

Upper Savannah River Basin Council

**June 12, 2024 Meeting Minutes**

**RBC Members Present:** Daniel Milam, Reagan Osbon, Alan Stuart, Mark Warner, Harry Shelley, John Hains, Mack Beaty, Chuck Connolly, Jill Miller, Dan Murph, Tonya Winbush, Billy Owens, Tonya Bonitatibus, Cole Rogers, Cheryl Daniels, & Scott Willett

**RBC Members Absent:** Jon Batson (Maria Akridge, alternate, present), Jeff Phillips (Elizabeth Pierczynski, alternate, present), Tim Hall, Katie Hottel, Carl Price, Melisa Ramey, & Will Williams

**Planning Team Present:** John Boyer, Ashley Reid, Tom Walker, Scott Harder, Leigh Anne Monroe, Hannah Hartley, Alexis Modzelesky, Andy Wachob, & Jeff Allen

**Total Present: 35**

1. Call the Meeting to Order (Jill Miller, RBC Chair) 10:00–10:10
  - a. Review of Meeting Objectives
  - b. Approval of Agenda
    - i. Agenda approved
  - c. Approval of May 8<sup>th</sup> Minutes and Summary
    - i. minutes approved
  - d. Announcements and Housekeeping Items
    - i. Bathroom location because of alternates
    - ii. Q: Do we have a quorum? A: yes, alternates count as part of the quorum
  
2. Public Comment (Ashley Reid) 10:10–10:15
  - a. Public Comment Period
    - i. none
  - b. Agency Comment Period
    - i. none
  
3. May RBC Meeting Review (Ashley Reid and John Boyer) 10:15–10:20
  - a. 11<sup>th</sup> meeting
  - b. May meeting topics and discussion
    - i. Synthetic/extended drought analysis
    - ii. Safe yield of reservoirs
    - iii. Drought impacts to agriculture in the Upstate
    - iv. Lessons learned by urban water systems experiencing drought
    - v. RBC’s drought response obligations
      1. Collecting and evaluating local hydrologic info for drought assessment
      2. Providing local drought info and recommendations to the DRC regarding drought declarations

3. Communicating drought conditions and drought declarations to the rest of the RBC, stakeholders, and the public
  4. Advocating for a coordinated, basin-wide response by entities with drought management responsibilities
  5. Coordinating with other drought management groups in the basin as needed
4. Updates to Surface Water Analyses (Kirk Westphal and John Boyer) 10:20-10:50
- a. Extended Drought Analysis Incorporating Lake Levels Important for Recreation
    - i. Synthetic drought
    - ii. Resequencing historical flows to investigate potential future droughts
      1. Methods
        - a. Supply-side investigation to quantify sensitivities to hydrologic non-stationarity
        - b. Repeating sequences of monthly flows and reservoir evaporation rates
        - c. 2070 high demand scenario projection
        - d. Current reservoir operation rules
        - e. 3 constructed scenarios
          - i. Repeating 5-year drought, splicing 5 driest water years
          - ii. Repeating single-year drought, 2<sup>nd</sup> driest water year
          - iii. Repeating synthetic drought year, splicing 12 driest calendar month flows
        - f. Ranked data based on mainstem headwater flows, reference data, precipitation
      2. Critical recreation access levels
        - a. Boating access- level at which 70% of boat access points remain usable
        - b. Swimming access- level at which all USACE-operated swimming areas are dry
        - c. Hartwell and Thurmond- boat/ swimming levels above Deadpool. Others equal to Deadpool
        - d. Thurmond boat ramp elevations
        - e. % of simulation months does each lake drop below recreational access levels
          - i. C: Better than I thought, thought it would be worse (boat access)
          - ii. Q: is this based on the recreation season or every month of the year?  
A: yes, every month of the year. Might be better to look at just recreation season because there is not a lot of boating in February
          - iii. C: April – October would be interesting to see

