

Middle Chattahoochee Water Planning Region: Water and Wastewater Forecasting Technical Memorandum

PREPARED FOR: Middle Chattahoochee Water Council/Georgia Environmental Protection Division
 PREPARED BY: Black & Veatch
 DATE: February 15, 2017

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. POPULATION FORECASTS	3
III. MUNICIPAL WATER NEEDS FORECASTING	5
Adjustment of Per Capita Water Use	5
Plumbing Code Water Efficiency Adjustment	6
Public vs. Self-Supply	6
Additional Considerations	7
2016 Municipal Water Demand Forecast Results	7
Forecast Allocation	8
VI. INDUSTRIAL WATER NEEDS	11
V. MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER DISCHARGE FORECASTS	12
2016 Wastewater Forecasting Results	13
VI. INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER GENERATION AND DISCHARGE FORECASTS	14
VII. AGRICULTURAL FORECASTS	15
Agricultural Projection Methodology	17
Non Permitted Water Use Operations	17
VIII. ENERGY FORECASTS	18
Energy Forecast Results	19
IX. REGIONAL SUMMARY	20
X. REFERENCES	23

Tables

Table 1. Middle Chattahoochee Population Projections By County	4
Table 2. Per Capita Demand Values by County, gpcd	5
Table 3. Per Capita Water Demand Values by County Adjusted for Plumbing Code Savings, gpcd	6
Table 4. Total Municipal Water Demand Projections by County, MGD	7
Table 5. Industrial Water Demand Projections	12
Table 6. Total Annual Average Wastewater Flow Projections by County	14
Table 7. Wastewater Generation Projections by Major Water Using Industry, MGD-Annual Average	15
Table 8. Total Agricultural Water Demand for 2015 and 2050 (MGD) for the 75th Percentile Scenario	16
Table 9. Energy Water Withdrawals and Consumption in MGD for the Council	20

FIGURES

Figure 1. Previous vs. Updated Statewide Population Projections.....	3
Figure 2. Previous vs. Updated Middle Chattahoochee Population Projections	4
Figure 3. Publicly-Supplied vs. Self-Supplied Water Demand Projections	7
Figure 4. Previous vs. Updated Municipal Water Demand Comparison.....	8
Figure 5. Delineation of Water Planning Regions (Bold Lines) and Watershed Boundaries (Colors)	9
Figure 6. Water Planning Regions with Aquifers.....	
Figure 7. River Basin Map with Nodes	10
Figure 8. Water Demand Projections by Withdrawal Location	11
Figure 9. Industrial Water Demands by Source	12
Figure 10. Middle Chattahoochee Wastewater Flow Projections by Discharge Type.....	14
Figure 11. Industrial Wastewater Discharge Projections by Discharge Type	15
Figure 12. Water Demand Projections by Source.....	21
Figure 13. Water Demand Projections by Sector.....	21
Figure 14. Wastewater Flow Projections by Basin of Discharge.....	22
Figure 15. Wastewater Flow Projections by Discharge Type.....	22

I. INTRODUCTION

Current and future (2050) water and wastewater forecasts were developed as part of the Middle Chattahoochee Regional Water Plan, which was adopted in 2011. These forecasts are referred to as “previous” or “former” forecasts in this Technical Memorandum. As part of the 5-year review and revision of that plan required by the State Water Plan, these forecasts have been updated. The revised forecasts are referred to as “updated” or “revised” forecasts. This Technical Memorandum describes how the original forecasts have been updated to account for changes in population and water use that have occurred since the original forecasts were produced. These updates also have incorporated specific input from the Council when necessary.

The basic approach to updating the forecasts starts with the same methodology used in developing the original forecasts, which is described in various technical memoranda from the previous round of forecasting.¹ Those memoranda were included as supplemental material to the 2011 Middle Chattahoochee Regional Water Plan. The purpose of this Technical Memorandum is to describe where modifications to the original forecast methodology were made to prepare the updated forecasts, and to present the results of the updated forecasts.

