

## Saluda River Basin Council

### June 19<sup>th</sup> Minutes

**RBC Members Present:** Patrick Jackson, Rick Huffman, Eddie Owen, Rebecca Wade, Kevin Miller, Michael Waddell, Katherine Amidon, Thompson Smith, Robert Hanley, Larry Nates, Kaleigh Sims, Melanie Ruhlman, Josie Newton, Rett Templeton, Jason Davis, Devin Orr, Charlie Timmons, Jeff Boss, Phil Fragapane, & Tate Davis

**RBC Members Absent:** KC Price, David Coggins, Brandon Grooms, David Lawrence, Paul Lewis, Justin McGrady, & Jay Nicholson

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

**Total Present: 40**

Katherine Amidon, Vice Chair, called the June 19th, 2024, meeting to order. The Saluda RBC's June 19th meeting objectives included receiving an overview of Draft Saluda River Basin Plan Chapters 2 and 3, finalizing the review process, and discussing and developing planning process, technical, policy, regulatory, and legislative recommendations.

Katherine called for approval of the meeting agenda. Kevin Miller – 1st made a motion to approve the meeting agenda with Michael Waddell – 2nd, which was approved unanimously. There was a motion to approve the April 17<sup>th</sup> and May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes and summary. Thompson Smith – 1st – made a motion which was seconded by Kevin Miller – 2nd. Members unanimously approved the last two meeting minutes and summary.

K.C. Price has recently retired from the Laurens County Water and Sewer Commission and agreed to continue to represent the county interest as a water utility member on the Saluda RBC and continue in his role as chair if the members of the Saluda RBC concur (see appendix). The RBC members in attendance concurred.

#### **Housekeeping Items and Announcements:**

- Engagement of the public with this process-what, when, how, who- (Status- Ongoing)
- Engagement of public officials (pertinent municipalities) to promote the plan when we get to the public comment period and beyond- (Status-Not started)

- Identify and engage stakeholders that are not involved in the basin council but have an overlapping or adjacent connection to our efforts. For example, NRCS, SC Forestry, SCEMD, etc. (SCDNR emails state and federal agencies ahead of each council meeting)- (Status-Ongoing)
- Development and maintenance of a public facing data clearinghouse for all things water with Saluda Basin- (Status-Not Started)
- Funding for implementation- (Status-Not started)
- We have discussed some data gaps-making sure we acknowledge those in our final report and determine how to mitigate those in the future- (Status-Started, e.g., fish data in Blue Ridge)
- If we want to request additional surface water demand scenarios we need to decide when? - (Status-Last call)
- Determine how and when we will coordinate with other basin councils- (Status-Ongoing)
- What recommendations do we need to consider for non-FERC regulated dams and how they impact recreation- (Status-Discussing today)
- Visit and learn more about NRCS buffer and restorations- (Status-April-May possibly)
- Keep apprised of the Surface Water Withdrawal Act- (Status-Ongoing)
- John to share general PPT with RBC for council member customization and sharing with networks
- Idea for public engagement, create a ppt that is student-friendly (need age groups desired and a better understanding of who would have use for this)
- Optional idea for a talk-Ask our state representative to speak to us about current policies? Maybe with Megan Chase from Upstate Forever (Rebecca Wade's suggestion regarding policies)?
- Legal petition for safe yield conversation-add to discussion with policy and legislature- (Status-Ongoing)

Other parking lot items/points of discussion were to distribute the SCAWWA recording with members and to share the NRCS plan.

There was no public comment or agency comment.

### **Review of May Meeting Highlights and Decisions:**

John Boyer facilitated this session by reviewing some of the highlights and decisions from the May meeting, which included addressing how RBC wants to communicate to the public and stakeholders. The response to this question is that an RBC Liaison could be the chair or vice chair or other members from RBC on drought conditions and responses for their location, then RBC Liaison compiles drought information from the RBC members and finally RBC Liaison Reports to Central DMA Representative and DRC. However, the DRC and SCDNR have existing mechanisms to communicate and coordinate drought response with stakeholders and the public. The Saluda RBC does not envision direct messaging to the public. It's recognized that water utilities are generally responsible for that.

Discussion:

C: Getting involved in politics. Could be some improvement in representation. Not turn over to RBCs.

