

Lower Savannah-Salkehatchie River Basin Council

April 3, 2025 Meeting Minutes

RBC Members Present: Pete Nardi, Joey Oswald, Kari Foy, Bill Wabbersen, Reid Pollard, Brad O’Neal, Sara O’Connor, John Carman, Courtney Kimmel, Ken Caldwell, Lynn McEwen, Jeff Hynds, Brandon Stutts, Tommy Paradise, Will Williams, Leslie Dickerson, Brad Young, & Taylor Brewer

RBC Members Absent: Danny Black (Kathy Rhoad, alternate, present), Brian Chemsak, Austin Connelly, Sam Grubbs, Larry Hayden, Heyward Horton, & Dean Moss

Planning Team Present: Tom Walker, John Boyer, Joe Koon, Scott Harder, Alexis Modzelesky, Andy Wachob, Leigh Anne Monroe, Hannah Hartley, Alex Floyd, & Kirk Westphal

Total Present: 31

1. Call the Meeting to Order (Kari Foy, RBC Chair) 10:00–10:10
 - a. Review of Meeting Objectives
 - b. Approval of Agenda
 - i. Agenda approved
 - ii. Lynn McEwen – 1st and Ken Caldwell – 2nd
 - c. Approval of March 6th Minutes and Summary
 - i. Minutes approved
 - ii. Ken Caldwell – 1st and Bill Wabbersen – 2nd
 - d. Newsworthy Items [**Discussion Item**]
 - i. Can change if it is too cold or hot
 - ii. WaterSC listening sessions
 1. 4/8 6-8 pm Penn Center
 2. 4/9 6-8 pm Clemson’s Pee Dee Research and Education Center
 3. 4/10 6-8 pm Greenville ReWa
 4. Encourage everyone to come if they can and spread the word
 5. Will not be live streamed
 6. Q: format the same? A: it should be
 - iii. Savannah River Site Tour
 1. 4/22
 2. Acceptable ID: US passport/ passport card, REAL ID license or ID card, enhanced driver’s license, HSPD-12 PIV card, DoD Common Access Card

3. Jeff sent out the proposed agenda
4. Will send out agenda and directions
5. Have to go to the website and do a background check to register
6. Q: is there a list of those who signed up to make sure everyone has registered correctly? A: should get a confirmation email after registering. Jeff sent a list
7. Jeff will send out a 1 pager with acceptable forms of ID and a map
8. Q: any clothing requirements? A: no
9. Contraband list
10. Need to be there 9:15
- iv. US public meeting
 1. 4/21
 2. Not live streamed
 3. Can send out presentation slides
- v. Federal judge's decision in GA
 1. Settled a lawsuit related to Atlanta's municipal water system
 2. AL had sued to reduce the take
 3. Judge sided with EPA
 4. 6 southern states have sued each other over water in the last 2 decades
 5. Been discussions awhile back over interbasin transfers in Charlotte area
 6. All involve surface water
2. Public and Agency Comment Period (John Boyer) 10:10–10:15
 - a. none
3. March Meeting Review (John Boyer) 10:15–10:20
 - a. Main focus working on recommendations
 - b. Sent chapter 9 draft
 - c. Planning process, technical, and policy/ legislative/ regulatory recommendations
 - d. Planning process recommendations
 - i. C: no comments
 - ii. C: some corrections and comments. Some spelling errors and comments on yellow buckets
 - iii. After this meeting, will finalize the draft chapter for review
 - e. Technical recommendations
 - i. C: I think we're comfortable with these recommendations. Where our concern would be is South Carolina is functional now. Everyone has water now, and if we are planning for however many more million people to move to South Carolina, at what point is the ratio gonna get out of balance.
Right now, there is, you know, we can all manage this relationship between urban and rural, you know, if you just split it between that you

know. I think we need to, you know, as a group, consider what we want South Carolina to look like.