The basic methodology for forecasting water demand is to estimate demand separately for each major water use sector. For each sector, water demand is estimated using a ‘driver’ multiplied by the ‘rate of use’. The driver is defined as a countable unit that can be projected in future years, such as number of people, number of employees in a business, acres irrigated or megawatts of power generated. The rate of use is defined as the quantity of water used by the driving unit per unit of time, such as gallons per person per day, gallons per day per acre, or gallons per megawatt produced.

The planning process examines and forecasts water demand for four major sectors:

¹ See “Municipal and Industrial Water and Wastewater Forecasting Memorandum,” dated July 1, 2010; “Statewide Energy Sector Water Demand Forecast” Technical Memorandum, dated October 29, 2010; and Agricultural Water Use forecast prepared by Dr. Jim Hook et al. (information available at <http://www.georgiawaterplanning.org/>).

- **Municipal** – this sector includes domestic, commercial, and industries served by municipal utilities.
- **Industrial** – this sector includes separately permitted industries.
- **Agricultural** – this sector includes major crops such as cotton, corn, peanuts, soybean, pecans, specialty crops, and nursery and horticulture; a snapshot of major livestock water use and golf course water use.
- **Energy** – this sector includes thermoelectric power generation.

II. POPULATION FORECASTS

The 2011 Regional Water Plan incorporated population projections through the year 2050 that were prepared by UGA's Carl Vinson Institute of Government on behalf of the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (OPB). These population projections were used as a basis for municipal water demand forecasting.

Updated population projections were provided by Georgia OPB for use in the 5-year review and revision of the Regional Water Plan. These projections were developed for all counties within the state through 2050 and were released in 2015. These projections take into account 2010 U.S. Census Bureau information and updated information on natural increase and net migration. Overall, the updated population projections show less growth than the projections used in the development of the 2011 Regional Water Plan. Figure 1 shows the statewide change in the revised population projections compared to the projections utilized in the previous round of planning.




Figure 1. Previous vs. Updated Statewide Population Projections

Projected trends varied on a county-by-county basis, but the overall projections for the Middle Chattahoochee Council showed a 33% decrease in the 2050 projections from the previous projections. Figure 2 graphically illustrates this trend.




Figure 2. Previous vs. Updated Middle Chattahoochee Population Projections

Table 1 displays the revised population projections for each planning year through 2050 for each county within the Middle Chattahoochee Water Planning Council, as well as the total Council projections.

Table 1. Middle Chattahoochee Population Projections By County

County	2015	2020	2030	2040	2050
Carroll	115,587	123,628	139,407	155,302	172,143
Chattahoochee	12,983	13,276	13,655	13,921	14,020
Clay	3,013	2,928	2,723	2,462	2,243
Haralson	28,869	29,774	31,173	31,719	31,871
Harris	33,451	35,495	39,873	44,141	49,233
Heard	11,630	11,791	11,818	11,315	10,554
Muscogee	206,058	213,728	225,912	233,750	238,600
Quitman	2,351	2,317	2,229	2,154	2,229
Randolph	7,076	6,755	5,980	5,090	4,263
Stewart	5,782	5,571	5,191	4,938	4,999
Troup	70,569	74,397	82,070	88,781	95,153
TOTAL	497,369	519,660	560,031	593,573	625,308

III. MUNICIPAL WATER NEEDS FORECASTING

Municipal water includes uses for residential, commercial, and industrial purposes, and may be supplied by either a public or private supplier. For the previous publicly-supplied demand forecasts, preliminary per capita water use rates were calculated using the publicly-supplied water quantity and estimated population served for 2005 based on the USGS publication, "Water Use in Georgia by County for 2005 and Water-Use Trends for 1980-2005", by Fanning, J.L. and Trent, V.P. (2009). Modifications were made on a county by county basis where deemed necessary using Council feedback and additional data received. The 2009 USGS publication used a self-supplied per capita water use rate of 75 gpcd based on a Georgia Water Use Program (GWUP) conducted survey and study to estimate the self-supplied domestic water use for 2005 in Georgia.

The per capita water use rates were adjusted over the planning horizon to account for plumbing code efficiency savings. The number and mix of toilets were estimated by county using available census housing information. An estimate of a 2% change over per year of higher volume flush toilets to low volume flush toilets was assumed for the duration of the planning period. Water demand forecasts were calculated by multiplying population projections by this adjusted per capita water use rate by county for each projection year.

