



Broad River Basin Council

Meeting #18

February 15, 2024

Broad River Basin Council

February 15, 2024, Meeting Agenda

Meeting Objectives:

- 1) Review comments and finalize responses to the Draft Broad River Basin Plan
- 2) Determine consensus on the Final Plan
- 3) Discuss next steps and RBC membership

1. Call the Meeting to Order (Ken Tuck, RBC Chair) 11:00–11:05
 - a. Review of Meeting Objectives
 - b. Approval of Agenda
 - c. Approval of October 19th, 2023 Minutes and Summary
2. Public Comment (John Boyer) 11:05–11:10
 - a. Public Comment Period¹
 - b. Agency Comment Period
3. Review Comments and Finalize Responses to the Draft Broad River Basin Plan and Executive Summary (John Boyer) 11:10–11:25
4. Determine Consensus on the Final Plan (John Boyer) 11:25–11:35
5. February 20th Public Meeting Reminder (John Boyer) 11:35-11:40
6. Discuss Next Steps and RBC Membership (John Boyer) 11:40–11:55
7. Closing Comments and Adjourn (Ken Tuck) 11:55–12:00

Quorum Determination

Review Meeting Objectives

1. Review comments and finalize responses to the Draft Broad River Basin Plan
2. Determine consensus on the Final Plan
3. Discuss next steps and RBC membership

Approval of Agenda

Approval of October 19th Minutes and Summary

Broad River Basin Council

Meeting #18

February 15, 2024



Public and Agency Comment



Water Availability: Supply and Demand

SURFACE WATER SUMMARY

The Broad River is the main stem of the Broad River basin. The Broad River headwaters originate in North Carolina, and the river discharges into the Saluda River near Columbia. The major tributaries of the Broad River are the Pacolet, Tyger, and Enoree Rivers. The Tyger and Enoree Rivers originate in South Carolina, while the headwaters of the Pacolet River originate in North Carolina. No other river basins flow into the Broad River basin.

Streamflow in the Broad River depends primarily on precipitation and surface runoff (SCDNR 2009). The upper portion of the river, near Gaffney, experiences higher annual rainfall and more significant groundwater discharges to streams, resulting in moderately variable and well-sustained flows. Downstream flows are more variable because of less rainfall and groundwater discharge (SCDNR 2009). Consequently, supplies from these streams may be less reliable during periods of low rainfall. This characteristic becomes more pronounced with increased distance downstream. Streamflow characteristics of the tributaries resemble those of the main stem, with streams draining the upper portion of the subbasin showing the least variability and streams draining the lower portion of the subbasin showing the greatest variability (SCDNR 2009). Because the headwater of the Broad River and several tributaries of the Pacolet River originate in North Carolina, out-of-state withdrawals on the portion of the river have the potential to impact water availability in the Broad River in South Carolina.

What to Know About this Plan

This plan is the second of eight river basin plans to be developed for South Carolina. The Broad RBC, comprising stakeholders representing various water interests, collaborated with South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) and the South Carolina Department of Environment and Health (SCDHEC), and met monthly for almost 2 years. They followed a process of dialogue and actions throughout the basin. Through facilitated dialogue, they discussed and agreed on recommended actions or policies for improved sustainability of water resources in the Broad River.

Review Comments and Finalize Responses to the Draft Broad River Basin Plan and Executive Summary



Public Comments and Responses

Public comments on the Draft Broad River Basin Plan were accepted from November 29th, 2023 through January 19th, 2024. Comments were received from the following:

Angie Price, PE

Renewable Water Resources (ReWa)

Public Comments and Responses

1. In the executive summary, numerous objectives are outlined. Clarification regarding the entities or individuals accountable for these objectives is sought to facilitate public engagement and coordination for implementation. A mechanism to track progress with the implementation of these objectives and measure success would be beneficial to stakeholders.

Response: For brevity, only the objectives and associated strategies and actions to meet those objectives were included in the Plan's Executive Summary. Table 10-2 of the Plan identifies the entities responsible for implementing each action and/or strategy. A note has been added to the Executive Summary to make the reader aware of the additional implementation details that are included in Table 10-2 of the Plan. As part of the Broad RBC's ongoing planning efforts, they will be tracking the implementation of the identified actions and strategies. Progress metrics, which are listed in subchapter 10.3 of the Plan, were selected by the Broad RBC to monitor the success or failure of actions and strategies. The Broad RBC will continue to review the progress metrics to measure the effectiveness of their implementation efforts.

Public Comments and Responses

2. To enhance the River Basin Planning process, it is recommended that additional communication channels be used to share the outcomes of the planning efforts to a broader audience. Please consider the creation of succinct fact sheets or informative short videos to benefit public accessibility throughout the planning process and moving forward.

Response: The RBC appreciates the comment and agrees that reaching a broader audience will be critical during implementation of the Plan. A two-page fact sheet was created to summarize the Plan's key findings and can be found at: [hydrology.dnr.sc.gov/pdfs/basin-planning/broad/Broad RBP Summary Sheet.pdf](https://hydrology.dnr.sc.gov/pdfs/basin-planning/broad/Broad%20RBP%20Summary%20Sheet.pdf). The RBC will consider creating additional facts sheets, videos, or other methods to improve accessibility and public understanding as they continue to meet during the implementation phase.

Public Comments and Responses

3. ReWa supports the establishment of a model riparian buffer ordinance, aligning with recommendations included in the Policy, Legislative, Technical, and Planning Process section. Significant streambank erosion, particularly in the Enoree River sub-basin, poses a threat to wastewater infrastructure. Protecting streambanks through natural vegetative growth not only benefits water quality but also safeguards essential infrastructure. The Plan suggests that either the Broad RBC or PPAC take the lead in developing the model ordinance. For optimal implementation, local government representatives should be involved in the development process and targeted as stakeholders for communication and education initiatives of the Broad RBC.

