

Saluda River Basin Council
January 15th Meeting Minutes

RBC Members Present: Katherine Amidon, KC Price, Robert Hanley, Eddie Owen, Michael Waddell, Tate Davis, Rebecca Wade, Brandon Grooms, Kevin Miller, Rick Huffman, Jay Nicholson, Patrick Jackson, Josie Newton, Thompson Smith, Melanie Ruhlman, Kaleigh Sims, Paul Lewis, Rett Templeton, Devin Orr, Charlie Timmons, & Phil Fragapane

RBC Members Absent: Jeff Boss (Jeff Phillips, alternate, present), David Coggins, Jason Davis, & Larry Nates

Planning Team Present: John Boyer, Tom Walker, Alexis Modzelesky, Scott Harder, Leigh Anne Monroe, Jeff Allen, Hannah Hartley, Joe Koon, & Kirk Westphal

Total Present: 38

Katherine Amidon, Saluda RBC Vice Chair, called the meeting on January 15th, 2025, to order at 10:01 AM. The Saluda RBC's January 15th meeting objectives included finishing development of River Basin recommendations, discussing and developing implementation plan and its actions and receiving an update on WaterSC.

Katherine called for approval of the meeting agenda. Kevin Miller – 1st made a motion to approve the meeting agenda with Tate Davis – 2nd, which was approved unanimously.

There was a motion to approve the December 18th meeting minutes and summary. Robert Hanley – 1st – made a motion which was seconded by Michael Waddell – 2nd. Members unanimously approved the last meeting minutes and summary.

Housekeeping, Parking Lot Items and Announcements:

Drought Tabletop Exercise – Wednesday, March 5th at Emergency Operations Center- 2779 Fish Hatchery Road, West Columbia.

There were no public and agency comments.

Final Discussion and Development of Plan Recommendations:

The RBC encourages state and local governments to develop/review/update/adopt and enforce laws, regulations, policies, and/or ordinances that improve the management of stormwater runoff, encourage infiltration, minimize streambank erosion, reduce sedimentation, and protect water resources. The following are the (revised) RBC's recommended best management practices:

- Riparian buffer protection
- Tree ordinances
- Open space protection
- Strengthening stormwater regulations to minimize stormwater runoff volume from construction sites
- Incentivizing green infrastructure in development designs
- Allocating local funding sources for land conservation
- Regulation for open space protection

A survey was sent to members to identify which one listed above would support those recommendations and how members voted explicitly. Some comments submitted as part of the survey were in line with what some of the recommendations mean, and that needs to be explained further, including what's included and the interpretations.

There are some options to help us move forward, which are:

1. Keep the recommendation general and remove the of BMPs
2. List the BMPs in the (rec) as examples that could be considered or applied in appropriate settings (universally)
3. Include a subset of BMPs which have strong majority support
4. Omit the proposed recommendation entirely

Comments:

C: Opposed to that – discussion on list of what should be on the list and that might leave things off the list

C: We see a large majority favoring 7 of those who voted. There is one who commented that floodplain management programs need to be added.

C: The lists are nice, but does not identify all options, including the merit of just using that 1st sentence as a recommendation rather than putting a list of examples.

C: I can support the bold at the top as a starting point for this

C: How about we say local, riparian buffers, tree protection, and open space protection, remove words like regs and ordinances, and list the best practices as they were?

C: In favor of riparian buffers in a development setting and not for everyone everywhere

C: Land disturbance if over 5000 sq ft of disturbance

C: Acre for most parts – ½ acre in some coastal areas

C: We were talking about mass grading – one way to handle that is regulate how much is mass graded at once

C: See sedimentation and erosion in your streams – the science behind the permit is the issue. Design requirements may not be effective. Already a permit process in place

C: They've reduced/relaxed the effort for permits

C: I am still comfortable with the opening statement up there, and I like the idea that when we come back with the implementation plan and hammer out some of these, they could be included or implemented afterward.

Majority Approved Recommendations Pertaining to Surface Water Law and Regulation:

- The South Carolina Surface Water Withdrawal, Permitting, Use, and Reporting Act should allow for reasonable use criteria to be applied to all new surface water withdrawals, like those that currently exist for groundwater withdrawals.
- Improve the current laws that allow for regulation of water use so that they are enforceable and effective. The current water law, which grandfathers most water users, needs to be improved to support effective management of the state's water resources.