Adjustment of Per Capita Water Use

To obtain the per capita water use by county for the updated forecasts, GA EPD reviewed withdrawal data and estimated population served data reported to EPD by permitted municipal water systems. GA EPD then calculated adjustment factors for each county's per capita water use rate.

For each county, a per capita value for each year 2010-2014 was calculated based on actual withdrawal and estimated population served data for that county. The percent rate of change was calculated for each year interval (2010 to 2011, 2011 to 2012, 2012 to 2013, 2013 to 2014), and the average of those four values was calculated as the per capita water use adjustment factor. This adjustment factor for each county was then applied to the previous per capita water use value. A summary of these adjustments can be found in Table 2.

Table 2. Per Capita Demand Values by County, gpcd

County	Former Per Capita Value	2015 Adjustment Factor	Adjusted Per Capita Value
Carroll	146	-0.7%	145
Chattahoochee	94	0.6%	95
Clay	141	-0.8%	140
Haralson	84	-4.3%	80
Harris	171	-1.2%	169
Heard	129	6.6%	137
Muscogee	194	1.5%	197

Quitman	79	0.0%	79
Randolph	179	-6.3%	168
Stewart	260	1.8%	265
Troup	206	-2.9%	200

Plumbing Code Water Efficiency Adjustment

The per capita water use rates were adjusted for plumbing efficiency savings. The adjustment was zero in 2015; the adjustment factor was applied in all future planning years to reflect the replacement of existing toilets with more efficient toilets over time. This updated per capita value with plumbing code savings was used to obtain water demand forecasts through 2050. Table 3 summarizes the adjusted per capita values by county through 2050.

Table 3. Per Capita Water Demand Values by County Adjusted for Plumbing Code Savings, gpcd

County	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Carroll	145	144	143	142	141	140	139	138
Chattahoochee	95	93	92	91	89	88	86	85
Clay	140	139	138	136	135	134	132	131
Haralson	80	79	78	77	75	74	73	72
Harris	169	168	167	166	165	164	163	162
Heard	137	136	135	134	133	132	131	129
Muscogee	197	195	194	192	191	190	188	187
Quitman	79	78	77	76	75	74	72	71
Randolph	168	167	165	164	162	161	160	158
Stewart	265	263	262	260	259	257	256	254
Troup	200	199	197	196	195	194	192	191

The per capita water use rate for self-supplied customers (75 gpcd) was determined to be acceptable for use in the updated forecasting efforts. This rate and the updated population projections were used to estimate the self-supplied residential/commercial water demand.

Public vs. Self-Supply

The total municipal water demands represent the sum of the publicly-supplied and self-supplied water needs for each county. The percentage of the population within each county that uses self-supplied water is retained from the previous forecasting effort. This ratio value was obtained from the 2005 USGS report and evaluated by the Council during the previous plan review process. Figure 3 graphically displays the split between publicly-supplied and self-supplied demands for the Council.




Figure 3. Publicly-Supplied vs. Self-Supplied Water Demand Projections

Additional Considerations

It is recognized that in many parts of Georgia, transient populations due to university education, military installations, or seasonal tourism can have a significant effect on water use rates. These transient and seasonal demands are embedded within historical use data and/or are accounted for by the OPB population projections used to prepare the forecasted demands. Council specific inputs were incorporated during the 2011 forecasting effort where new industry or growth patterns were believed to deviate from historical trend. These inputs were retained in the forecast updates through utilization of the previous per capita values as a base. Additional Council input was incorporated where appropriate to reflect significant changes on existing or future expected use.

2016 Municipal Water Demand Forecast Results

Table 4 shows the total annual average municipal water demand projections by county, including publicly-supplied and self-supplied demands.

