



Comprehensive Regional Water Supply Plan

Duck River Development Agency
Comprehensive Regional Water Supply Plan

Meeting Minutes
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
FOR WORKSHOP NO. 1 / KICKOFF MEETING
Henry Horton State Park
June 23, 2009
1 PM - 4 PM

Meeting Participants

Name	Representing
Eugene Crowell	DRA, Chair; Shelbyville Water
Tom Peebles	DRA, Vice Chairman
Doug Murphy	DRA, Executive Director
David Crowell	Shelbyville Power, Water & Sewer System
Scott Young	Tullahoma Utilities Board, Chairman of DRATAC
George Rest	O'Brien & Gere (OBG)
Tom Dumm	OBG
Ryan Owens	TDEC - Water Pollution Control
David Money	TDEC - Division of Water Supply
Michael Eiffe	TVA
Steve Barnes	TVA
Brian McCrodden	HydroLogics
David Jackson	BDY Environmental
Rick Whiteside	BDY Environmental
Richard Young	BDY Environmental
Leslie Colley	The Nature Conservancy



Comprehensive Regional Water Supply Plan

Justin Adams	Traugher & Tuke, Legal Consultant
Joe Bishop	CTI Engineers, Inc. (CTI)
Jerry Hightower	CTI

Purpose of Meeting

Purpose of the meeting was to seek input on Workshop No. 1 from this representative group.

Purpose of Steering Committee and Participation on Committee

- Two groups in attendance: Group 1 is the Strategic Team which includes the consultant team who are the “folks on DRA payroll”. Group 2 is the Steering Team which includes everyone else (two from each stakeholder group or agency).
- Do we need more groups represented on Steering Committee? What about legislators? Doug Murphy identified that they were invited. What about County Mayors? Doug identified that DR Watershed Association is newly formed and may want representation on the committee.
- DRATAC wants to make sure folks understand that they have ownership of the study.
- OBG identified that the steering committee is serving as a “sounding board” for the stakeholders. Teams may be formed throughout the study to address specific topics and initiatives.
- Communication and outreach materials, press releases, and other information will be reviewed by the Steering Committee or some sub-set of the committee.
- DRA identified that DRATAC has authority to recommend decisions to DRA Board; therefore, this Steering Committee is only a “sounding board” and does not have the authority to make decisions for DRA. It was clarified that only the DRA Board is the entity that will ultimately make decisions.

Workshop Format and Input from Attendees

- DRA identified that there will be 40+ people in the Wednesday meeting.
- Stakeholder input at the Wednesday meeting will be encouraged. There will be three separate time periods for public comments with a time limit of 15 minutes and 2 minutes per person.



Comprehensive Regional Water Supply Plan

- OBG identified that a project website will be available soon for public comment.
- Steering Committee identified that there should also be a means of input from the public via written comments.

Stakeholder Participation and Roles

- A stakeholder is anyone invited to the Wednesday meeting.
- Three primary groups: DRA Board, DRATAC, Water Resource Council (WRC)
- Steering Committee agreed that this group will have no authority over DRATAC, WRC or DRA Board. This is a process for receiving comments from various stakeholders and citizens.
- Decisions that require voting should follow the structure already established for DRA. The Consultant Team and DRATEC will evaluate and “score” alternatives, then present recommendations to DRA Board. Interim meetings will be held with the DRA Board to make decisions. The word ‘vote’ will not be used when discussing the evaluation process portion of the project. The evaluation process is an excellent opportunity to get a better understanding of various aspects of alternatives.
- DRA asked whether a public relations (PR) firm needed. When does the plan need to be “sold”? T&T identified that there is no plan to hire PR firm yet and we should educate public on need for a water supply plan and process for choosing plan. DRA asked when a PR firm should be hired and whether workshops should be advertised with the risk of having 300 people attend. The apparent consensus of group was to wait on hiring a PR firm until after workshop and inform the media about what is going on with the study. May be prudent to issue a written press release.
- TNC identified that the study should define both problems and solutions.
- Meeting participants agreed that permits cannot be provided until a definitive need has been established. Demands for each supplier and deficiencies must be identified. The amount of growth in the next 30 years and 50 years needs to be identified. Some participants identified that a certificate of need should be obtained from the state prior to moving forward with the alternatives analysis. TDEC personnel at the meeting were not familiar with such a certificate or approval.



Comprehensive Regional Water Supply Plan

Study Process

See Exhibit "P" Comprehensive Regional Water Supply Plan:

- 1st element is identification of Water Quality and Capacity.
 - 2nd element is Reliability and Permitting.
 - 3rd element is Financial Analysis.
 - 4th element is Community Impacts and Policy.
-
- TUB indicated that the driving force for the study is drought. Public water suppliers could have ceased withdrawals from the river for the drinking water treatment plants and we still would not have maintained the "needed" water for minimum flow in the river (i.e., instream flow required for "ecological" needs and for wastewater assimilation).
 - TNC identified that another need is wasteload assimilative capacity; wastewater treatment plants need to treat to lower limits, higher technology, and require lower assimilative capacity flows.
 - The question is: What is the total need for drinking water supply, regardless of need for aquatic life?
 - Is there a financial maximum on the water supply alternative? No cap now on financial maximum of project, although they may need to be a phased implementation, as need increases.
 - What drought will be used for establishing the baseline supply available....2007 or 1953? OBG responded that the answer is to be determined by this study.

Tools and Models

- HydroLogics identified that the OASIS model is a tool for better management of the Duck River. The model did not predict the 2007 drought flows; however, that software has now been updated (calibrated) to include 2007 conditions. Considering climate change, the next 80 years may not look like the past 80 years. Need to identify if we can handle 80 year drought events by learning to anticipate needs and respond better. Multiple "what if" scenarios is best solution for defining sensitivity of results.
- One question will be: "How much are the users willing to reduce supply requirements?"



Comprehensive Regional Water Supply Plan

- It may be desirable to add 20% reserve to “safe yield.” Operational policies establish that “failure” occurs with 20% of the storage remaining in Normandy Reservoir.
- Is DRATAC confident in the OASIS model? DRATAC was not confident in the OASIS model; but has it been accurate since 2007 drought re-calibration. HydroLogics identified that the model has been accurate. Significant review of the input data has occurred although an independent review of the data may be desired.
- “Wetted perimeter” of the stream under various flow conditions has been the issue for TDEC because of aquatic habitat concerns.
- TDEC is supportive of the OASIS model.
- TVA identified that their agency has no questions regarding the validity of the OASIS model.