Save Our Saluda Proposed Recommendations: (Melanie proposed these as a package)

- Require permits statewide for all existing and new water withdrawals over 3 MGM, including those before 2011 and all registered users. All users must be evaluated for reasonableness and must meet minimum instream flow (MIF) requirements.

- Review minimum instream flow (MIF) standards based on best available science to adequately protect designated uses and recognize regional differences
- Review the implementing regulations to ensure consistency with the law, including a review of the existing definition of “safe yield” (SY) in the implementing regulations. Redefine how SY is determined to be consistent with the law and protective of minimum instream flow requirements that safeguard the integrity and designated uses of state waters.

C: Most of withdrawals 97% not subject to MIFs. Some will see shortages from zero water in the system. Require MIFs and level the playing field

C: MIFs were developed in the 80s. 2009 – 2010 reviewed the MIFs – reaffirmed them. Still the recommended instream flows. DNR hasn’t made it a priority

C: Recommend review again – should happen every so often anyway

C: Our recommendations should recognize there are better ways to look at it and recognize it in 5 years-10 years, 20 years, etc. It would be better if we included our tools to make better-informed decisions. One of the first steps is for DNR to look at it again and say there is a better way to determine. Also, in the permitting process, do we do it on 5-year or a permit basis? Or whatever the case may be.

C: I just wanted to add one thing to the DNR policy for clarification. The policy does defer to existing site studies, so 20/30/40 is only if there’s an absence of such studies.

C: Stream standards should be based on assimilated capacity for waste and water withdrawals, aligning with the stream's designated use. Emphasis is placed on reviewing the scientific methods used to determine minimum in-stream flow (MIF) and ensuring agencies like DES integrate this science into permitting programs. Concerns arise over DES potentially relying on preset flow levels without input from entities like DNR, which could undermine scientific efforts. Recognizing that MIF values vary by stream type is crucial for effective, science-based, and location-specific water management.

C: On the wastewater side – requirements for discharges to meet standards. Review the science behind how state determined MIF. Ensure DES uses that for permitting. Merit on bullet 2

C: Doesn’t 3 MGM cover that issue – corporate vs family farms

C: Opposed to distinguishing between size of farms

C: Is an industrial farm someone who leases land to farm to be profitable? See a permit program as a protection. Needs to be more discussion

C: Vote on first bullet

C: Nobody has questioned the threshold – 3 MGM

C: 100,000 gallons a day is the requirement and other states also use that number. Some states smaller and some permit everything

C: Bigger problem is that third bullet – safe yield – pie in the sky number. Conflicts with the law. SY above MIF for use. Reg needs fixing. Overallocating is what the state is doing – public trust doctrine. SWWA is a formula for overallocation

C: Math yes, specific situations. Most registered users are on tribs in this basin. I have to stop pumping because I am impacting a few thousand feet.

C: Drought management plan to work out irrigating crops – also crop insurance

C: I don't know if we need to be overly prescriptive. Issues with the SWWA that need to be addressed. Big picture – what we have doesn't meet all of our demands

C: Most simply on #2 bullet #3 is an acknowledgement #1 is trying to address it proactively

C: What happens in Oconee Co is very different than what happens in the Edisto. Passing statewide laws is tricky for that reason

Q: Do you feel like law protects you and future farmers or do you see any changes that are needed, a gap we can fill?

A: Ag supports the reg as it protects ag. The regs did not capture the full intent of the law. I know what the intent was. We are afraid of opening the law up. Going to get emotional and political. One thing we discussed was the Edisto issue – registered users getting whatever they ask for and not based on pump capacity. Would consider reg change

Q: Safe yield reg too?

A: Yes, we'd consider it – need exceptions to use water when we need it

C: May be other parts of reg that might need review. Reg 61-119 for consistency with the SWWA law and to use a science-based approach

C: Don't want law addressed but we are good with review and changing regs

A motion was made by Melanie Ruhlman to adopt the first point as a recommendation- and seconded by Rebecca Wade: 9 voted For, 9 voted Against, and 2 Abstained.