Table 4. Total Municipal Water Demand Projections by County, MGD

County	2015	2020	2030	2040	2050
Carroll	15.11	15.96	17.71	19.42	21.17
Chattahoochee	7.33	7.69	8.37	9.05	9.71
Clay	0.34	0.32	0.29	0.26	0.23
Haralson	2.32	2.36	2.39	2.35	2.28
Harris	4.39	4.69	5.19	5.66	6.21
Heard	1.40	1.40	1.38	1.30	1.18
Muscogee	45.28	46.49	48.23	49.08	49.32
Quitman	0.19	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.16

Randolph	1.01	0.96	0.83	0.69	0.57
Stewart	1.40	1.35	1.24	1.17	1.17
Troup	12.37	13.01	14.14	15.06	15.90
TOTAL	91.15	94.40	99.94	104.19	107.91

Figure 4 graphically displays the Council's total water demand projections for each planning year in comparison with the previous projections. Overall, the municipal forecast is lower than in the previous forecast due to lower population projections and per capita water use values.




Figure 4. Previous vs. Updated Municipal Water Demand Comparison

Forecast Allocation

The geographical representation of water withdrawal, either from groundwater or surface water was determined using updated EPD permit information, including water use data, and input from water suppliers in some instances. The withdrawal quantities and locations were related to the 2014 historical data provided by GA EPD. The public supply water demands were assigned proportionally based on 2014 distribution of surface watersheds or groundwater sources to generate this forecast. Figure 5 shows the delineation of water planning regions and watershed boundaries, while Figure 6 shows water planning regions with aquifers. Figure 7 is a map that displays Georgia's river basins, along with the nodes that are consistent with the River Basin Planning Tool used for the Surface Water Availability Assessment.




Figure 5. Delineation of Water Planning Regions (Bold Lines) and Watershed Boundaries (Colors)




Figure 6. Water Planning Regions with Aquifers




Figure 7. River Basin Map with Nodes

The municipal water demand forecasts were allocated between surface water nodes and groundwater aquifers for analysis. The allocation retains the same proportions as the previous forecasts. The distribution of locations for projected withdrawals is graphically displayed in Figure 8. The majority of municipal water demands in the region are from the Chattahoochee River basin.




Figure 8. Water Demand Projections by Withdrawal Location

VI. INDUSTRIAL WATER NEEDS

The 2011 Regional Water Plan included industrial water demand forecasts based on employment projections produced by the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. Updated employment projections were not available, so this update of the plan does not include any revisions to the industrial water use forecasts.

For the 2011 plan, EPD worked with stakeholders within an industrial working group to establish current and projected industrial water and wastewater needs on an industry specific basis. Employment projections were used as a basis for the industrial water demand forecasts. Industries require water for processes, sanitation, cooling, and other purposes, in addition to domestic (employee) water use. Water demand/withdrawals are largely based on production. The previous methodology forecasted industrial water demand using employment projections per industry and the 2010 water demand multiplied by the expected employment growth rate into the future for that type of industry. It should be noted that water use forecasts for any industry with a projected decline in employment remained at the level of water use before the employment growth rate began to decline.

Table 5 summarizes the annual average industrial water demands by industry type for the Middle Chattahoochee Council region, while Figure 9 illustrates industrial water demand projections by withdrawal source.

Table 5. Industrial Water Demand Projections

NAICS	Industry	SIC	2015	2020	2030	2040	2050
0	Other Industrial	0	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.23	0.26
311	Food - Food Manufacturing	20	0.45	0.46	0.47	0.48	0.50
313	Textiles - Textile Mills	22	2.34	2.34	2.34	2.34	2.34
314	Textiles - Textile Product Mills	22	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
325	Chemicals	28	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05
331	Primary Metals	33	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.13
336	Automotive Manufacturing	37	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.65
	Total		3.77	3.80	3.84	3.88	3.95




Figure 9. Industrial Water Demands by Source

V. MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER DISCHARGE FORECASTS

The previous municipal wastewater demand forecasts used the water demand projections as a basis. Indoor water use percentages were estimated and applied to the water demand forecasts, as well as estimates of infiltration and inflow, to obtain the municipal wastewater forecasts. More details regarding the previous forecasting methodology can be found in the 2011 Technical Memorandum.

All self-supplied water users were assumed to dispose of wastewater via septic systems. Wastewater generated from publicly-supplied water users was assigned a percent septic value in one of two ways: based on 1990 U.S. census data for percentage of homes on septic systems, or EPD estimates of septic systems installed by county in conjunction with 2005 U.S. Census housing stock estimates.