C: Drought declaration as it relates to farmers is a concern. RBCs would have a better handle on it.

C: Big difference in agricultural drought versus GVL water drought.

**Drought Response Recommendations:**

1. The RBC recommends that water utilities review and, if appropriate, update their drought management plan and response ordinance every 5 years or more frequently if conditions change. Changing conditions that could merit an update might include:
  - Change in the sources(s) of water
  - Significant increase in water demand ( such as the addition of a new, large wholesale customer)
  - Significant change in the proportion of water used by one sector compared to another (e.g., residential versus commercial use)
  - Addition ( or loss) of another user relying on the same source of water
  - New water supply agreement with neighboring utility
  - Incorporating lessons learned (if any) from a recent drought.
2. The RBC recommends that water utilities coordinate, to the extent practical, their drought response messaging. Consistent and coordinated messaging can help to avoid confusion and provide efficiency. However, the RBC recognizes that coordinated and consistent messaging may not be possible when drought conditions are appreciably different across the basin, utilities are in various stages of drought response, or utility response strategies are different. (Keep – Ch 8)

3. The RBC encourages water utilities in the basin to consider drought surcharges on water use during severe and/or extreme drought phases. Drought surcharges, when used, are typically only implemented if voluntary reductions are not successful in achieving the desired reduction in water use. (Keep – Ch 8)

C: Why would we encourage surcharges?

C: Add to their toolbox of strategies

C: Not sure why we're telling them what to do

C: Protect water quantity in the basin. Trying to recommend consistency among utilities in the basin

C: Gives us ability to go after highest water users. Board decides.

C: Why wouldn't we add a bunch more things utilities should do? Proposing we leave them alone

C: Recommendation not a mandate I'm ok with it

C: Drought is a natural disaster. Goes against my thinking to surcharge people during drought. Similar to gas price gouging

4. When drought occurs, the RBC encourages water users and those with water interests to submit their drought observations through the Condition Monitoring Observer Reports (CMOR). The CMOR, maintained by the National Drought Mitigation Center (NDMC), provides supporting evidence in the form of on-the-ground information to help the authors of the U.S. (Keep – Ch 8)

C: Extension report weekly. May be only extension agent doing it

C: Talking about that line in north part of the state rains every day. 3 miles away no rain.

Important tool

C: Takes a few minutes 2-5 minutes to post

C: Clarification: is that SCO?

C: IF you could get people to do it. Picture says it all. Pasture is getting very dry. 2 weeks w/o rain. West Anderson – Williamston to Princeton – no rain for 2 weeks. Gaffney got 3/4" last night

C: Engagement w/ the recommendation to get the word out

C: I wasn't aware of it. Farm Bureau convention in December to talk about it

C: We'll promote through the conservation district

C: Would help county to county to determine drought

C: SCO can talk to Farm Bureau and other groups

C: Support that recommendation

C: Disappointment: USDA based application – NDMC – USDA one head of agency doesn't talk to another. Encourage NRCS to have county agents to promote this. Should promote activity

C: Elliot was going to ask if they can filter by basin

C: AAS program could also be useful for that program and for training. AAS people already do it just not adding to CMOR

C: Flash droughts and impacts crops. CMOR could help identify flash droughts

C: They do happen. Allendale has a drought

Some suggestions:

5. The RBC encourages the State Climate Office to conduct outreach

6. The RBC encourages NRCs to promote the use of the tool.

7. Encourage use by the Adopt-a-Stream program

These recommendations are what we need to put together a draft of chapter 8 when we meet in August.

### **Introduction to Draft River Basin Plan Chapters 2 and 3:**

John Boyer talked about chapters 2 and 3, which are introductory chapters that describe the physical environment and water resources of the basin.

Chapter 2 talks about the Physical Environment (geography), Land Use and Cover (NLCD Land Cover Class), Geology (generalized geological map of the Saluda River basin-SCDNR), Climate, Severe Weather, Severe Thunderstorms and Tornadoes, Tropical Cyclone, Winter Storms, Flooding, Drought. Also, an Overview of Natural Resources, Fish and Wildlife, Natural and Cultural Preserves, Agricultural Resources (Agriculture and Livestock), Silviculture, Socioeconomic Environment (Population and Demographics), and Economic Activity.