- iv. C: Not many private swimming areas, some state parks, but mostly USACE
- v. Q: Bring both sides to Upper Savannah – summer and winter?
- vi. A: Yes
- f. Lake Thurmond Graphs
  - i. 2001-2009. For both current use and P&R scenarios, lake levels fall below boating access level for a maximum duration of 7 months in 2008
  - ii. 5 driest water years- shortages appear
  - iii. 2008 hydrology- shortages appear
  - iv. Driest months- shortages after month 17
  - v. C: when Thurmond hits a dead pool, all flow in the Savannah River comes from Lake Hartwell
- g. Lake Hartwell graphs
  - i. Water levels fell below boating access level in 2001, 2002, 2007-2009
  - ii. Shortages for all 3 scenarios
  - iii. Haven't assumed any drought management plans
  - iv. ARJWS- voluntary restrictions, voluntary + mandatory restrictions on nonessential water use 10% reduction, mandatory restrictions 20% reduction
  - v. Example drought plan triggers
  - vi. Typical drought ordinance
    - 1. Elliot's drought management manual
  - vii. Would RBC like additional analysis
    - 1. Testing effectiveness of existing drought plans? Yes. As you get into a drought, increased water usage is needed because people anticipate restrictions. Assume demand reduction goals are achieved; may not be fair
      - C: I certainly would. Summertime makes a difference as well
      - C: Rest of our drought triggers is below boat level
      - C: Could look at changing trigger levels scenario
      - C: Seasonal peaks for golf
      - C: Demands go up in early drought (incipient)
      - C: When we renegotiated with USACE biological assessment. Funding from Duke to USACE to extend boat ramps (\$2 million)
      - C: This was 2012

- C: This was after 2012
  - C: Follow up with the USACE to see if they'd changed
  - C: On GA side extended boat ramp
  - C: Nothing on my side
  - C: Seneca Creek ramp got done
  - C: Would be interesting to look at it
  - C: Changed wording in our plan trigger levels didn't change
  - C: 2017 we got to drought stage 4
  - C: Did users reduce demand?
  - C: Didn't track
  - 2. Testing the effectiveness of different drought plan triggers and/or demand reduction goals?
    - a. C: Don't adjust triggers north or above the levels at which the corps operates for seasonal flood variation.
  - 3. Now, just looking at existing plans
    - a. Q: tied in Duke Energy's plan with the Army Corps?  
A: yes
  - 4. Q: Thoughts on synthetic drought analysis?  
A: Did an approximation of what I was looking for. Ya it did at that 4<sup>th</sup> year it would tip us into a problem. Close to having a problem.
- iii. What are the impacts on the LSS under the synthetic/ extended drought scenarios?
- 1. Lake Thurmond release. 2070 high demand scenario 2001-2010
    - a. Drought scenario 1: Release remains consistent
    - b. Drought scenario 2: not able to release
    - c. Drought scenario 3: no release or small release
    - d. C: even when you get to the dead pool, they're going to keep releasing. Not realistic
    - e. Q: when they get to the dead pool, is it in and out, or is that the stage before? A: not true. Previously thought before they did a study
    - f. C: not 3600 out of Thurmond, 3600 at Augusta dam, have to include other inputs
    - g. C: balance the lakes until they exhaust the conservation pool at Thurmond
    - h. C: presentation they made in Augusta; all that info is in the PowerPoint
  - 2. LSRB drought scenario 2

3. LSRB drought scenario 3
- iv. Discussions and limitations
  1. Triggers conditioned upon flow in Broad River
  2. Reservoir operations play a role, primarily with respect to the location of shortages
  3. No attempts have been made to directly incorporate future hydrologic or climate projections
  4. Neglects changes in groundwater-surface water interactions
    - a. C: Table month February with NMFs approval, is that assumed?
    - b. C: In past hasn't been a good assumption
    - c. C: Stays at 3600
    - d. C: Worst case would be if they kept it at 3600 and didn't approve
    - e. C: Critical sturgeon spawning time (February)
    - f. C: Shad and Stripers as well not just sturgeon
    - g. Those are fish and wildlife oversight. Sturgeon is NMFs responsibility
- b. Update on Safe Yield of Major Reservoirs
  - i. Concepts and purpose
    1. See how much water is physically available during times of stress
  - ii. Method
    1. SWAM model to simulate high withdrawals
  - iii. Upper Reservoirs
    1. Bad Creek Reservoir, Lake Jocassee, Lake Keowee
    2. Intake elevations and prior results
    3. Lake Keowee (as a system with Bad Creek and Jocassee)- Baseline safe yield
      - a. Baseline: 276 mgd, 2070 HD: 271 mgd, permitted and registered: 235 mgd
  - iv. Lower USACE Reservoirs
    1. Lakes Hartwell, Russell, and Thurmond
    2. Lake Hartwell
      - a. Baseline: 687 mgd, 2070 HD: 567 mgd, permitted and registered: 484 mgd
      - b. Intake based on WS Pioneer
    3. Lake Russell
      - a. Intake based on Hydro Ops
      - b. Baseline: 1750 mgd, 2070 HD: 1709 mgd, permitted and registered: 1649 mgd
      - c. Q: looking at Thurmond as an overall system? A: yes. Safe yield for Thurmond was an order of magnitude lower than Hartwell, which was curious. Neither Hartwell nor Russell support Thurmond and Thurmond has some significant downstream release requirements. Experimenting with