Because how we write this, and where we allocate this water, whether we restrict it to one industry or put it in another industry, we may offset the balance of why people want to come to this State. While we love the State like it is, you know, do we want to keep South Carolina looking like it is today. I think that we need to be very careful with how we steer this, because water ultimately will be the limiting factor that could control urban sprawl. You know, at some point when it's no longer economically feasible to farm, we will sell our land to developers. That is the reality. It's not what we want to do but the land will go to the highest and best use. I mean, that's it's just how things work.

If we can keep Ag economically feasible, Ag can offset some urban growth. You know, we can have some wild areas, you know. We can have woods.

You know, cause it's hard to expect public funds to support all of these wild areas, or you know like an open land trust. You know we do a lot with open land trust, but there's only so many funds and you need some money-making entities that it's in their best interest to keep things wild and open. For that to happen, you know, we have to have water.

One thing to always remember about ag, water cost ag money to use it and so no farmers want to pump any more than they have to.

You know we were talking about it. We equate it to like paying taxes. You know, nobody in this room says man I hope I can go pay a lot of taxes next year.

It's the same thing on the farm with water. We do not desire to pump water. We would prefer just to get showers only when we need them and never spend the money pumping and building the infrastructure.

You know, in our world, typically, we lose more money from too much water.

That's the reality we live in.

And so, we really don't want to irrigate.

It's not an efficient way to grow crops, you know we would prefer not to have to irrigate, or we want to irrigate as little as possible.

And you know, and it's and so my concerns were not with the specifics. My concern was more of just like the global trajectory of how we're shaping this. And just to make sure that we're keeping South Carolina, you know, right now, South Carolina is very functional. I think it's beautiful, and obviously other people want to come here.

So, I would hope that we could be smart about it and steer this ship so that it stays like it is. That's really my whole 2 cents.

- ii. C: we are not a political body; we are an advisory board. The whole report is chapter 5 which talks about quantity. Can determine if there is enough water to meet projection demands. Chapter 5 is the original mission
 - iii. C: at some point there's going to be lawsuits between ag and municipalities and ag will lose
 - iv. C: ag is an important part of the economy, ag lobbyists are powerful
 - v. C: if there's adequate water then these are political decisions, not water decisions. A: what he's saying is that if we allocate water where ag is impacted then it could be a problem.
 - vi. C: have to decide what's going to be more prioritized. A: policy recommendation
- f. Policy recommendation
- i. C: Want to make a recommendation that directs the state's policy towards development. A: we're in a relationship with the land and we have to wrap our minds around having a relationship with other industries. We don't know what relationship we are going to need in the future
 - ii. Chapter 3 talks about concerns
 - iii. C: what Brad is suggesting shouldn't be tucked away in chapter 3
 - iv. C: couple of years ago, State Sen. Tom Davis got County Green Space Sales and Use tax passed with water protections. Could add in policy recommendation to ask the legislature to do it with grants
 - v. C: If we want to preserve it, we have to own it and there has to be a fund where we can do it right
 - vi. C: SC Conservation Bank has a map of land they want to conserve
 - vii. Q: are you suggesting that the money that's collected in this fund could be put in a conservation easement and used by ag forever? A: the easement is done. Even if you go bankrupt, the property is protected
 - viii. C: works the best when we're competing to buy a tract of land, and we are competing against a developer. We can't budget what they budget. Opportunities are not there in this area
 - ix. C: CA doesn't have enough water; they borrow from CO. It's all about taxes. If you elect nongrowers, there won't be growth. A: need balance
 - x. C: SoLoCo Design Manual. Intended to force responsible development over developing virgin land. Original stakeholders included Hardyville, Jasper and Beaufort counties. Would be helpful to establish something regionally
 - xi. Do you want to craft policy statement around conservation easements?
 - xii. The SC legislature should support matching or incentivizing County Green Space Sales and Use Tax programs to establish appropriate balance

among land uses (ag, residential, industrial, recreation). Mention gov's protection of open space and Open Space Land Trust