Chapter 3 talks about Surface Water Resources (Major Rivers and Lakes), Surface Water Monitoring, Surface Water Development, Surface Water Concerns, Surface Water Assessment Tools, Groundwater Resources, Groundwater Development, Capacity Use Areas, and Groundwater Concerns.

John further encourages RBC members to send their feedback or comments to him before July 17.

Q: Are these active gages?

A: Both active and inactive

### **Discussion and Development of Plan Recommendations:**

John Boyer anchored this session by discussing chapter 9, which includes:

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

The RBC can make specific recommendations at both basin-wide and state levels. These recommendations could include:

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

The way we make the recommendations is to build a consensus after somebody proposes a recommendation by voting. We encountered some level of disagreement during the policy, legislative and regulatory recommendations (Edisto), and we tried to address these disagreements in multiple meetings, including reviewing data and looking at the surface water law from using mean to medium. In other words, regardless of whether the number of voters voted for it or not, we ensure that all voices are reflected for those specific items where we could not come to a consensus. There might have been a majority, but those were important enough issues that dissenting opinions were voiced and included in the plan.

### **River Basin Planning Process Recommendations:**

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

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

- Implementing the River Basin Plan and continued RBC activities and actions

**Planning Process Recommendations:**

- Consider 3 public meetings announcing the formation of the RBCs and presenting the Draft and Final River Basin Plans.
- Annual meeting of RBCs, perhaps before the legislative session begins.
- Upstate IRC, with annual or otherwise meetings

Discussion:

Q: People who draw 2 years – done March of 2025 or December of 2024?

A: 2 years after the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. March schedule – 2 years from start

C: All RBCs are on different schedules

C: Talk about how the communication worked or didn't work. Some pitfalls

C: Disagreements almost all on policy and regulations. Some differences on studying water quality. RBC should focus on quality after initial plan

C: A lot of intense disagreements and passion. Mostly around SW law and potato farm. Groups fighting each other. Loophole in law got rights to rest of water. Not use the water. Complicated discussion

C: The animosity down there w/ the potato farm coming in. Part of the reason we're here today.

Lessons learned respect each other and opinions

C: What has worked and what hasn't

C: Blue Ridge data gap

C: Technical

C: Great process, great leadership, great representation

C: Confusing how PPAC, RBCs, new agency work moving forward

C: PPAC was going to write a letter

C: Hasn't been written yet

C: Didn't know what PPAC was, would like to give it some consideration. Public meetings – to announce formation of RBCs. One additional meeting location to be added in mid-basin. Split basin into 3 pieces.

Also when do we do the public meetings for draft and final plan?

C: Like to include more rural areas too not just Greenville and Columbia

C: We do give rural water users opportunity. Greenwood and Newberry areas. Broad attendance was low and Edisto attendance was low.

C: Hard to get people to come to public meetings. Go to them and get on their agendas to talk about it. Very effective – a lot of time and resources

C: Broad saw that as well

C: Other thing happening to incentivize people coming. How to get invite out. Make it exciting

C: People if they feel it will impact them they'll show up. May feel it doesn't impact them

C: Reflect afterwards if we do approve it

C: How do we distribute it now?

C: Various listservs and press releases

C: Coordinate with other basins moving forward – formal forum for all basins to meet annually or bi-annually. United. Present at water day (March). Way to get us there at Columbia

C: We won't be meeting every month after the plan is done

C: Could be quarterly

C: Convene before legislative session timing

C: Annual is right initially

C: Drought could change that

C: Meeting with all basins – especially with legislative changes

C: Competing uses for water. Broad, Saluda, Upper Savannah regional group to increase impact and influence. Most water comes from up here. Resentment to upstate using water instead of letting it go to the low country

C: How to propose without animosity?

C: Different functions statewide - upstate coalition

C: Santee is at the mercy of users to the North. Lower Savannah depends on Upper Savannah releases. Forum for collaboration. Headwater basins – IRC for the 3

C: Protect ability to grow. 4 million people are projected for the upstate. Don't need to hoard water but need water for growth

C: land use wise – water wise – 4 million people



C: Discussion about water below the fall line is different than upstate issues

C: Don't disagree – regional differences. Merit in having all RBCs meet to discuss legislative areas with a common purpose. Agree to both statewide and regional approach. Do share common headwaters interest. Rapid growth. Plan not just for population growth but protecting water for ag and recreation

C: Plan put together to meet with Santee and Catawba 4 team IRC

C: 3 options – state, upstate, and upstate + Santee

C: Adding US to that meeting

C: Keep 2 for now any others?