We have one more recommendation to consider;

Alignment with Existing Water Plans:

- The water withdrawal permitting process should specifically assess the permit application's alignment with the current River Basin Plan, particularly regarding proposed withdrawals, returns, resource conservation, and drought response.

Adopted by the BRBC- (Red bucket)

- The water withdrawal permitting process should specifically assess the permit application's alignment with the legislatively approved State Water Plan.

Adopted by the US and LSS RBC

C: Not sure what it means

C: SWP is not binding

C: Don't think legislature has approved the SWP in the past

C: Legislative committee – what's their charge?

C: Make recommendations about changing the law

C: Don't need – red bucket

Discussion and Development of Implementation Plan:

- Objectives should be ranked by importance and prioritized
- Each objective should include a justification describing its importance to water management in the basin.

Draft Objectives:

1. Improve water use efficiency to conserve water resources
2. Communicate, coordinate, and promote findings and recommendations from the River Basin Plan
3. Improve technical understanding of water resource management issues
4. Protect water resources
5. Improve drought management
6. Promote engagement in the water planning process.

Five-Year Implementation Plan- For Objective 1- Improve water use efficiency to conserve water resources

Strategies :

Municipal: 5-Year Actions:

1. Identify funding opportunities (yrs1-5)
2. Survey to understand the extent of AMI/AMR use amongst utilities (yrs 1-2)
3. Encourage water utilities to conduct a water loss/leak detection audit using a water system appropriate method, such as AWWA M36 Method, establish a baseline, and continue to measure every 2-3 years (yrs 1-2).
4. Work with water utilities to determine how water is being used and understand where conservation measures may have the most impact (yrs 2-3)
5. Develop and implement outreach and education program about recommended water management practices and funding opportunities (yrs 1-5)
6. Individual water users to implement conservation practices (yrs 3-5)
7. Develop survey of practices implemented, change in per capita use, funding issues, and funding sources utilized (beginning in yr 5 as part of 5-year plan update)

C: AWWA – systems trying to benchmark – not a trivial task. Still folks physically reading meters. What will it tell us as a basin. I don't know if it is going to be a good conversation as there are reasons for the difference. Trying to get # down – ok but trying to achieve what another utility has done is hard

C: No water supplier is going to want to sell less water

C: Trying to think about the RBC in 5 years. Room to check the box but maybe not meaningful

C: Merit in tying things into action

C: We consider this a toolbox of options for utilities to consider

Agricultural Conservation: 5-Year Actions:

1. Identify funding opportunities (yrs 1-5)
2. Develop and implement outreach and education program about recommended water management practices and funding opportunities (yrs 1-5)
3. Individual water users to implement conservation practices (yrs 3-5)

4. Develop survey of practices implemented, funding issues, and funding sources utilized (beginning in yr 5 as part of 5-year Plan update)
5. Review and analyze water usage to improve understanding of water savings of strategies (beginning in yr 5 as part of 5-year Plan update)

C: Generally good with it, improving center pivots and changing irrigation types. Go from overhead to a drip system for example. Changing system types – encourage farmers to change systems through Soil and Water Conservation Districts. If change to drip / trickle can get tax credit

Industrial Conservation: 5-Year Actions:

1. Develop and implement outreach and education program about recommended water management practices (yrs 1-5)
2. Individual water users to implement conservation practices (yrs 3-5)
3. Develop survey of practices implemented, funding issues, and funding sources utilized (beginning in yr 5 as part of 5-year Plan update)
4. Review and analyze water usage to improve understanding of water savings of strategies (beginning in yr 5 as part of 5-year Plan update)

C: Industry – don't understand appliances in this

C: Duke sends out incentives – for example to upgrade appliances

Objective 2- five Year Implementation Plan: Communicate, coordinate, and promote findings and recommendations from the RBC.