1. Remove appropriate, added water
 - xiii. Encourage towns and counties to develop stormwater design manuals that prioritize redevelopment over new development
 1. Already one designed, SoLoCo manual, but only 2 of the original stakeholders have officially adopted it
 2. Could add to the narrative
 - xiv. C: not intended to require people with ponds to apply for registration or permits. Big picture policy recommendation
 - xv. C: difficulty of creating blanket ag regulation would be because farms operate so differently that it needs to be looked at on an individual basis.
4. Finish Discussion and Development of River Basin Plan Recommendations (John Boyer)
- [Discussion Item]** 10:20–10:50
- a. Parking lot of policy recommendations
 - i. The RBC encourages local governments and land managers to act to reduce sediment loading to impoundments
 1. Recommendation made by USRBC
 2. C: southside of Allendale, all trash blows back to farm pond. Sediment falls to the bottom of his pond. Trash is filtered through grass waterways and crops
 3. Q: what's the recommendation?
 4. C: we have a section to include evaluation. Wondering whether it is similar to this. If it is similar, do we need to bring it out? A: included looking at the impacts of nutrients, water quality and better understanding the impacts of sediment. Recommendation focused on encouraging local governments to develop more strict land use requirements to help reduce sediment loading, like riparian buffers or stream restoration projects
 5. C: this was started because of the volume of reservoirs in the US, since sedimentation is reducing the volume of the reservoir. Not as much of an issue here, more of an issue that smaller impoundments fill up quicker with sediment
 6. C: another opportunity to encourage local governments to work with green station providers. The more we can slow the water down, the better water quality and less erosion we'll have
 7. C: the recommendation isn't saying what you're saying
 8. Q: what is the US trying to say? A: can take this idea and craft it to be more appropriate for this basin
 9. C: SoLoCo manual covers a lot of that. Beaufort County has a 1.95 retention requirement

10. C: change act to coordinate, take out impoundments. Addressing it in relationship with each other. Want open channels of communication
 11. C: want to keep nutrients on the farm
 12. Spent a lot of time in Saluda talking about items that would fall under this and couldn't come to consensus
 13. Added to waterways
 14. C: with riparian buffers, losing land but not losing yield
 15. Add narrative
- ii. RBC recommends that the legislature approve and adopt the State Water Plan
1. Q: isn't this already assumed? A: added this because we were worried that WaterSC was going to cause the State Water Plan to get sidelined
 2. C: we do need something to make future plans on. Need some direction to know how to build and invest so the rules don't change
 3. C: want something said about groundwater capacity so that we can have some predictability
 4. C: 2004 plan was never approved by the legislature so don't know if we can assume this one will
 5. Q: are WaterSC and RBCs complementary? A: can't categorize this as WaterSC SWP. DES is preparing the state water plan, and WaterSC is providing input. Both stakeholder entities and listening sessions are 3 pronged approaches to provide input into the SWP. WaterSC is an advisory working group
 6. Added and subsequent updates
 7. Q: are we still waiting on hydrology models? A: have recommendations about adding the models to future plans
- iii. Whether water law and their implementing regulations should distinguish between registrations and permits
1. While most RBCs discussed this, only the Broad reached a consensus and made this recommendation
 2. Previous discussion centered on groundwater, you have to get a permit regardless of your use type. Why not make it the same for surface water. Other RBCs generally feel that the way it is now is ok. Only got consensus in Broad where ag is very tiny
 3. C: if you want the farms there, leave it as is. If not, change it
 4. C: most of us don't know enough about this to have a long discussion. What are the main differences between a permit and a registration? A: so many users aren't subject to reasonable use and are subject to minimum instream flow. If we require ag users