Response: The RBC appreciates the comment.

Public Comments and Responses

4. ReWa fully supports water reuse as a potential strategy to “reduce demands on surface water and groundwater” ultimately extending source water supplies. The challenges posed by contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) are an issue common to many source waters, not exclusively to reuse water. Like other water sources, reuse water has been impacted by the prevalence of contaminants of emerging concern in our daily lives. A continued focus on source control, research, and affordable treatment methods is essential to ensure that all water resources are protected including reuse water. Preserving water reuse as a viable and sustainable option in the long-term is imperative.

Response: The RBC appreciates the comment.

Additional Executive Summary Comments from RBC

1. The picture labels are a bit hard to read when the document is printed out. Might use a heavier font.
2. Surface Water Summary on p. 11 of the Exec. Summary
 - 2nd paragraph, last sentence – “headwaters” needs to be plural.
 - Last line right above Table ES-1 – Change “flood control” to “flood management”. There are no flood control reservoirs in this river basin.
3. Water Demand Summary, p. 14 – Shouldn’t we make it clear that the demands shown throughout the report are gross water uses (i.e., there are also wastewater returns)? We don’t speak much about the returns in the report. In the Catawba Basin, we tend to talk more about net withdrawals, so those numbers will be much lower than these when the actual gross withdrawals are likely higher. Just thinking about readers that perhaps have never thought about the difference.
4. Table ES-2 (p. 19), 2nd row – change “of Water Conservation” to “on Water Conservation”



Determine Consensus on the Final Plan

Decision Making – River Basin Plan Approval Process

Step 1

- Testing for consensus of **Draft Plan**

Five Point Rating Scale

1

Full Endorsement

2

Endorsement, but with minor points of contention

3

Endorsement, but with major points of contention

4

Stand aside with major reservations (requires changes)

5

Withdrawal (Member leaves)

Step 2

- For the **Final Plan**, each RBC Member will indicate their **support** or **disagreement**
- By supporting the **Final Plan**, each member acknowledges their:
 - Concurrence with the Plan
 - Commitment to support implementation of the Plan

Consensus on Final Broad River Basin Plan

| RBC Member Name | | Draft Plan Level of Endorsement | Final Plan Level of Support |
|-----------------|------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| John | Alexander | 1 | Support |
| Daniel | Hanks | 1 | <i>Not in attendance</i> |
| James | Kilgo | 1 | <i>Not in attendance</i> |
| Angus | Lafaye | 1 | Support |
| Amy | Bresnahan | 1 | Support |
| Jeff | Lineberger | 1 | Support |
| Kristen | Austin | 2 | <i>Not in attendance</i> |
| Erika | Hollis | 2 | Support |
| Bill | Stangler | 2 | Support |
| Paul | Pruitt | 1 | Support |
| Mark | Boland | 1 | Support |
| Frank | Eskridge | 1 | Support |
| Bryant | Fleming | 1 | Support |
| Ken | Tuck | 1 | Support |
| Jeff | Walker | 2 | <i>Not in attendance</i> |
| Karen Swank | Kustafik | 1 | Support |
| Justin | McGrady | 1 | Support |



February 20th Public Meeting Reminder

Agenda Item 5

Public Meeting

Tuesday, February 20
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

**The River Center –
 Saluda Shoals Park
 5605 Bush River Rd.
 Columbia, SC 29212**

| Topic | Speaker | Time |
|--|--|-------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | Ken Tuck, RBC Chair | 6:00 - 6:10 |
| 2. Overview of the Planning Process | Ken Rentiers, SCDNR and Jeff Lineberger, RBC Member | 6:10 - 6:20 |
| 3. Draft Broad River Basin Plan Highlights | | 6:20 - 7:20 |
| a. Vision and Goals | Jeff Lineberger, RBC Member | |
| b. Water Demands | John Boyer, RBC Facilitator | |
| c. Surface Water Availability | John Boyer, RBC Facilitator | |
| d. Streamflow-Ecology Relationships | Dr. Daniel Hanks, RBC Vice Chair | |
| e. Water Management Strategies | Frank Eskridge, RBC Member | |
| f. Plan Recommendations | Ken Tuck, RBC Chair | |
| g. Issues and Challenges | Ken Tuck, RBC Chair | |
| h. Implementation Plan | Ken Tuck, RBC Chair | |
| 4. Summary of Draft Plan Comments and Responses | John Boyer, RBC Facilitator | 7:20 - 7:30 |
| 5. Public Comment Period and Questions and Answers | Dr. Jeff Allen, Clemson University | 7:30 - 8:00 |



Discuss Next Steps and RBC Membership

Agenda Item 6

RBC Term Limits

| RBC Member Name | | RBC Term | Interest in Continuing? |
|-----------------|------------|----------|-------------------------|
| John | Alexander | 4 | |
| Daniel | Hanks | 3 | |
| James | Kilgo | 2 | <i>No in attendance</i> |
| Angus | Lafaye | 3 | |
| Amy | Bresnahan | 2 | Yes |
| Jeff | Lineberger | 3 | |
| Kristen | Austin | 4 | |
| Erika | Hollis | 2 | Yes |
| Bill | Stangler | 2 | Undecided |
| Paul | Pruitt | 4 | |
| Mark | Boland | 4 | |
| Frank | Eskridge | 4 | |
| Bryant | Fleming | 3 | |
| Ken | Tuck | 3 | |
| Jeff | Walker | 3 | |
| Karen Swank | Kustafik | 2 | Yes |
| Justin | McGrady | 2 | No |



Closing Comments and Adjourn

Ken Tuck, RBC Chair