For the updated forecasts, estimates of municipal wastewater disposal were determined for each county and watershed within a planning region. Historic data provided by EPD for 2014 was utilized for forecasting future wastewater flows by county. The percent change between the updated population projection base year (2015) and each planning year (2020, 2030, 2040, and 2050) was applied to the wastewater discharge totals for each county from 2014 to obtain estimated total county discharge flows for each planning year.

Inflow and infiltration, commonly referred to as I&I, is a term used to describe the ways that groundwater and stormwater enter into dedicated wastewater or sanitary sewer systems. Inflow is stormwater that enters into sanitary sewer systems at points of direct connection to the systems while infiltration is groundwater that enters sanitary sewer systems through cracks and/or leaks in the sanitary sewer pipes. Because forecasting updates are based on historical discharge information, infiltration and inflow is inherently accounted for in the projections.

Historic data for wastewater treatment facilities was used to calculate a percentage breakdown by facility for each county. These percentages were applied to future forecasts to allocate future wastewater discharge projections by facility for each county. Forecasts were manually adjusted based on knowledge of new facilities and the decommissioning of old facilities. Facility type for centralized discharge was broken down into three categories: point discharge, Land Application Systems (LAS), and general subsurface permits. The assumption was made that future expansions during the planning period would be to point discharges.

For the updated forecasts, all self-supplied water users were again assumed to dispose of wastewater via septic systems. For the 2016 forecasting update, the percent changes in population projections for each planning year through 2050 were applied to the initial septic flow forecasts to obtain an updated septic flow projection by county for the 2016 plan review and revision.


Historical data was also used to allocate wastewater quantities by Local Drainage Area (LDA) so that quantity, disposal type, and LDA location could be summarized. Forecasts for centralized wastewater discharge projections were disaggregated based on 2014 flow percentages. Septic systems were disaggregated by node based on watershed land area percentages within each county.

2016 Wastewater Forecasting Results

Table 6 shows the forecasted total municipal wastewater discharges for each county within the Middle Chattahoochee Water Council. The following Figure 10 illustrates the breakdown between type of treatment/discharge.

Table 6. Total Annual Average Wastewater Flow Projections by County

County	2015	2020	2030	2040	2050
Carroll	14.96	15.98	17.86	19.71	21.08
Chattahoochee	1.08	1.15	1.16	1.19	1.18
Clay	0.22	0.21	0.19	0.17	0.15
Haralson	2.22	2.27	2.34	2.33	2.30
Harris	4.70	4.97	5.53	6.07	6.71
Heard	1.02	1.02	1.01	0.95	0.86
Muscogee	35.10	36.66	38.71	40.02	40.81
Quitman	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.16
Randolph	0.67	0.63	0.55	0.47	0.39
Stewart	1.07	1.02	0.95	0.90	0.90
Troup	10.93	11.52	12.60	13.53	14.39
TOTAL	72.15	75.61	81.07	85.49	88.94

**Figure 10. Middle Chattahoochee Wastewater Flow Projections by Discharge Type**

VI. INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER GENERATION AND DISCHARGE FORECASTS

The industrial wastewater generation and disposal forecasts were not modified from the 2011 Regional Water Plan. Estimates of industrial wastewater were calculated in each watershed unit within the Water Planning Regions and were retained for this plan update. Industrial wastewater volume is derived by industrial water demand for all industries based on prior water use analysis. Table 7 shows the wastewater projections for the Council for each planning year by industry. Figure

11 displays industrial wastewater discharge projections by type, centralized point source discharge or land application system.