- to be permitted, they would have to go through evaluations-
potential reason to consider subjecting all users to the criteria
- 5. Q: in the time that only 8 permits have been issued statewide,
how many registrations statewide have been issued? A: I don't
know
- 6. C: all surface water withdrawals for S are for ag
- 7. C: some merit for distinction between local and large corporate
ownership
- 8. No consensus
- iv. Is there value in making a distinction between the size and/or local or
large corporate ownership of agricultural operations for planning and
permitting?
 - 1. C: hard to distinguish between corporate ownership and family
farms. Hard to get people who want to work in ag. As farms grow,
they can hire more people. Regulation harms smaller farms more
than corporate farms
 - 2. C: trying to distinguish it so they can put more regulation on
corporate farms and less on smaller farms
 - 3. C: look at who's been a good steward of the land and who's been
here a long time
 - 4. C: in other places, corporate ownership enters into an agreement
with the farm where they control everything
 - 5. C: don't want to take away legacy farms
 - 6. Unless we can come up with a policy recommendation that is
specific to how water is used, don't want to debate this topic
 - 7. No consensus
- v. Recommendation on strengthening state laws around the protection of
wetlands, given the 2023 Sacket vs USEPA Supreme Court Decision which
ruled that nearly half of the 118 million acres of wetlands in the US can't
be protected by the Clean Water Act
 - 1. Going to be more development in wetlands, removing the
ecosystem services that the wetlands provide, which impacts
water quantity, availability and timing
 - 2. C: don't know enough about it
 - 3. C: more of a coastal issue
 - 4. C: don't know what the recommendation would be
 - 5. C: could make a comment. A: could add to implementation plan
as something to look into in the future
 - 6. C: recommend something be done at the state level
 - 7. Can add to chapter 3 as a concern
- vi. SCDES should refrain from requiring the trading of permitted
groundwater withdrawal capacities between aquifer systems for

permittees to obtain withdrawal permits absent an analysis of available capacities within these aquifers

1. C: kill it
 2. 25-30 recommendations total
- vii. Added recommendation to encourage towns and counties to develop stormwater design manuals that prioritize redevelopment over new development
1. Encourage everyone to formally adopt the SoLoCo Manual and making it a regional design manual
 2. Southern Low Country Design Manual
 3. 6-7 original stakeholders
 4. Q: what was the reason why they didn't adopt it? A: engineers and development community are not in favor because it is so restrictive
 5. C: if only 2 or 3 of the original stakeholders approved it, why? We should read it before we agree to it.
 6. We want it to be restrictive, but we still want it to be comprehensive and cohesive to the engineering community. A big debate is that the SoLoCo manual requires you to change the peak factors from precondition to postcondition from 200 to 400. Hard to find a model
 7. If a community doesn't agree with 100% of it, there are parts of it they can incorporate and adopt
 8. What if we refer to the SoLoCo Manual as a potential example that includes ideas that might be considered by others?
 9. Added promotes responsible development, protects water resources
- viii. Last call
1. C: 9.3 in first section says Upper instead of Lower
 2. Ctrl-F upper

5. Discuss Draft Chapter Comments (John Boyer) **[Discussion Item]**

10:50–

11:05

a. Reminders

- i. RBC is charged with developing and implementing a RBP following the guidelines set forth in the State Water Planning Framework
- ii. The Planning Framework establishes the content, details, organization and requirements for each RBP
- iii. CDM Smith's role as facilitator and lead author is to work with the RBC to prepare a plan they support and agree to work to implement
- iv. Capturing the RBC's thoughts, ideas, and recommendations and working to address RBC issues and concerns is a critical part of the process