C: Enhance communication going on?

C: Technical info expert recommendation

C: Define experts – anybody that came in to present

C: I think this is valuable. Lean on subject experts

C: Don't understand allowed comment about who is an expert. Experts – we ask you not just take off the shelf stock discussion but focus on the basin. Know the basin you are presenting on with focused recommendations

C: Allowed – some aren't allowed to make recommendations (USGS example)

C: Should give us recommendations to put into the plan. Shouldn't ignore opportunity to get these folks recommendations

C: Presenting science-based data it is vital to open discussion on recommendation

C: Want someone else to propose recommendations

C: We going back to ask for recommendations?

C: No, moving forward “what do you recommend”?

C: Non-technical RBC members didn't feel confident in coming up with own recommendations. Need proposed recommendation to work from.

C: Mesonet example – Hope Mizzell, presented a recommendation to the Broad

C: Would USGS have to change their policy?

C: Doesn't impact USGS

C: Allowed to give multiple options to consider

C: A lot of government agencies are reluctant to give opinions and advice. More appropriate for state agency. We make decisions. Impressed with our RBC and that would be redundant. We have the ability already

C: Not opposed to it

C: Don't need redundancy

C: May come down to way we use our words

C: If we need to remove someone, would we replace them? We've had good participation

Q: Largest RBC?

A: Yes, 27 members

C: Output we want commonality among basins. Core group overseeing us. Are we being herded too much or allowed to make own decisions?

C: Intent is to give flavor of other recommendations to see if there are commonalities

C: Appreciate the comment – make sure we aren't rubber stamping and have time to deliberate

C: Can send us an idea (Katherine, KC, John) if you need help fleshing it out

### **Technical and Program Recommendations:**

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

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

**Topics discussed at previous RBC meetings that could become technical recommendations:**

- Encourage more fish and macroinvertebrate data collection in Blue Ridge province to support development of flow-ecology relationships
  - C: Problem I have they need 30 sample sites. Can't get 30 sites in BR. Measure uncertainty, we do it all the time
- Encourage researchers that are assessing flow-ecology relationships to use the data that is available, recognizing that there may be more uncertainty.
  - C: Use what you have available
  - C: Several different agencies data is likely out there. DNR should be first place – see what they have. EPA was doing work up near Jones Gap. Scattered data.
- Initiate a discussion with DES exploring the expansion of the ambient water quality monitoring network
  - C: Recommend more ambient monitoring stations throughout the watershed. Flow and water quality. More data – always for it
  - C: Good to encourage – how to affect policy and application and flow ecology work. How can we use that data? What does it mean to collect and how its used for water quantity and quality
  - C: Ambient data - meeting designated uses 303 data the program was reduced years ago. Needs a boost
  - C: Specific section of the basin that is lacking?
  - C: Good question for DHEC
  - C: Change researches to researchers
  - SC watershed atlas – turn on water quality – see where stations are. Temperature, bacteria, etc. Determine impaired water
  - C: Fixed locations are where they go back over and over
  - C: Not a lot of fixed locations
  - C: How many stations fixed?
  - C: Quarterly
  - C: Depends

- Explore incorporating County-collected data ( e.g., flow data) to augment existing models ( e.g., SWAM model)
  - C: Incorporation of county stormwater data in the model (SWAM)
  - C: General across basin – flow and quality gaps. Assessment should be done to see where gaps are.
- When updating Drought Management Plans, encourage water utilities to use the SWAM model to evaluate the potential effectiveness of drought triggers.
  - C: Its useful
  - C: Arguments for it – get some consistency between utilities and modeling. Defer to water utilities on this
  - C: Triggers in the plan tied to lake levels, LIP in Keowee. Updating our model
  - Q: How does that coincide with hazard mitigation plans – covers drought and other things
  - A: Not sure it does
- Consider use of the River Basin Plan as a tool for local comprehensive plans and economic development.
  - C: Highlight the whole upstate wouldn't it?
  - C: Make it more specific and use words to get it into comprehensive plans. Economic development – groups and agencies comprehensive plans
  - Q: Does it highlight now?
  - A: Does highlight but not significantly stressed
  - C: Economic development folks don't understand the need to include them. Tremendous disconnect
  - C: Water users talking to water utilities
  - C: Right track – lots of water don't necessarily have the infrastructure or capacity
  - C: Look at it on map – ideal location. No slope, no wetlands, etc
  - C: Local comprehensive plans and economic development should work with water utilities to determine resources are available (create new bullet)