Table 7. Wastewater Generation Projections by Major Water Using Industry, MGD-Annual Average

NAICS	Industry	SIC	2015	2020	2030	2040	2050
0	Other Industrial	0	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.14	0.16
311	Food - Food Manufacturing	20	0.43	0.43	0.45	0.46	0.47
313	Textiles - Textile Mills	22	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
314	Textiles - Textile Product Mills	22	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
325	Chemicals	28	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.05
331	Primary Metals	33	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.08
336	Automotive Manufacturing	37	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.58
	Total		3.23	3.25	3.28	3.31	3.36




Figure 11. Industrial Wastewater Discharge Projections by Discharge Type

VII. AGRICULTURAL FORECASTS

Agricultural water demands were prepared by the Georgia Water Planning & Policy Center at Albany State University (GWPPC), with support from the University of Georgia's (UGA) College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. GWPPC was contracted by Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GAEPD) to prepare estimates of current and future use of water by the agricultural sector in Georgia. The projections cover row and orchard crops as well as most vegetable and specialty crops accounting for more than 95 percent of Georgia's irrigated land. Additionally, estimates of current use are made for animal agriculture, horticultural nurseries and greenhouses, as well as golf courses. The results for the Middle Chattahoochee region are summarized below; more detailed information can be found on the website or from EPD.

Estimates of current agricultural demand were calculated from data collected through the Agricultural Water Metering Program administered by the Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission. Agricultural water demand, both annual and monthly, was calculated using metered observations from the 2010 – 2013 growing seasons. In addition, agricultural irrigation water demand was projected for groundwater and for surface water sources for the years 2015, 2020, 2030, 2040, and 2050 using methods consistent with the first round of regional water planning. Each year's projection included a wet year, a normal year, and a dry year to simulate a range of weather conditions. Irrigated areas for each crop were projected from the baseline of year 2015 acres using economic models. Water withdrawal quantities were computed as the product of the projected irrigated area for a crop (acres), the predicted monthly irrigation application depth (inches), and the proportion of irrigation water derived from a source (fraction). While fields irrigated by wells only were assigned as 100 percent groundwater, the proportion of a county's water obtained from surface water sources was reduced to 70 percent of the estimated amount. This adjustment was applied in recognition of observed irrigation patterns since they are often limited by water available in streams or rainfall that refills ponds. The final monthly withdrawals (acre-inches) by crop were summed for each county and/or drainage area. To be consistent with other water planning efforts, the data was converted to million gallons per day (MGD).

To address the potential climate extremes in the forecasts, a range of agricultural irrigation demand scenarios were considered, including the 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 90th percentiles. The 50th percentile value represents the average rainfall conditions and the median water demand, while the 75th percentile represents the dry year conditions when higher irrigation demands are expected. For planning purposes, the 75th percentile values for each region are used since they represent a more conservative scenario than the median value. The agricultural water demand forecast for the Middle Chattahoochee planning region is summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Total Agricultural Water Demand for 2015 and 2050 (MGD) for the 75th Percentile Scenario

County	Groundwater		Surface Water						
	2015	2050	Irrigation 2015	Irrigation 2050	Nursery	Golf	Livestock	Sum 2015	Sum 2050
Carroll	0.000	0.000	0.411	0.476	0.187	0.649	0.903	2.15	2.215
Chattahoochee	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001
Clay	2.575	2.687	2.567	2.703	0.130	0.000	0.095	2.792	2.928
Haralson	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.301	0.271	0.576	0.576
Harris	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.568	0.065	0.040	0.673	0.673
Heard	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.182	0.182	0.182
Muscogee	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.139	0.904	0.004	1.047	1.047
Quitman	0.000	0.000	0.359	0.421	0.284	0.000	0.023	0.666	0.728
Randolph	11.089	11.698	9.031	9.290	0.228	0.076	0.061	9.396	9.655
Stewart	0.870	1.318	1.674	1.625	0.229	0.000	0.027	1.93	1.881
Troup	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.156	0.167	0.156	0.479	0.479

County	Groundwater		Surface Water						
	2015	2050	Irrigation 2015	Irrigation 2050	Nursery	Golf	Livestock	Sum 2015	Sum 2050
TOTAL	14.534	15.703	14.042	14.515	1.925	2.162	1.764	19.893	20.366

Note: Nursery, golf, and livestock projections are assumed to be consistent through planning years 2015-2050.

