Lower Savannah-Salkehatchie River Basin Council

June 5, 2025 Meeting Minutes

RBC Members Present: Bill Wabbersen, Kari Foy, Pete Nardi, Reid Pollard, Brad Young, Ken Caldwell, Brandon Stutts, Tommy Paradise, Jeff Hynds, Courtney Kimmel, Larry Hayden, Taylor Brewer, Brian Chemsak, Joey Oswald, John Carman, & Leslie Dickerson

RBC Members Absent: Austin Connelly (Angel Brabham, alternate, present), Danny Black, Sam Grubbs, Lynn McEwen, Dean Moss, Sara O'Connor, Brad O'Neal, & Will Williams

Planning Team Present: Kirk Westphal, Grace Houghton, Andy Wachob, Hannah Hartley, Brooke Czwartacki, Leigh Anne Monroe, Scott Harder, Joe Koon, & Tom Walker

Total Present: 29

1. Call the Meeting to Order (Kari Foy, RBC Chair) 8:30–8:40
    a. Review of Meeting Objectives
        i. Don't have quorum (early)
        ii. Got quorum later on
    b. Approval of Agenda
        i. Agenda approved
        ii. Ken Caldwell – 1st and Reid Pollard – 2nd
    c. Approval of May 1st Minutes and Summary
        i. Minutes approved
        ii. Ken Caldwell – 1st and Pete Nardi – 2nd
    d. Newsworthy Items [**Discussion Item**]
        i. WaterSC meeting 5/15
            1. Interbasin transfer and multistate water management considerations, Catawba-Wateree Water Management Group, Councils of Government panel discussion
            2. C: concern in SC over IBT in NC. A lot of interest. Conversation towards the end of the meeting about focusing on RBC work. This month's meeting will have RBC chairs and vice chairs on a panel
        ii. Upcoming WaterSC meeting
            1. 6/19, panel discussions with RBC chairs and vice chairs
            2. C: LSSRBC will be represented

2. Public and Agency Comment Period (Grace Houghton) 8:40–8:45
    a. none

3. Discuss Final Edits to Draft Plan and Executive Summary [**Discussion Item**] (Grace Houghton) 8:45–9:00
    a. Sent out revised executive summary and comment log
    b. A member said that in the beginning of the document we talk about the 4 questions plan will answer. At the end of the water availability assessment go back to the questions and answer them
    c. Unresolved comments
        i. Q: 2nd half of RBC planning, started talking about having surface water and groundwater model. Never got groundwater model, don't say that just have it as a recommendation. A: in chapter 5, there is language addressing that. Added it to executive summary. Note on page 24 of summary
    d. Terminology discussions
        i. Original draft, terms were used interchangeably. Got comments saying to be consistent with terminology. Next draft consistently used recycled water. A member had some concern with using recycled water, suggested reclaimed wastewater
            1. C: The first use of the term recycled water we define it as recycled water, also known as water reuse/ reclamation
        ii. One approach is to stay consistent with using recycled water throughout but define it upfront
        iii. Another approach: definitions from National Water Reuse Association
            1. Recycled water: treated domestic wastewater that is used more than once before it passes back into the water cycle. Reused/ recycled used interchangeably
            2. Reclaimed water is not reused or recycled until it is put to some purpose
            3. Diagram
        iv. Instances of terminology in the plan
        v. C: no better source of info than NWRA. Would be nice to include this and what he recommended. Giving further info
        vi. C: disagree. Would prefer definition in SC code. SC code has a definition for reclaimed water- all piping that's reclaimed water has to be labeled reclaimed water, not recycled. No definition of recycled water. Using info that's not from this state. State reg 61-9505 definition. Read plans ahead of us, everyone else calls it reclaimed water. Pee Dee changed it a little bit, called it reclaimed water for reuse and recycling. Everyone else mentions it 4-20 times, we mention it 69 times. We are out of alignment with other RBCs and SC code. Pee Dee is transparent that their representatives on the RBC are currently service directors at large of the SC Water Reuse Association.
        vii. C: terminology difference in this definition and the code refers to where the water is in the cycle. Water that is taken out of the waste cycle is reclaimed and prepared for any kind of recycled use but hasn't been

recycled yet. Think that's what the state code says. Once water is used again, it has been recycled.