- Encourage that developers work with water utilities to ensure adequate water availability and infrastructure.
  - C: Those get to the first point better
- Sedimentation:
  - Encourage use of SCDHECs.... (Melanie to draft)
  - Encourage streambank restoration and riparian buffers, other practices that reduce sediment load to streams and reservoirs
  - Encourage and incentivize sustainable development that includes green infrastructure and sediment/erosion controls/BMPs
  - Encourage more enforcement, monitoring, and maintenance of stormwater controls. Enforcement, especially following site stabilization. Better enforcement of sediment and erosion control measures.
  - Encourage strengthening design standards to capture larger storm events

Discussion:

C: Under #3 riparian buffers after streambank restoration

C: Discouraging development that is causing all of these sediment issues. Recognize negative impact of runoff and increasing sedimentation practices and regulations

C: Enforcement is a problem. Resources for more inspectors and political support for that locals trying to enforce but political pressure to not do so

C: Staff available and accountable

C: Stormwater regulations and active enforcement

C: County is enforcing it through permits – helping. After development the retention pond, roofs, streets, etc. Too much rain fills pond and does job until capacity is reached. Dumping a lot of water in creek and Saluda river which erodes banks

C: HOA catch basins don't do anything

C: Deeded lots to homeowners

C: Supposed to be monitored or reported on – no incentive for that

C: Encourage and incentivize – carrot or stick approach

C: I have to inspect 38 miles of shoreline and they have dredging operations non-stop

C: Do they have a plan to do that

C: Implementation plan – identifying loss of storage and associated costs

C: Upstate Forever has done that which identified those lands

C: Still on website I believe

C: We included it in our plan. What comes available for purchase is a variable

Q: Was there a model used? Was it a hydrologic model?

A: Used GIS to do an analysis. Assigned weighted values to evaluate which lands were highest risk for development.

C: Screened approach – sounds similar to the WaterFALL model

C: Could quantify with hydrologic model maybe

C: RTI international – does have relationship with CDM Smith

C: In case we needed to supplement SWAM

C: Observation – one of the challenges around development is a developer will masquerade a site and remain that way for months or years. Poor stabilization – sediment impact. Supportive of strong recommendation emphasizing enforcement. Site stabilization period.

C: Better enforcement of erosion control

C: Mass grading sites – remove topsoil and its gone. Build retention pond and put topsoil back. No go ahead until that was done. Then clearing. Step process – not let land remain disturbed. When a 1 or 2 inch rain comes red clay and shell rock – needs grass

C: Standards have been lowered

C: Enforcing standards but standards have lowered

C: Comes back to engineering design. Solution is green infrastructure. The tool to better control sediment and runoff. Pipe or pond. A lot more tools out there. We went opposite way – trying to get water underground. Wetlands to hold water – move away from pipes and ponds. Green infrastructure helps with flood control

- Sediment/Erosion Control/land Use and Management:
  - Provide more incentives to land owners to not sell their land to development and place them in permanent conservation easements.

- Provide incentives that encourage cover cropping and other practices that reduce erosion and maintain healthy soils.
- Encourage leveraging of USDA EQUIP programs for regenerative farming practices that minimize soil disturbance and soil loss and improve soil health.

Discussion:

C: Agree – get farms in this green infrastructure. Don't understand why we don't incentivize to not sell to development. Conservation practices (no till). Development adds to problem. Land use is at the local level, Oconee is almost zone-free county. Landowners can declare.

C: Tax base situation – taxed out of their land

C: Stormwater fees (can't, not sure) be allocated to agriculture

C: There are some NRCS initiatives. Has been in disarray in SC. EQIP isn't wide enough or far enough.