- v. We're committed to working to address each and all RBC members' concerns and comments to prepare a consensus-based plan
 - vi. Saluda submitted 600 comments, other have submitted less
- b. Decision making- RBP approval process
 - i. Step 1: testing for consensus of draft plan
 - 1. 1-5: 1 is full endorsement, 5 is withdrawal
 - 2. In US, 13 votes of full endorsement and 6 votes of endorsements with minor points of contention
 - ii. Step 2: for the final plan, each RBC member will indicate their support or disagreement
 - 1. By supporting the final plan, each member acknowledges their concurrence with the plan and commitment to support implementation of the plan
- c. Summary of RBC comments on chapters 3, 5, 6, 7, 8
 - i. Chapter 3: Dean provided miscellaneous comments and questions seeking clarification
 - ii. Chapter 5: consider a concise chapter summary to answer the core question "is there enough supply to meet demand?"
 - 1. Executive summary will have high level language and will be 30 pages. Will also prepare a 2-page summary
 - 2. Can move tables to the appendix
 - 3. C: still missing groundwater modeling and data. A: Brooke is still working on groundwater resources summary. Hoping to distribute next week. Won't have any modeling results, it's what DES is doing in lieu of the model. She will be summarizing USGS monitoring data
 - iii. Chapter 7: consistently use recycled water throughout the plan, more emphasis on recycled water as a strategy that can be expanded and promoted
 - 1. C: don't like recycled water. Seems like it's putting lipstick on a pig. Why are we changing the name to make it more palatable? A: public adoption of water reuse is very important in regards to the terminology that's used. Recycled water people are thinking how do we make this more palatable for the public
 - 2. C: go online, educate yourself. No public harmful aspects
 - 3. C: changed unspent fuel to recycled fuel in nuclear. Why do we need to make it palatable? A: the why is that it can be a water resource used to solve SC water issues. FL spent billions of dollars to create a water supply direct from a water treatment plant to potable water. You got to market to the public
 - 4. C: if you vote it down, vote it down but you're going to hinder SC water research
 - 5. C: most current terminology is recycled water. Should use the most current one
 - 6. C: would be prudent to use something that the water reuse community thinks is the most palatable and widely used

7. C: going through all of this expense to create expensive, clean, pure water that has higher standards
8. C: recycled water has been used to lower demand for other types of water
9. C: have Water Reuse Association that meets with DES officials who view the future here that recycled water is going to be part of the community's water portfolio
10. C: going to be a factor in SC
- iv. Draft chapter review schedule
 1. Chapters 1 and 4: distributed 4/1, requesting comments by 4/23
 2. Chapters 5, 9, 10: distributed next week, requesting comments by 4/30
 3. Chapters 2, 3, 6, 7, 8: still accepting comments
 4. Working to complete a draft executive summary before 5/1
 5. Q: did you get the pictures I sent 2 weeks ago? A: have to go and check
 6. Q: we're not allowed to take photos at SRS site? A: they can take photos and send them
 7. Q: can we have our phones with us? A: you can have your phone.

Break

11:05–11:15

6. Review and Develop the Draft Implementation Plan (John Boyer) **[Discussion Item]**
11:15–1:15
 - a. The implementation plan
 - i. Objectives, strategies and actions
 1. Address water shortages or other identified issues
 2. Informed by the recommended water management strategies and other plan recommendations made by the RBC
 - ii. Schedule
 1. Focuses on first five years following adoption of the RBP
 - iii. Budget
 1. Budget needed to accomplish each objective
 2. Identifies potential funding sources
 - iv. Flowchart
 - b. Implementation plan- proposed objectives
 - i. Improve water use efficiency to conserve water resources
 - ii. Engage GA in water planning
 - iii. Communicate, coordinate and promote findings and recommendations from the RBP
 - iv. Promote engagement in the water planning process
 - v. Enhance understanding of groundwater resources
 - vi. Improve technical data and understanding of water resource management issues
 - vii. Improve drought management
 1. C: there are things in ag that we can do if there is early notice. Communication is helpful A: you're talking about a

