a lot of comments were lumped under this category of watershed projects. Looking at what are some new of existing tools we don't know about etc... could be things that the consultant look at. No one in the comments said that we should not do watershed improvements. The question of "is there interest in the consultant collecting case studies or strategies for what is going on outside Metro Atlanta?" was proposed. After some brief discussion including new tools and current / completed district projects was suggested.
 - Really critical issue and that we have the case studies to make sure that we don't just monitor and do nothing about it.
 - Having a joint committee between watershed and conservation talking about restoration and things like that
 - There are a lot of integration issues that make it so it cannot just be a jurisdictional thing.
 - People are starting to do large scale restoration projects, how to take this plan to the next plan depends how you can address these watershed issues.
 - Being able to show successes that have happened so you can show what you have been doing you should be doing more of and to be able to show your local government too.
 - Studies of new technologies and how they support water scale as well.
 - Result: Ready for scope of work after some TCC clarification- gathering these case studies and new tools to do more/better/larger scale of these restoration improvement projects you are already doing.
- Item 3: Green Infrastructure/LID
 - What incentives exist for doing GI / LID
 - Maintenance must be part of any conversation about GI/LID (BMPs in general)
 - What are the cost saving of GI/LID, particularly as compared to BMPs currently designed for the 25 & 100 yr storms.
 - Issues with accountability, particularly when practices are implemented in private developments
 - Development community has a hard time understanding the value of GI/LID & greenspace
 - Result: Scope item: Incentives, maintenance, agreements, and implementation strategies for GI / LID.
- Item 4: Data & Monitoring

Watershed Management Stormwater Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary

Page 4

- “What opportunities do we see for this data collected to be used for District purposes?”
- Need for streamlined sampling programs
- Concern over who might use data and how it might be used
- Some monitoring has been dialed back in the last several years
- What are municipalities doing different today as opposed to 5 years ago
- How can data being collected achieve program goals
- This is a big topic
- Tension between those who pay for monitoring and those who write regs
- Reconcile district monitoring with other monitoring
- Danny Johnson was working with a group to make recommendations for data is it related to Georgia’s 305(b) / 303(d) list. The results of that work may be presented to the TCC in the future.
- Result: Small group to look more at this issue pending the outcomes of the 305(b) / 303(d) group already working. Mr. Faulkner will send an email and try to get some people together on this once staff has a clearer understanding of the issue based on the aforementioned results.
- Item 5: Better use of existing regulations-further refinement
 - Look at all levels of regulation
 - Lots of regulations exist, focus on opportunities to better use existing rather than developing new ones
 - Result: Focus on the existing regulations and use those as a basis for moving forward. This will be taken under advisement as the planning process shifts to action items in the future.
- Item 6: Further integration of Plans
 - What do people feel integration means?
 - Previous two TCC meetings there was agreement to form a small working group to better flesh-out the concept of integrated planning.
 - Two people in this TCC had already agreed through the previous TCCs to serve on the small group.
 - Result: An additional WMSW TCC member volunteered to be on the small group and the overall consensus from the TCC was concurrence with the previous two.
- Item 7: TCC and consultant interaction
 - All of the comments will go to the consultant and there will be a lot of feedback chances. How do you see action items and how that process happens?
 - The way it happened last time worked well and was very beneficial. .
 - Mr. Johnson recapped previous discussion that there was a strong suggestion from the last meeting to keep the TCC as involved as possible, means a lot more meetings with the consultant and the TCC in the room. The conclusion was that we will bring the scope of work back to TCC a month ahead of time for everyone to review and provide formal feedback. When the process starts we will develop those action items with the consultant and get back before they are finalized.
 - Result: The WMSW TCC agreed with the decisions of the previous TCCs.

2013 Implementation Report Results

Sarah Skinner provided an overview of the 2013 Implementation Review. The report was published electronically this year in order to provide the user with more accessibility to the information and to enable the user to do more personal analysis with the data. Additionally, she went over the results for watershed management / stormwater survey.

Proposed 2014 Implementation Survey

Mr. Faulkner talked about the 2014 implementation survey, some questions we are trying to trend out and so we kept those, others have a follow up part so that a clearer picture of what is going on can be seen better than in previous years.

Other Items

Koustoula Vallianos said the Clean Water Campaign summary would be ready soon for the MS4 reporting and also gave the same summary of the FOG video contest.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.