Good to build duck ponds

C: Paid \$35 per acre for cover cropping. Doesn't pay for seeds, equipment, etc. Doesn't keep up with inflation

C: I'll check on stormwater fees to ag

C: Farmer sells property – pays back taxes. Start buying up farms or buffers on farms

C: Permanent conservation easements and incentivize that

C: Take it out of production to help stormwater

C: Monitoring easements is problematic

C: There is a new Farm Bureau program - folks are monitoring

C: Need to have staff and we use drones to reduce staff time. It's worth it

C: Put \$ towards solving the problem – development and farming, need buffers, more stormwater. We know the sources. Let's go out and fix it

C: Use previous studies and update as needed

C: Encouraging folks to do DHEC watershed based plans. 303d non-point funds. \*Melanie will follow up in an e-mail\*

Changing land use – streamflow discussion:

C: not just climate

C: We did some of this in Saluda – Reedy consortium looked at Reedy watershed looked at different sub-watersheds. Two different studies. More impervious surfaces are adding to peak flows. We know what patterns are – give it a solution

C: Paralysis by analysis

C: Could update those studies

C: Hydrologic impairments – below hydroelectric operations – leverage permits or regs or develop new regs

C: Overarching remove impairment and preventing impairments and making sure there aren't others

C: Hold for August or Table until September to give KC time to set up discussion

Q: Timeline for the plan?

A: We're at meeting 15 and planned for 24. May only need to meet a few more meetings to finish recommendations and draft should be wrapped by end of year

C: Some of what we talked about today falls onto policy realm

C: Other technical recommendations in other plans

C: Mesonet was one in the Broad. GW monitoring in Edisto

C: Costs for mesonet?

C: Hope would know

C: Don't county airports have those?

C: May not have the parameters mesonet needs

John stated that if anybody has ideas about recommendations, they should do so and send them to him before the next meeting to discuss them further.

- Work to remove the Saluda River hydrologic impairment (4C) below the Saluda Lake hydro project through negotiation with the operator
- Leverage existing permitting procedures and regulations to ....

#### **Saluda RBC Meeting #16:**

Wed, August 21, 2024 (No July Meeting)

- Chapters 4 through 8 introduction
- Continue discussion and development of Technical, Program, policy, Regulatory and Legislative Recommendations



- Begin development of Implementation Plan ( time permitting).

Tentative meeting location LCWSA Office, Laurens.

Meeting concluded at 1:59 PM.

Minutes: Iffy Ogbekene and Tom Walker

Approved: 8/21/24

RBC Chat:

09:53:06 From Robert Hanley to Everyone:

Good morning!

09:53:28 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

morning!

09:54:22 From Robert Hanley to Everyone:

I'll likely stay muted except when I have something to add to the conversation. My votes will be green x for yes or red x for no.

09:54:51 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

ok thank you

09:55:39 From Robert Hanley to Everyone:

I miss the coffee and morning treats

09:55:53 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

Reacted to "I miss the coffee an..." with 😊

10:04:40 From Robert Hanley to Everyone:

I concur with KC's continued involvement.

10:50:48 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

10 min break until 11 am

11:40:24 From Charlie Timmons to Everyone:

I support the rec as well

11:40:37 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

thanks charlie

11:53:17 From Robert Hanley to Everyone:

No need to strictly enforce. But the leadership team should reach out.

11:59:23 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

break for lunch until 12:30 pm

13:40:14 From Charlie Timmons to Everyone:

great discussion. this is an uphill battle. thankful we have folks like melanie fighting this fight day in and day out.

13:42:09 From Charlie Timmons to Everyone:

from a CRE perspective it's more of an uphill battle to reduce sediment. Developers have already become so regulated. costs have gone up so much. those costs get passed on to the consumer. Regulators may be hesitant to increase those costs even more on behalf of the environment. Regulators seem more focused on looks, traffic, use, and planning.

13:43:34 From Charlie Timmons to Everyone:

Sorry I have conflicting meetings. can't talk. conflict will be over at the end of summer.

13:43:43 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

understood!

13:43:58 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

thank you for the comment

13:59:59 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

meeting adjourned