different release rates from Hartwell to see if it has impact on Thurmond, it does

- d. C: Corps wants to keep as much water upstream as they can because its useful to the basin on demand. Q: would it be interesting to show it both ways?
- e. C: try to keep the lakes together until Thurmond gets exhausted
- f. C: Hartwell just completed a bathymetry study, showing 10% less yield. Have siltation

*Break*

*10:50–11:00*

5. Development of Drought Management and Response Strategies and Recommendations (Ashley Reid and John Boyer) 11:00–12:00

- a. Specific drought response-related obligations of the RBC
- b. Planning framework outline for chapter 8 drought response
  - i. Summarize existing drought plans and drought advisory groups
  - ii. Summarize any drought response initiative developed by the RBC
  - iii. List recommendations on drought management or drought management strategies
  - iv. Include a communication plan to inform stakeholders and the public on current drought conditions and activities regarding drought response
- c. SC Drought Response Committee
  - i. 4 drought management areas, state agency members, and representatives
  - ii. Haven't met this year – State committee only meets when needed. USDM uses spatial data. State goes county by county
  - iii. US is in West DMA
- d. Drought response communication plan
  - i. How does the RBC want to communicate to the rest of the RBC, public, and stakeholders?
    - 1. Suggested approach: RBC Chair/ Vice Chair solicits inputs from RBC members on drought conditions and responses for their location and interests-> RBC Chair/ Vice Chair compiles drought info from RBC members-> RBC Chair reports to West DMA representatives and DRC -> DRC/ SCDNR have existing mechanisms to communicate with stakeholders and public
      - a. C: Chair and VC compile info and report up is essentially what the committee already does. Each committee member represents a sector/ use/ type of agency. Lack of info stops the committee from taking action, but this method duplicates the very purpose of having a DRC

- b. C: The planning framework envisioned that RBCs would provide input. It may be somewhat repetitive
  - c. C: Have RBC replace gubernatorially appointed members. Need to integrate planning.
  - d. C: Replace RBC with DMA
  - e. Q: are you going to lose certain groups of people? A: stakeholder groups are broken up differently in DMA
  - f. C: DMA is never fully staffed because it's gubernatorially appointed. Takes almost a governor's term to get someone appointed. Could pick a committee from RBCs that is representative
  - g. C: have members that take forever to get appointed and then don't know what to do
  - h. C: flat organization, what value do RBCs add if they're active in their areas? If you are going to fund/staff RBCs, which is the only way to get a real water plan, eliminate DMA
  - i. Q: could it be a subcommittee of the council? A: yes, maybe 4-5 or 8 members
  - j. Q: what about having standing members on DMA elected from RBC? Would that solve representation issues? A: difficult to keep DMA staffed because it's overly prescriptive. May not have someone that fits the description. Hope may not want to deal with 8 basins, currently deals with 4 DMAs.
  - k. C: revisit the Drought Response Act
  - l. Q: if you made this change, would it have to be a statewide change? A: yes, we would have to change Drought Response Act
2. Another approach: ask Scott, Mark, or Cheryl because they sit on the DMA to help compile info
  3. Put together some language for a recommendation for next meeting, then make a motion to approve it
    - a. Q: can you give us a copy of the act? A: yes
    - b. Q: Are DMA members able to make equitable and well-informed decisions for the entire basin based on the current geographic boundaries? A: They will make drought designations by county; they get voted on and approved.
    - c. C: RBC members have 2-4 year terms. Most RBCs have gotten to renewals. Broad and Edisto have, and most of them have been willing to stay on, but that might not