(A). Conduct additional public meetings to enhance public engagement, such as announcing the formation of the RBCs and presenting the Draft and final River Basin Plans-

5- Year Actions:

1. SCDES and contractors to inform future RBCs of this recommendation to consider in their planning processes (yrs 1-5)
2. Saluda RBC to plan and conduct public meetings during 5-yr update of Plan (yrs 1-5)

(B). Hold annual coordination meeting of all RBCs

Actions:

1. SCDES to gage interest from all active RBCs (yr 1)
2. If other RBCs concur with the recommendation, SCDES to plan first annual meeting location, agenda, and invitees. SCDES will also identify cost and assess availability of funding if needed (yr 1-2)
3. Execute annual meeting (yrs 1-5)

(C) . Form an upstate Interbasin River Council consisting of Broad, Saluda, and Upper Savannah RBCs representatives to coordinate on shared interests and goals as headwater basins.

(High Strategy Priority)

Actions:

1. SCDES to gage interest from all active RBC and determine meeting frequency (yr 1)
2. SCDES to plan first meeting location, agenda, and invitees and identify costs and funding source (yr 1-2)
3. Execute meetings (yrs 1-5)

(D) . To continue positive progress at the state level for river basin planning, the RBC calls for a state-led assessment of the current funding to SCDES to support river basin planning.

Actions:

1. RBC to work with SCDES to identify scope (yr 1)
2. SCDES to identify funding needs for continued water planning at the river basin scale and for implementation activities and communicate the needs with the legislature (yr 2-5)

(E) . The RBC recommends that as part of the comprehensive planning process, each local government consults the Resilience Plan developed by the South Carolina Office of Resilience, local Hazard Mitigation Plans, and the associated River Basin Plan(s) developed by the RBCs for inclusion within the resilience element as required by the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act as amended in 2020. Encourage land use regulations and corresponding ordinances be adjusted to support the resilience element.

Actions:

1. RBC to develop outreach documents to municipalities with information about Resilience Plan and associated River Basin Plans (yr 1)
2. RBC to conduct outreach to planning entities within the local governments of the Saluda River Basin (yr 2)

(F). For river basins with state or federal specially designated streams (e.g., National Wild and Scenic Rivers or State Scenic Rivers), watershed-based plans, and any other similar plans, the RBCs should assess alignment between the River Basin Plan and the management plan associated with the special designation.

Actions:

1. RBC to further review recommendations and identified strategies of the management plans summarized in Chapter 1 of the Saluda River Basin Plan (yrs 1-4)
2. RBC to share River Basin Plan with developers of any ongoing planning efforts (yrs 1-5)
3. RBC to consider and incorporate recommendations and strategies from other plans in 5-year Plan update (yrs 4-5), where appropriate and supported by the RBC

(G). Consider use of the River Basin Plan as a tool for local comprehensive plans and economic development. Encourage that developers work with water utilities to ensure adequate water availability and infrastructure.

Actions:

1. RBC to review and distill information in the River Basin Plan to identify areas with ample water resources, now and through the 2070 planning period, that can best support growth and economic development (yr 1).
2. RBC to develop a 1-3 page “fact sheet” summarizing the current and projected availability of water resources in the basin, for use as a guide to support decision-making by local governments and economic development organizations (yr 2-5)

(H). The Legislature should fund and SCDES should establish and manage a grant program to help support the implementation of the actions and strategies identified each RBC’s River Basin Plan.

Action:

1. SCDES to identify funding needs, with input from the RBCs, and communicate with legislature (yr 1-5)

(I) . The state should support and fund RBC-led and statewide water education programs that include all sectors of water use and promote the types of water management strategies recommended in River Basin Plans.

Actions:

1. RBC to determine education topics of importance and target audience for education program (yr 1)
2. RBC to meet with organization (e.g., Clemson Extension, Soil & Water Conservation District, and non-profit), that already conduct water-related education and outreach, to discuss opportunities for collaboration (yr 1)
3. RBC to identify what education programs exist to meet these needs and promote them (yrs 2-5)
4. With support of SCDES and/or contractors, RBC to present funding recommendations to legislature (yrs 3-5)
5. With support of SCDES and/or contractors, RBC to develop new education and outreach program to fill gaps (yrs 3-5)

C: Curious if it is more effective – plan in place 5 years – during this time the RBC needs to get the plan to its’ constituents and actively promote the plan – present to boards or trade organizations