- recommendation within the drought response management chapter for early communication during flash droughts
- viii. Could decide to prioritize the objectives
 - c. Improve water use efficiency to conserve water resources
 - i. Water management strategies in chapter 7 fall under this objective
 - ii. Municipal conservation
 - 1. RBC identifies funding opportunities and technical assistance
 - 2. RBC establishes a baseline of residential per capita water use by system
 - a. Some RBCs find it useful; some think it is difficult to do
 - b. C: our utilities would have the ability to do it. A way to get customers to get a grasp of water usage
 - c. C: RBC is helping the utilities
 - d. Deleted
 - 3. RBC surveys water utilities to understand the extent of AMI/AMR
 - a. C: we implemented AMI/AMR but you don't have to have that
 - b. Q: when it says RBC is that us or state level? A: that's you guys
 - c. C: that assumes this group stays active for the next 5 years. A: the assumption of the implementation plan is that you're the ones driving it
 - d. Deleted
 - 4. Deleted RBC reviews and analyzes per capita water usage to improve understanding of water savings
 - iii. Agricultural conservation
 - 1. Agree with all recommended strategies and actions
 - iv. Industrial and energy conservation
 - 1. Not a lot of industrial activity
 - 2. C: Could put water reuse into ag. A: added
 - d. Engage GA in water planning
 - i. Governor of SC should communicate with Governor of GA to establish a coordinated, state-level planning and water management process for Savannah River Basin and shared aquifers
 - 1. Discussed in IRBC
 - 2. RBC communicates with SCDES, governor's offices and legislative representatives to resume a coordinated, state-level planning process
 - a. Q: when you lose the 2 governors that made the pact, how do you keep it going? A: added on-going
 - b. C: should help avoid legal proceedings
 - c. Added reassess in 5 years
 - 3. RBC will communicate with GADEP and request to coordinate water planning activities with CGRC

- a. Q: is that the only council they have in our basin? A: CGRC touches LSS, Upper Ogeechee doesn't really touch this basin
 - b. C: it's up to the RBC to initiate this. A: yes, or at least encourage it
- e. Communicate, coordinate, and promote findings and recommendations from the RBP
 - i. The SC legislature continues to fund state water planning activities, including RBC-based river basin planning
 - 1. SCDES identifies funding needs and communicate with legislature. A: beyond this year, we don't know if WaterSC will continue as a planning body or not
 - 2. C: one recommendation was for the legislature to approve the plan, but we're not talking about that in this communication strategy. A: if you think it's important, we can add it. Hard to decide what actions the RBC could take to get legislation to approve the state plan
 - 3. C: not that different from C2. A: yes, but its more specific
 - 4. B mentions legislatively approved SWP. Added advocate for the legislature to approve SWP
 - 5. C: best way to get them to adopt our plan is to write it for them. A: chapters 6-8 of SWP take RBC recommendations and bring them to a state level and summarize them
 - 6. Q: SWP needs to be fully completed in time? A: Santee Basin RBP won't be done by the end of the year. Most plans will be done in time
 - 7. C: for 1st objective, why is it not DES identifying funding opportunities? A: could be them too
 - ii. SC legislature establishes a grant program to help water users implement the actions and strategies identified in the legislatively approved SWP
 - iii. RBC members communicate with legislative delegations through the river basin planning to promote their familiarity with the process and its goals and to generate buy-in on its recommendations
 - 1. Q: does DES have an advocacy day? A: not aware that agencies have their own advocacy days. Early March is water day advocacy
 - 2. C: could try to put together a legislative breakfast
 - 3. C: can go to different town councils
 - iv. SCDES designate staff to continue to coordinate and support ongoing RBC activities
 - v. Encourage WaterSC to consider the water planning recommendations developed by the RBCs
 - 1. Going to be an RBC panel at WaterSC meetings
 - 2. Saluda wrote a letter to WaterSC
 - 3. C: writing a letter can't hurt
 - 4. WaterSC has heard some of the more common recommendations that have been developed