- always happen. People might drop out, and you have to replace them.
- d. C: for large sectors like ag, forestry and fisheries, there are permanent members from the state that represent those interests
4. Scott's suggestion eliminates the need for a communication plan; other than how do RBC drought committee members get info to other RBC members?
- a. Pee Dee had a suggestion for a subcommittee within RBC to deal with drought issues? No one remembers this
    - i. (later) There is a recommendation related to a subcommittee within the RBC but most of the language is dealing with basin specific drought coordination, not state level drought coordination
  - b. Edisto and Broad: Chairs/ Vice Chairs collect info, report to DMA, report to DRC
  - c. Q: can we add a recommendation that communication with the public/ stakeholders includes widgets that can be embedded on other websites/ news agencies? A: hold that thought/come back to it
- ii. Does the RBC want to develop any drought management or response strategies or make recommendations to adjust any existing strategies?
- 1. Already have very well-vetted drought management strategies
    - a. Keowee-Toxaway low inflow protocol triggers/ parameters
    - b. USACE drought contingency plans
  - 2. USACE drought trigger action levels
    - a. C: In drought, why do they lower the lake in winter?
    - b. C: Difference in foot drop between level 2 and 3. Would like them to take a look at the study because issues with GA. Would help re-evaluate alternative 2
    - c. C: Comp study needs to be finished; lower river wasn't taken into account
    - d. C: Pick up Army Corps comp study because they ran out of money
    - e. C: GA wanted more modeling – stuck with 2012
    - f. C: new harbor deepening, without comp study, you're going to have a bunch of projects that are working in vacuums and the comp study is your opportunity to pull that into the management of the rest of the basin
    - g. C: every time you wanted to do something you had to do an environmental assessment.
    - h. Could do SWAM model to test alternatives

- i. Q: alternative 2 from the Comp 2 study from 7-8 years ago? A: yes ended in 2017
  - j. C: DNR involved in Comp 2 study, chose alt 2, not sure if GA ever formally recommended it or not. SEPA killed it because they felt that it affected their ability to generate power/ revenue.
  - k. C: people are saying it didn't do a thorough job downstream, but they did
  - l. C: they didn't choose the recommendation and did not take it into consideration. Management currently on the lakes is only focused on power generation and public water supply. During spawning other than sturgeon, maintains a pool for spawning fish.
  - m. C: USACE should restart comp study
  - n. C: outflow does not equal inflow at level 4
- 3. C: Both sides of the Savannah River should be meeting during droughts
  - a. C: GA side should be involved in decision-making
- 4. C: Keowee has triggers that might come at a different time. How do we work with them?
  - a. C: made a subcommittee for the basin and the drought subcommittee helps coordinate efforts for all utilities to give the same message
  - b. C: "we have a well-managed utility, and our messages shouldn't be affected by a mismanaged utility." How do we support their efforts to get consistent outreach messaging and drought plans?
    - i. C: Broad had monthly water utilities meetings to discuss water utility issues.
  - c. Q: is there value in a US subcommittee that meets with the LS to make sure we have the same messages? A: good topic for the interbasin council meeting.
  - d. C: when we get into a drought and want water use reductions, basin boundaries almost evaporate because messaging happens in media markets. Better to align with Greenville media market (Greenville, Anderson, Spartanburg) than Beaufort and Jasper.
    - i. C: everyone should be aware of what the other is going through. Happens in 4 vacuums currently
- iii. Does the RBC want to develop recommendations on drought management?
  - 1. Example drought response recommendations