C: We are a public body. Give the public opportunity to hear from us and hear from them

C: Curious in the basin we identify two examples or is this open to other examples? Specially designated streams may affect water withdrawals- does a withdrawal affect them

C: Upstate Alliance is one in this category – recruit economic development, but where

C: Love to be able to drive people to certain areas – look for cheap land

C: When we did the master plan – looked at blocks- to get water where it need to be where we anticipate there will be growth

C: Big hole in Powdersville due to no sewer

C: Mostly sewer is driving things. If they have sewer and can get water that’s all they need

C: Southern Greenville County does not have enough water but can run a pipe. Development is putting those in

C: RBC would want to have input into this

Objective 3: Improve technical understanding of water resource management issues:

(A) . In future planning phases, the RBC recommends understanding the potential impacts of private and community/commercial wells, and how they may affect surface water (especially during droughts) and/or better characterize growth potential. **(Low Priority)**

Actions:

1. RBC to work with SCDES and /or contractors to identify the location and number of likely private/public/commercial wells in the basin and prepare a groundwater budget to help assess potential impact to surface water (yrs 1-3)
2. RBC to assess results of analysis and incorporate findings into the next 5-year update (yrs 4-5)

(B). Update models to consider future uncertainties (changing weather patterns, population growth, water use scenarios, etc)

Actions:

1. RBC to identify and assess any uncertainties for potential model scenario development and analysis (yrs 3-5)
2. Contractors to perform analysis and present results to RBC
3. RBC to assess results of analysis and incorporate findings into the next 5 year update (yrs 4-5)

(C). Future planning efforts should include evaluation of surface water quality and trends, including nutrient loading and sedimentation.

Actions:

1. RBC to first identify specific quality issues and concerns in the basin with consideration to current watershed-based plans (yr 1)
2. RBC to determine if there are data gaps recommend data collection to fill gaps (yr 1)

3. RBC to develop approach to further address those water quality issues and concerns, including the need for development of a watershed plan under SCDES Watershed Program (yrs 2-5)

(D). Support continued efforts to maintain and expand streamflow gages. The RBC also recommends that public entities that collect streamflow data make it more publicly accessible. Priority consideration to the following water bodies is recommended: (a) Saluda at SC 186 and Middle Saluda at SC 288, (b). Oolenoy River, (c) Saluda below Holiday Dam, (d) Tribs in Lower Saluda basin may need more gages.

Actions:

1. RBC to further consider specific locations (yr 1)
2. Develop communication strategy for speaking with USGS and other entities funding stream gages (yr 1-2)
3. Outreach to USGS and current funding entities on the importance of streamflow data to the river basin planning process. RBC to support search for additional funding sources as needed (3-5)

(E). SCDES should create and maintain an online library of, or a catalog of links to, technical information that will enhance the RBC's technical understanding of water resources concepts and issues.

Actions:

1. SCDES, with support from Facilitator, will create an online library/catalog of technical information to support RBC (yrs 1-5)
2. SCDES, with support from Facilitator, to add resources based on new topics of discussed in RBC meetings and at request of RBC members (yrs 1-5)
3. Assess how often RBC members access and use the resources to determine if the effort should continue (yr 5)

(H). Explore incorporating County-collected data (e.g flow data) to augment existing models (e.g SWAM model).

Actions:

1. Contractors to identify data and determine applicability for SWAM modeling (yr 3)

2. Contractors to incorporate county-data into SWAM models, validating ungagged reaches and confirming accuracy of SWAM model (yr 4)
3. Utilize updated SWAM model for 5-yr Plan update (yrs 4-5)

(I) . Continue discussion of data needs for flue-ecology relationships

Actions:

1. RBC to coordinate with USGS, SCDNR, and Clemson on how to best determine and assess ecological flow requirements in the Blue Ridge region (yrs 1-2)

(J). Conduct studies to better identify sediment loading sources and the financial costs associated with mitigating those sources to our reservoirs and waterways.

Actions:

1. Work with utilities and other impacted parties to identify funding that could used to estimate the financial impact of sedimentation on reservoirs and water resources (yr 1)
2. Perform a study to identify the financial impact of sedimentation resulting from loss of storage, increased treatment costs, loss of property values, and loss of recreation.