- f. Promote engagement in the water planning process
 - i. SCDES, RBC planning teams, and RBCs conduct regular reviews of RBC membership
 - 1. Q: how have the other RBCs done in terms of membership? Are they able to sustain all of the categories as well? A: on average every RBC has lost 2-3 members over 2-year planning process. 90% of representatives with 2-year terms commit to a 3-year term. Haven't filled empty spots. Challenge in GA too. In Edisto, a representative felt strongly that ag wasn't adequately represented at first. Hard for ag people to be here during the day. Should be filling ag spots with people from Farm Bureau or other agencies
 - 2. C: different types of ag have different concerns
 - ii. SCDES organizes an annual statewide meeting of RBCs and state agencies
 - 1. Gauge interest from all active RBCs, then SCDES would be planning the meetings
 - iii. RBC attempts to increase engagement with USACE Planning Division and Department of Energy
 - 1. Co-recommendation with US. Had one meeting with Army Corps early on but otherwise never engaged with them
 - iv. RBC will support and promote outreach and education to increase awareness with the general public around watershed-based planning
 - 1. C: challenges with working with Clemson Extension but could leverage their help
 - 2. Q: what is our goal to teach them about watershed-based planning? What do we want the general public to know? A: answered in chapter 9
 - 3. C: Want them to know simple things like who the stakeholders are and why it's important that we work together. General education process for those who aren't familiar with the process
 - 4. C: want to be specific and talk about watershed-based planning.
 - 5. C: action 3 is specific but are just examples
 - 6. C: water-based planning is different from water systems
 - 7. Removed action 3
 - 8. Going to educate the legislature
 - 9. Need to be more specific about how we do advocacy
 - 10. C: already have RBC developing talking points and strategies to provide consistent messaging
 - 11. Added elaborate on what the committee can do, such as promote consistent messaging to action 1
 - v. Require that developers work with utilities to ensure adequate availability of water resources and current and future capacity of water and wastewater infrastructure to support the development
 - 1. C: people who are going to require it are the county or municipal officials
- g. Enhance understanding of groundwater resources

- i. SCDES to continue to work with USGS to develop a groundwater model for LSS basins
 - 1. Q: is it really going to be years 4-5 before we simulate current and future conditions? A: making progress with the calibration. Calibrate, run 3 regional models, develop 3 regional models. Once that's done, we can summarize that work and share the info. More likely to be 2-3 years
- ii. Seek funding for SCDES to add monitoring wells in deeper aquifers in the central part of the basin
 - 1. Do have some funding for wells, wouldn't hurt to seek additional funding
 - 2. Q: can you co-fund with USGS? A: not common, not sure whether you'd be able to rely on USGS funding anyways
- iii. USGS use the groundwater model to analyze and predict chloride levels in Upper/ Middle Floridan
 - 1. C: they can do particle tracking for chloride levels, not dual density saltwater model. A: not part of the current scope
 - 2. Q: is this all about saltwater intrusion? A: yes
 - 3. C: have to build production wells and monitoring wells
- h. Improve technical understanding of water resource management issues
 - i. RBC will support continued efforts to maintain and expand streamflow gages
 - 1. Q: is the USGS actually a funding entity? A: they do fund their own gages and get sponsors for gages. Some gages don't have sponsors
 - ii. Future modeling incorporates scenarios that further examine future uncertainties
 - 1. Q: is this for groundwater and surface? A: This was to explore the problems. Could be both, more focused on surface water
 - iii. Future planning efforts include evaluation of surface water quality and trends, including nutrient loading and sedimentation
 - 1. Q: why do we feel the need under strategy to put nutrient loading and sedimentation? A: part of the recommendation that got approved. Getting more specific
 - 2. Removed including nutrient loading and sedimentation
 - 3. Q: make the same change to page 9-4 of this chapter? A: should shy away from just including those 2
 - 4. C: could say including but not limited to
 - iv. SCDES study the use of indirect potable reuse (IPR)
 - 1. C: feel 1 is incomplete. A: intent was to guide DES to say how we're going to study it
 - 2. C: could take 2 and say DES has developed scope study based on input from RBCs
 - 3. Removed 1
 - 4. Assume this is something water reuse committee has talked about