- a. Water utilities review/ update their drought management plans every 5 years or more frequently if needed
  - i. C: Greenville last update was in 2008.  
Recommended to be 3-5 years
  - ii. C: Larger utilities more likely to update their plans
  - iii. C: Ex: After a large customer comes in perhaps revisit plan
  - iv. Q: are you asking us to make these recommendations today or are you just introducing us? A: If I see that the members are behind it, we'll make a motion to adopt this recommendation and put it in the plan. If not, we'll change some of the language or think about it for a month
  - v. Q: should we introduce anything with interbasin transfer? A: like a bullet point as to why an update might be needed if there's a new or proposed interbasin transfer. Yes, seems like a good idea
  - vi. C: Upper Basin in GA has it if interbasin transfer is proposed, they want to be notified. C: this is more of a technical recommendation (chapter 9) not a drought recommendation (chapter 8)
  - vii. Move to adopt 1 – utilities update plan. Approved
  - viii. 1<sup>st</sup> – Mark Warner and 2<sup>nd</sup> – Reagan Osbon
- b. Water utilities look for opportunities to develop response actions that are consistent with those of neighboring utilities
  - i. C: Not all RBCs adopted this one
  - ii. C: Do we want to encourage utilities to have consistent response actions?
  - iii. C: Neighboring doesn't mean everyone in the basin
  - iv. C: encouraging consistency makes messaging easy but doesn't adequately reflect investments made by different utilities. Held to the commonality of utilities that invest the least. Bad to race to the bottom
  - v. C: should support the message and avoid conflicting messages
  - vi. Q: is there a benefit for the utilities to share and make that into a place that's accessible for others? A: Make it so others can replicate what fits them. A: SC climate office has a drought page where all the utilities post their drought plans

- vii. C: we should promote collaboration, communication, and implementation with each other
  - viii. C: have some redundancies built into the basin already
  - ix. C: 2 different conversations, response actions and communications. Need to define what we're talking about
  - x. C: Broad thought this was a good idea because there were neighboring utilities both getting into a drought phase, but one utility was calling for mandatory restrictions on lawn watering while it wasn't, and people were confused. Make public actions consistent
  - xi. C: don't think that the way this is written is going to hurt utilities that are set up well
  - xii. C: This is getting in the weeds for the non-water utilities members
  - xiii. C: utilities are going to do what they want to do anyways
  - xiv. C: use bolded statement, added "where possible". Utilities looking for opportunities, not prescribing/mandating
  - xv. Q: when would it be not possible? A: when you can't have a response action that's similar to your neighbors. Like someone having an action level that's way more aggressive than other utilities
  - xvi. It is our recommendation as BMP
  - xvii. Motion to include as written (Bolded). Approved
  - xviii. 1<sup>st</sup> – Alan Stuart and 2<sup>nd</sup> – Mark Warner/Mack Beaty
- c. RBC recommends that water utilities coordinate, to the extent practical, their drought response messaging
- i. C: Broad already has water utilities meet monthly and collaborate on outreach mechanisms
  - ii. Crossed out explanation
  - iii. C: consistency very important
  - iv. C: coordinate the message that you're saying the same thing
  - v. Q: what does coordinate mean? A: making sure you're saying the same thing. That could be more

consistent, coordination could be send each other messages, doesn't mean they match

- vi. Erased explanation
  - vii. C: have to have consistency to be able to do coordination
  - viii. C: it's also a cost savings mechanism, if one utility has really good marketing materials and can share
  - ix. C: Broad collectively puts up billboards that they all contributed to. Leveraging an existing mechanism-monthly meeting. Doesn't happen in US
  - x. Q: do you have informal or formal meetings with wholesale customers? A: each one has a seat on the board, so we meet with them once a month
  - xi. Motion to include as written. 1<sup>st</sup> – Mack Beaty and 2<sup>nd</sup> – Daniel Milam
  - xii. Q: who are these recommendations going to? A: individual recommendation will go into RBC water plan and state water plan if there's consistent recommendations between 8 RBCs
  - xiii. Q: were struggling to develop the words. When were all gone, is there going to be a narrative that it defines what the intent was? A: what the language below was, we could add it back in. in chapter 8, there was that small narrative. We can add it based on the discussion, if its useful. State water plan will have a narrative
  - xiv. C: once it's in a plan, it triggers state/ federal funds. In GA, seed grants are based on recommendations in the regional plan. Nothing like that in SC. FEMA is a FED example to help communities w/ flooding or drought. Need it in plan. BRIC funding now includes drought
  - xv. Approved
- d. RBC encourages water utilities to consider drought surcharges on water use during severe and/or extreme drought phases
- i. Equitability of different rate structures and whether a drought surcharge impacts low-income users
  - ii. Intent of drought surcharges is only when you get to moderate/ extreme drought level would rates increase on higher tiers of water usage