C: Quality issue is extremely important for the next round

C: Benefit is it has areas where it needs to be workshopped. Adds a roadmap

C: With consideration to watershed-based plans

C: TMDL plans?

C: 319 plans

Q: Was this a spinoff of the Broad?

A: Yes

C: Spartanburg Water already had this keyed up with funds to do it

C: We are going to look at Lake Rabon

Objective 4: Protect Water Resources

(A) . The RBC support reducing sediment loading to reservoirs and waterways through:

- Encourage streambank restoration, riparian buffers, and other practices that reduce sediment load to streams and reservoirs.
- Encourage sustainable development that implements green infrastructure and best management practices (BMPs) to reduce downstream runoff.

- Encourage more enforcement, monitoring and maintenance of stormwater controls and sediment and erosion controls measures.
- Encourage strengthening design standards to capture larger storm events
- Provide more incentives to landowners to not sell their land to development and, rather, place them in permanent conservation easements
- Provide incentive that encourage farming practices for regenerative farming practices that minimize soil disturbance and soil loss and improve soil health
- Strengthen penalties for non-compliance of erosion/sediment control permits and ordinances and stormwater permits and ordinances.

Actions:

Work with local governments and COGs to incorporate strategies into land use, planning, zoning, and permitting processes (yrs 1-5)

(B). Work to remove the Saluda River hydrologic impairment (4C) below the Saluda Lake.

Actions:

1. Public suppliers on the RBC to review and update their drought management plans and send them to the SCO (yrs 1-5)
2. Public suppliers on the RBC to consider ways to incorporate RBC drought management recommendations into their drought plans (yrs 1-5)
3. Updates to drought management plans should be shared with the SCO (emailed to drought@dnr.sc.gov) (yrs 1-5)

C: Saluda Dam - I am good with things for now, and I wonder if I need to push for a stronger recommendation; let's stay patient with this a little longer if we can't do anything in the implementation phase. Then we might consider to vote on them.

C: Let us continue to vote on what techniques we use. We are committed to undertaking these 2 actions, but we are not limited to these two.

C: We are responsible for doing anything about any of the trends. We have to check the current law to know the requirement for minimum in-streamflow.

Objective 5: Five-year Implementation Plan

(A) . The RBC recommends that water utilities review and update their drought management plan and response ordinance every 5 years or more frequently if conditions change. Once updated, the plans should be submitted to the SCO for review.

Actions:

1. Public suppliers on the RBC to review and update their drought management plans and send them to the SCO (yrs 1-5)
2. Public suppliers on the RBC to consider ways to incorporate RBC drought management recommendations into their drought plans (yrs 1-5)
3. Updates to drought management plans should be shared with the SCO (emailed to drought@dnr.sc.gov) (yrs 1-5)

(B). Develop materials and outreach strategy to public suppliers in the basin to implement the RBC's drought management recommendations (see Chapters 8,2.3)

Actions:

1. Develop materials on benefits and implementation of RBC drought management recommendations (yr 1)
2. Develop outreach strategy to communicate with public suppliers and distribute materials (yr 2)
3. Execute outreach strategy and update materials as necessary (yrs 3-5)
4. Develop approach to track updates to drought management plans in the basin (yrs 3-5)

Q: Anywhere SCO is spelled out in the plan?

A: We did that in the plan

Objective 6:- Promote engagement in water planning process

(A) . SCDES, the RBC Planning Teams, and the RBCs should conduct regular (every 6 months) reviews of the RBC membership to make sure all interest categories are adequately represented, and attendance across all interest categories meets the requirements of the RBC Bylaws.

Actions:

1. SCDES, RBC Planning Team, and RBC to conduct review of membership every 6 months (yrs 1-5)
2. SCDES and RBC conduct outreach to promote membership for under represented groups as necessary (yrs 1-5)

(B). The Saluda RBC will support and promote outreach and education to increase awareness with the general public around watershed-based planning.