Agricultural Projection Methodology

A database of statewide irrigated acreage was updated to reflect changes that have occurred since data was compiled in 2009 to support the initial round of regional water planning. This comprehensive update was completed by the GWPPC through a combination of on-farm field mapping efforts in certain regions as well as an analysis of 2014 aerial imagery whereby visible irrigated field areas were delineated and labeled by location using standard GIS tools. The proportion of existing irrigated area of each major rotation crop was taken from the 2015 USDA National Crop Data Layer and supplemented with information from the 2012 USDA Farm Census. The projected growth rate for each year for each crop was based on the arithmetic average of projections from three economics based models as calculated by faculty at the UGA College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences. The models predicted the total Georgia production area for each crop based on United States, Southeast Regional, and Georgia data. Five major crops—corn, cotton, peanut, soybean, and pecan—were included in these three models because they make up 85 percent of Georgia's irrigated crop area.

The water demand created by vegetables, specialty crops, and ornamental nurseries lacked the long-term data needed to make econometric projections. Therefore, projections of irrigated area for these crops were assumed to stay constant within the same areas and future growth rates would equal the aggregate growth rate of the five major crops. Therefore, water demand for vegetable and specialty crops was included with the major crops to produce the total water withdrawal demands.

Predicted monthly irrigation amounts were computed and summarized statistically to represent monthly applications that would be needed to meet normal crop water needs during wet, average, and dry years. For each major crop type, irrigation schedules and monthly totals were computed for the weather conditions that existed during each of the years from 1950 through 2007. Finally, the proportion of water used for irrigation from a specific source was estimated using data collected in the field through GWPPC mapping efforts coupled with information from the Agricultural Permitting Unit of GAEPD as well as source data maintained by the Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission (GSWCC) as part of the Agricultural Water Metering Program. Groundwater sources were further broken down by aquifer (or aquifers) based on the available permitted well information.

Non Permitted Water Use Operations

State regulations require that farmers who withdraw more than 100,000 gallons per day from streams and aquifers obtain a permit from the GAEPD. While that limit means that most field irrigation withdrawals require a permit, other agricultural practices such as livestock and other animal-related operations, nurseries, and golf courses might not require permits. Therefore, the

following agricultural practices were considered during the forecasting period but forecasting numbers were not developed due to the lack of reliable data.

Livestock and Other Animal Operations

The GWPPC, with input from industry experts, estimated the aggregate water use in each livestock sector for each county and planning region. These estimates were not forecasted into the future (demand values for 2015 are carried forward through 2050). The data sources used for these estimates were the same as those used in the previous planning sector.

Nurseries and Greenhouses

The GWPPC prepared estimates of current water use by horticultural nurseries and greenhouses, but these estimates were not projected into the future (demand values for 2015 are carried forward through 2050). The data used to determine the extent of these operations was the same as that used in the previous planning cycle (Georgia Agricultural Statistics Service). While the horticultural sector is diverse, these estimates are focused on parts of the sector that are substantial but not captured in other water use estimates. For example, while landscape and lawn irrigation could be considered a part of this sector and accounts for a significant portion of the State's water use and much of its consumption, it was assumed to be accounted for within other sections of the state water demand analyses.

Water use in nurseries is difficult to quantify due to the ever changing inventory and the variable water needs of each plant depending on their type and size. Therefore, in the previous planning cycle, an ad hoc group including industry stakeholders and experts developed broad categories of water use in nurseries using studies conducted by the Agricultural Water Pumping and Plant Research Plots and surveys conducted by the Cooperative Extension Service Irrigation Surveys and the Green Industry. For in-ground nurseries average annual use is estimated at 31 inches; for container nurseries, 87 inches; and for greenhouses, 121 inches. These rates were used to develop water use estimates for each county for each type of nursery operation. Greenhouse water use numbers are larger because the elevated temperatures increase water losses but water use is expected to vary very little from year to year and from dry to wet seasons because they are covered. Although not included in the industry survey, lower management nurseries, like Christmas tree farms, tend to use less water than higher production, in-ground nurseries.

Golf Courses

In counties and state water planning regions with non-municipally supplied golf courses, their water needs were estimated with the support of the Georgia Golf Course Superintendents Association (GGCSA), GAEPD, and research on GGCSA Best Management Practices (BMPs). The data does not forecast golf course water use in the future but does provide water use estimates in an average rainfall year and in a dry year.

VIII. ENERGY FORECASTS

This section describes the methodology and results of the energy sector water demands for the Middle Chattahoochee Planning Council.

