Discussion and Identification of River Basin Plan Recommendations



Policy, Legislative, Regulatory, Technical, and Planning Process Recommendations

The RBC can make specific recommendations for improving the water planning process on both a basin-wide and state level. These recommendations could include:

- 1. Suggestions for improving the river basin planning process;
- 2. Considerations for additional technical information or tools; and
- 3. Potential changes to state **policy** or to the **existing regulatory** or **legislative** environment that would benefit the water planning process.

Planning process recommendations may include, but are not limited to:

- Changes to the RBC membership, bylaws, meeting schedules, or procedures
- Ideas to improve communication among RBCs and other groups
- Funding needs and sources of funding
- Improvements to the public outreach process
- Implementing the River Basin Plan and continued RBC activities and actions

Changes to the RBC membership, bylaws, meeting schedules, or procedures

- Have brief summary of previous meeting at the start of new meeting or re-send the minutes and meeting summaries right before next meeting
- RBCs may develop attendance requirements (warning after 2-3 meetings)

Changes to the RBC membership, bylaws, meeting schedules, or procedures

- Have an initial get to know you meeting on each member's background.
- RBC by-laws incorporate preference to in person attendance with hybrid option as needed
- Rotation of meeting locations if feasible

Ideas to improve communication among RBCs and other groups

- The Edisto, Saluda and Santee RBCs coordinate and participate in future monitoring, planning, modeling, and other activities focused on Calhoun County Groundwater Area of Concern which extends into all three basins.
- Communication from RBC can be communicated to groundwater management groups for Capacity Use Areas through DHEC
- RBC to communicate to Drought Response Committee

Ideas to improve communication among RBCs and other groups

- Communicate to legislative delegation on planning activities throughout process to promote their familiarity in advance of funding requests
 - Develop talking points from RBC for consistency: what we're discussing, when we're meeting, fact that plan represents wide range of interests
 - General assembly, county level, individual communications with elected representatives, etc.

Funding needs and sources of funding for the river basin planning process

- Currently, majority of funding from legislature, USACE funding for planning activities
- Keep river basin planning process fully funded to continue process through life cycle (indefinite)

Improvements to the public outreach process

- Establish professional social media account for RBC activities to engage with public
 - Clemson water center does some of this currently, not specific to Edisto
 - RBC members & DHEC could post on individual accounts with links to additional info
- Municipal RBC members may include inserts with summaries of RBC activities
 - Example: Charleston has citizen education program where they have discussed River Basin Planning Process

Improvements to the public outreach process

Presentations at conferences

Implementing the River Basin Plan and continued RBC activities and actions

- How to assess continuity of RBC membership between 5-year updates?
 - DNR has responsibility for this
 - Learning curve for new members is significant new member orientation of basin strategies and implementation plan
- More frequent meetings (quarterly?) to facilitate implementation and seek funding sources
- Once all river basin plans are developed, should statewide river basin planning meetings occur? This is close to PPAC

Any other recommendations intended to improve the planning process?

Technical and program recommendations may include, but are not limited to:

- Model improvement (accuracy or functionality)
- Need for more data (such as stream gages or monitoring wells)
- Need for additional models to address specific issues
- Improved water use data, population data or estimates, water demand estimates, land use data, etc.
- Recommendations for technical studies to improve knowledge of specific issues
- Need for additional technical training for the RBC members
- Better definition of "unacceptable" impacts to groundwater and surface water resources
- Improved instream flow requirement information

SWAM or Groundwater model improvement (accuracy or functionality)

- SCDNR work with SCDHEC and USGS to carve out a regional groundwater model covering the potential groundwater areas of concern and:
 - Further calibrate the model to local land conditions, including seasonal drawdowns.
 - Evaluate seasonal drawdowns through the planning horizon using the planning scenarios.

Need for more data (such as stream gages or monitoring wells)

- SCDNR work with SCDHEC, USGS and other partners (e.g., property owners, well, owners, Capacity Use Areas) to enhance monitoring capabilities in areas where model simulations indicate potential for water levels to drop below the top of the aquifer.
- Streamflow gage at Four Hole Swamp this has been considered and is challenging, likely not feasible. Perhaps with future advances in technology

Improved water use data, population data or estimates, water demand estimates, land use data, etc.

- Incorporate lessons learned from other basins in future River Basin Plan updates
 - Promote consistency with methodology from basin to basin, allowing basins to use best available local information
- Consideration of future climate projections (temperature, evapotranspiration, precip)

Recommendations for technical studies to improve knowledge of specific issues.

- Consider impacts of land use projections on changes to recharge
- is there documentation of the impacts of the duration of aquifer drawdowns on undesired impacts

Need for additional technical training for the RBC members.

- Demonstration of groundwater model (input parameters, sensitivity to various parameters) in similar manner to the surface water model
- Groundwater and surface water 101: key processes, interpreting results
 - Have a handout
- Hands-on trips to understand various water users (potentially include this under a different recommendation category)
- Readability of slides in meetings

Better definition of "unacceptable" impacts to groundwater and surface water resources.

Improved instream flow requirement information.

Other technical recommendations

• The RBC previously decided not to identify specific groundwater conditions but instead focus on a <u>desired future condition</u> approach in the final Plan recommendations. A <u>desired future condition</u> is long-term management goal for an aquifer.

Examples:

- Limiting drawdowns in a confined aquifer to always maintain X feet above the top of the aquifer
- Limiting seasonal drawdowns in an aquifer to no more than X feet

The RBC needs to identify the desired future conditions.

Other technical recommendations

- Note: If DHEC sees water levels are approaching the top of the aquifer, they would bring to discussions with Capacity Use Areas.
 - New users would be limited before existing users.
 - DHEC considers seasonal aquifer recovery to assess ability of aquifer to rebound to short drawdowns.
- Desired condition to not drop water level below the top of aquifer

Other technical recommendations