5. Specifically made the recommendation for IPR, don't know why
6. Changed to "SCDES performs study and analyses in support of a recycled water statute in SC"
7. Added WaterReuseSC to 1
- v. SC legislature funds and establishes a mesoscale network of weather and climate monitoring stations
- vi. RBC encourages local governments and land managers to act to reduce sediment loading to impoundments
 1. Yellow bucket originally
 2. Changed impoundments to waterways
- i. Improve drought management
 - i. Water utilities review drought management plan and response ordinances every 5 years and update every 10 years
 1. Q: isn't that something they have to do? A: no
 2. C: don't have doing outreach to other utilities on the RBC as an action. Do you want to add that? A: might be redundant
 - ii. SCDES lobbies for state funding to support the review and update of drought management plans by water utilities
 1. Added DNR
 - iii. RBC develops materials and outreach strategies to public suppliers in the basin to implement the RBC's drought management recommendations
 1. RBC encourages water utilities to consider drought surcharges
 2. RBC encourages water users to submit drought impact observations through CMOR
 3. A lot of outreach in the plan. Puts emphasis on you to advocate. Only going to be meeting 2-4 times a year
 4. Q: why are we making an implementation plan that is so involved? A: Catawba Watery funded by Duke and other energy companies. They've been meeting for more than 10 years. Need support whether from DES directly or someone else
 5. C: as volunteers, you're not going to be able to do a lot of this
 6. GA councils continue to meet and do implementation, but funding and participation are limited
 7. C: organizations that are a part of this group that have sent representatives here and might be willing to fund activities
 8. C: Spartanburg Water has started to fund some implementation activities on their own
 9. C: some organizations are asked what they're doing to help regionally
 10. C: not feasible to do everything ourselves. Some of these entities we represent are going to have to pay
 11. C: Farm Bureau already has lobbying. There's a process to get talking points on the docket
 12. Do you think you're taking on too much or do you want to shoot for the stars? Think about it over the next month
 13. Going to finalize the implementation plan next meeting

14. Implementation plan looks similar to other RBCs
15. C: we should say what we are willing to do as individuals
16. C: needs to be a reasonable amount of things
17. C: send this list to Farm Bureau, see what they would be willing to do
18. C: everyone could see what their industry normally does
19. C: this is an aspirational list. A: other RBCs have recognized the aspirational nature of this and said we'll do as much as we can but are going to be limited
20. C: we'll all get together and discuss advocacy issues
21. C: Lilli Langlois has policy students who could write to legislators. She would be happy to have students send in stuff for the RBC A: not sure if the department would approve
7. Next month's meeting (might be last in-person), will finish the discussion of the implementation plan and will prioritize strategies and objectives
8. Develop Progress Metrics (John Boyer) **[Discussion Item]** 1:15–1:50
 - a. Sent a draft list based on implementation plan
 - b. Way to monitor performance and quality of actions
9. Review Schedule and Adjourn (John Boyer) 1:50–2:00
 - a. Draft plan sent out before June meeting
 - b. Can extend things if needed
 - c. Schedule
 - i. 4/22: SRS site tour
 - ii. 5/1: draft executive summary and final chapter discussion
 - iii. 6/5: test of consensus on draft plan
 1. Q: not in-person? A: could be, can decide in May
 - iv. July: first public meeting
 - v. July/ August: address draft plan comments
 - vi. August/ September: finalize plan and possible 2nd meeting
 1. Planning framework suggests 2 but not required
 - d. Jeff extended the opportunity to register until next Tuesday

Meeting adjourned at 1:59 PM

Motion to Adjourn: Kathy Rhoad – 1st and Lynn McEwen – 2nd

Minutes: Taylor Le Moal and Tom Walker

Approved: 5/1/25

RBC Chat:

01:53:00 Thomas Walker: lunch break until 11:55ish

03:31:35 Jeff Hynds: I apologize, but I need to drop off. We've extended the opportunity to register for the SRS tour to next Tuesday. I sent John and Tom the registration link, visitors guide and an overview presentation.

03:31:51 Thomas Walker: thanks Jeff!

04:22:42 Thomas Walker: meeting adjourned