Demands forecasted in this section are associated with future energy sector utilities (NAICS 22) power generation. Water demands associated with power generation by facilities with other industry codes are captured as part of the municipal and industrial water demand forecasts discussed in previous sections.

The analysis covers both water withdrawal requirements and water consumption for energy generation. Information related to water withdrawals is an important consideration in planning for the water needed for energy production. However, water consumption is the more important element when assessing future resources because a large volume of water is typically returned to the environment following the energy production process.

Water requirements for thermoelectric power generation facilities are estimated based on future energy demands along with the water requirements and consumption rates in gallons per megawatt-hour (MWh) for different power generating configurations. For a full discussion of the original forecast methodology, see the 2010 technical memorandum “Statewide Energy Sector Water Demand Forecast” or the “Update of GA Energy Needs & Generating Facilities” memorandum. The following updates to the original methodology were incorporated into the current estimates:

- Projections of the statewide energy demand were updated using the new population projections with the relationship between population and energy demand the same as previously estimated.
- The list of existing facilities, facilities under construction, and planned and permitted new facilities was updated. In addition, some prior facilities were retired from service or converted from one generating configuration to another more efficient configuration.
- The same water withdrawal and consumptive use factors (gallons per MWh) by generating configuration were maintained as previously developed.
- To meet the future energy demand, the energy generation of existing facilities is increased over time to a predetermined maximum sustainable generating capacity based on the generation configuration. As additional capacity is needed in the future, “new” capacity is added to the most likely to be developed generating configurations, but the “new” generating capacity is not assigned geographically to any specific region within the state.
- The estimated future generating capacity of existing facilities, and associated water requirements, is allocated to regions based on the location of the existing facilities.

Energy Forecast Results

The water users in the energy sector with withdrawals in the Middle Chattahoochee region include Georgia Power Plant Wansley and Southern Power Plant Franklin. The same water withdrawal and consumptive use factors by generating configuration were maintained from the previous forecasting efforts. Table 9 shows the total withdrawal and consumption values for each planning

year for the Council for both the expected and the high growth scenarios. The water withdrawals are higher for the expected growth scenario because the generation configuration is different for each of those scenarios. Under the high growth scenario, a more water efficient power generation configuration is expected to be implemented.

Table 9. Energy Water Withdrawals and Consumption in MGD for the Council

County	2015	2020	2030	2040	2050
Expected Growth Scenario					
Withdrawal	32	33	38	42	44
Consumption	19	19	22	24	26
High Growth Scenario					
Withdrawal	43	42	44	46	47
Consumption	25	24	26	27	28

IX. REGIONAL SUMMARY

The total regional water demand for all sectors is included in Figure 12. This includes municipal, industrial, agricultural, and energy uses for the Middle Chattahoochee Council. The demand is broken down by withdrawal source, including groundwater aquifers and surface water basins. Note that total withdrawals for the expected growth scenario for energy sector demands and the 75th percentile demands for agricultural demands are incorporated into the total demands. The following figure, Figure 13, illustrates total water demand projections by sector. In addition to water demands for irrigation, Figure 13 also includes projected demands for livestock, nurseries, and golf course irrigation.




Figure 12. Water Demand Projections by Source




Figure 13. Water Demand Projections by Sector

The total wastewater forecasts for the Middle Chattahoochee Council are summarized in the following figures. Figure 14 illustrates the total wastewater flows by basin for each planning year, while Figure 15 illustrates future projections by discharge type.




Figure 14. Wastewater Flow Projections by Basin of Discharge




Figure 15. Wastewater Flow Projections by Discharge Type

X. REFERENCES

Black & Veatch. July 2010. *Municipal and Industrial Water and Wastewater Forecasting Memorandum*.

CDM Smith. April 2016. Update of Georgia Energy needs and Generating Facilities.
http://www.georgiawaterplanning.org/documents/Energy_Tech_Memo_102910.pdf

CH2M HILL. March 2008. *Georgia Water Use and Conservation Profiles*.

Fanning, J.L. and V.P. Trent. 2009. *Water Use by County for 2005; Water-Use Trends, 1980-2005*.
United States Geological Survey Publication.