Actions:

1. RBC to develop outreach sub-committee (yr 1)
2. RBC to partner with SCDES and SCDNR to develop a statewide educational strategy and budget needs (yr 1-2)
3. RBC to identify opportunities to support education programs such as (a), providing education or materials on the river basin planning process and (b), promoting existing citizen science tools such as CoCoRaHS, CMOR and Adopt-A-Stream (yrs 2-5)
4. Present at local and state conferences or to local organizations regarding the river basin plan and process (yrs 2-5)

C: We should highlight among the objectives those that require (high or low strategy priority); in other words, identify the ones that are more likely to get implemented and don't require a lot of funding. Another approach is to narrow the list down and try to prioritize the objectives in relation to their actions.

C: Recommend KC does an initial cut on prioritizing objectives

C: All the action strategies will be sent out to everybody so that we can have a good discussion in our next meetings. Then, we will identify the level of each strategy priority.

WaterSC Update:

January 7th WaterSC Open House and Listening Session. There were 11 speakers, and 10 were RBC members. The RBC were well represented there. If you are speaking on behalf of the RBC, ensure it is something the RBC has agreed on, and if it is your own, then discuss your interest.

Surface Water Study Committee Appointees:

- Governor: Myra Reece, Interim Director, SCDES

- President of the Senate: Sen. Rex Rice, R, Easley, District 2 and Sen. Kent Williams, D, Marion, District 30
- Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources: Chairman Wes Climer, R-Rock Hill, District 15
- Speaker of the House: Rep. Doug Gillam, R-Buffalo, district 42, Rep. Roger Kirby, D-Lake City, District 101
- House Agriculture and Natural Resources: Rep. Bill Hixon, R-North Augusta, District 83

Surface Water Study Committee Meeting:

Thursday, January 23, 2025, 11.15 am.

Blatt 410 Columbia, SC 29201.

Upcoming Meeting Schedule:

Jan – Finalize Implementation Plan

Feb- Review and Discuss Draft Plan and Executive Summary

Mar- 1st Public Meeting

Apr- Address Draft Plan Comments and Finalize Plan

May- 2nd Public Meeting.

In conclusion, you can look at the part of the table we didn't look at during the discussion, such as long-term goals, parties' budget etc., if we can come up with some potential funding sources apart from those identified. Please review and submit a draft of Chapter 10; We will finish the working draft of Chapter 9 and get that to you within the next two weeks, including Chapter 7. Also, in our next meeting, we will address the comments that have been submitted to the comment log. We will work on progress metrics in our next meeting, which is not included in Chapter 10, and the final voting.

Motion to adjourn: 1st – Thompson Smith and 2nd – Kevin Miller

Meeting adjourned: 1:41 pm

Minutes: Iffy Ogbekene and Tom Walker

Approved: 2/19/25

RBC Chat:

10:00:16 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

will get started here momentarily

10:02:57 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

I

10:03:16 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

I

10:05:44 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

add me to attendee

10:08:13 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

i called your name Rick, thanks for being online

10:09:11 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

I support 1 &2 on riparian recommendations

10:10:03 From gschmoltze to Everyone:

I like 2

10:27:50 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

Yes my vote but needs work

10:39:20 From Kaleighs to Everyone:

I have to jump off for a board meeting, I will be back on at 12pm.

10:43:42 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

Number two as written is working on MIF

10:57:43 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

I agree with Melanie the issue is 'Safe Yield" as defining the science when its not based on science. Prescription for allocation. Period.

11:16:11 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

Adopt bullet 1

11:16:19 From gschmoltze to Everyone:

yes

11:17:02 From Charlie Timmons to Everyone:

I am for the adopting the first bullet

11:17:41 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

thanks we are 9 for 9 against 3 abstain

11:18:11 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

sorry 9, 9, and 2

11:19:44 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

Document the votes and discussion

11:24:21 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

11:50 we will be back for the implementation plan

11:24:24 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

11:50ish

11:24:29 From gschmoltze to Everyone:

I will not be able to rejoin after lunch

11:24:34 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

ok, thanks guy

12:22:49 From Rick Huffman to Everyone:

I need to leave the meeting. I support objective 2 generally. Thanks Rick

12:23:10 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

thanks Rick

13:41:38 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

adjourned