- iii. Incentive to use less water
  - iv. C: utilities might not have power to change their rates
  - v. C: have rate structure in the table refer to the rate structure in the ordinance
  - vi. C: tiered rate structure no matter whether you're in a drought, disincentivize water use
  - vii. Q: is there proof that this is effective? A: I don't know
  - viii. C: some utilities consider it as one tool in the toolbox
  - ix. Q: Can we get DNR to get a breakdown of how it's worked for counties? A: not sure it has been in practice too much
  - x. C: increasing block and drought surcharge. Both works to reduce unnecessary water use
  - xi. C: need to discourage decreasing block rate structures. Put this in the technical recommendation section, not the drought section
  - xii. McCormick example
  - xiii. Motion to approve – 1<sup>st</sup> – Harry Shelley and 2<sup>nd</sup> – Dan Murph - approved
- e. When droughts occur, the RBC encourages water users to submit drought impact observations through CMOR
- i. Nationwide utility where anyone can log drought conditions in your area
  - ii. Can see demo of it in next meeting
  - iii. C: if all RBCs adopted this, this would be one way to communicate and gather info
  - iv. Ask RBC members to put in observations and have their network put in observations, which would grow the amount of observations
  - v. Used when developing Missouri's state water plan
  - vi. Motion to approve – 1<sup>st</sup> Dan Murph and 2<sup>nd</sup> Daniel Milam accepted
2. Any other drought recommendations?
- a. Q: is there an agricultural plan if were in a drought? A: we use very little water in this region. Each operation has their own plan  
C: In Edisto, farmers supplement with irrigation water. They developed low flow management strategy

*Lunch*

*12:00–12:30*

6. Development of Technical, Program, Policy, Legislative, and Regulatory Recommendations (Ashley Reid and John Boyer) 12:30–1:50  
TABLED
  - a. Once recommendations are developed, we have to put together an implementation plan
    - i. Supposed to focus on water management strategies. We didn't pick one because under the 2070 high demand scenario, there were no shortages or risks to address
  - b. Explaining how we are going about these for July/ August meetings
  - c. Ideas about how the planning process works, technical recommendations (future studies, monitoring data, widgets), potential changes to state policy or existing regulatory or legislative environment
  - d. Planning process recommendations
    - i. Changes to RBC membership, bylaws, meeting schedules or procedures
    - ii. Ideas to improve communication
    - iii. Funding
    - iv. Improvements to public outreach process
    - v. Implementing RBP and continued RBC activities and actions
    - vi. Examples of recommendations from Edisto and Broad Basins
  - e. Technical and program recommendations
    - i. Need more data
    - ii. Model improvement
    - iii. Need for additional models
    - iv. Improved data
    - v. Recommendations for technical studies
    - vi. Need for additional technical training
    - vii. Improved instream flow requirement info
  - f. Policy, legislative or regulatory recommendations
    - i. Modifications to existing state. Local laws
    - ii. New state or local laws, regulations or ordinances
    - iii. Ideas for recurring funding for water planning work
    - iv. Restructuring existing groups or agencies
7. Upcoming Meeting Schedule, Topics, and Draft Chapter Review Schedule (Ashley Reid and John Boyer) 1:50–2:00
  - a. Other RBCs taking off July because attendance will be down.
  - b. Move to DHEC also happening July 1<sup>st</sup>, they need a break
  - c. Most people available

- d. Q: will it mess up the schedule? A: only on meeting 12, but we've accomplished most of what we wanted to do in the 1<sup>st</sup> 3 phases. Each phase is 6 months, so we're ahead. 2-year schedule assumes looking at groundwater and surface water
- e. Meeting on July 10<sup>th</sup>
  - i. DNR not able to provide lunch
  - ii. Maybe potluck? We'll figure it out
- f. Cancel August or wait until July? Wait until July
- g. We're putting together drafts of the RBP chapters. May be able to review in July, more likely August
- h. Start working on recommendations
- i. Making great progress

Minutes: Taylor Le Moal and Tom Walker

Approved: July 10, 2024

RBC Chat:

11:02:16 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:  
break until 11

11:02:18 From Tonya Winbush ~ USRBC to Everyone:  
Ok

11:02:19 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:  
11:15

11:02:24 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:  
argh 11:15

12:12:50 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:  
break for lunch - return 12:30 about 20 min break

13:20:34 From Tonya Winbush ~ USRBC to Everyone:  
Is there any proof that this is an effective measure

13:51:58 From Tonya Winbush ~ USRBC to Everyone:  
Thanks

13:52:10 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:  
meeting adjourned