viii. C: we changed everything in the plan from reclaimed water to recycled water
ix. C: intent of the RBC is to put the water to use, at which point it becomes recycled water
x. C: we eliminated reclaimed water. Others called it reclaimed water programs for water reuse and recycling
xi. C: what Grace is proposing is to go through the plan to make sure we're calling things by the right name based on where it is in the cycle
xii. Look at chapter 6 language, change utility provided recycled water to recycled water program using utility provided reclaimed water for irrigation and other uses. When we talk about recycled water programs generally, keep it as recycled water program. When we talk about the source of the water, could change to reclaimed water.
xiii. Q: He seems very emotional about this issue. What's behind that? A: It's straight language. He said that you are changing the term to make it more palatable to the public. I don't like being misled by language. Other RBC plans are much more straight than we are. We are being misleading by changing the language. Not about safety
xiv. C: dealt with this issue in the late 80s in CA as a young politician on a wastewater board. Water Reuse Association was starting, term used in the 80s was treated effluent wastewater. Didn't call Coke cans reused trash, called them recycled cans. Enacted in the 90s, the Water Recycling Act that set goals and defined terms in SC. WRA has draft statute right now that's going to go to legislature this year to change the terms. SWP hasn't been updated in 20 years. Department of Energy bill defines recycled water. Trying to help SC come into the current century on this issue. I think we could help SWP. Charleston's trying to go directly to portable reuse and potable reuse in their planning process. Easiest way to do it is to define it upfront and use diagrams. To change each word could take weeks. RBC has discussed and voted on it and here we are again
xv. His main concern is lack of transparency and coming at this with a marketing perspective. If we make the change where we make it as transparent as possible and define it upfront and include a graphic and make distinction of recycled water programs with reclaimed water as the source, could this be a workable solution?
xvi. C: can live with that, in alignment with other RBCs
xvii. C: trying to bring attention to the issue
xviii. C: not out of line with other RBCs, we're setting a new standard. Maybe other RBCs are doing what we do in the profession where we use these terms interchangeably. Can help SWP if we set a new standard for this
xix. C: work here is not to be in alignment with other RBCs/ state code, it is to come together as a group of stakeholders, learn about what's going on locally and talk about what are some of the best things we can have the

state consider for our neck of the woods. Our part of the state has to be more progressive, dynamic and innovated when it comes to water resources because of what we face in coastal areas. We've been doing recycled water for a long time. Words matter. Don't mind going through process to edit recycled vs reclaimed but we can get there quicker if we define it upfront

xx. C: we had different words, comment log said change them all to recycled, undid the natural thing. Fighting sweeping change to recycling back to something we understand
xxi. C: Hilton Head not only coastal part. "pull us into 21st century" is offensive. Santee Cooper 200 years ago trying to figure water out
xxii. C: look at where SC is in water reuse vs surrounding states, it's archaic. Water plan hasn't been updated. Trying to be progressive.
xxiii. Add definition and discussion to discussion of water management strategies. Prior to that chapter, talk about recycled water programs, can leave those. Could add also known as reclaimed water vs water reuse.
xxiv. C: needs to be updated in executive summary
xxv. What to know about this plan section: supply side management first appearance
xxvi. C: could point to the chapter.
xxvii. Water management strategy: groundwater barrier injections. Makes sense to be reclaimed
xxviii. C: once you inject it, its recycled
xxix. C: that bullet is a great example of going through and differentiating purpose vs source
xxx. Going to get wordy, important to be clear
xxxi. C: let's be concise in the executive summary and be clear in the text
xxxii. After meeting, will go through and make changes
xxxiii. C: aim to be concise in the executive summary and use whatever words we need to in the chapter
xxxiv. C: Pee Dee has disclaimer that there are members on the council who are a part of WateReuseSC. We should add the disclaimer too.
xxxv. Q: where does it show up in Pee Dee plan? A: will email
xxxvi. C: if we mention that, we have to reference other interest groups that have different conflicts. Everyone has their own interests.
xxxvii. C: we're not members of WateReuseSC individually; our utilities are members of it
xxxviii. C: Pee Dee thought it was important to put it in their plan
xxxix. C: could do a general disclaimer
xl. C: we reference American Water Works Association. A: reference leak detection manual from them, don't remember other instances
xli. C: we have people in the permitting process and people want to keep their current permits, even though they're using 10%
xlii. C: state regulators are members of WateReuseSC
xliii. He made recommendation, concern from others is that is this a conflict that needs a disclaimer

xliv. C: maybe Pee Dee disclaimer is because of how they handled internal conflict. We had a good discussion and consensus
xlv. Move forward with expanding definitions and not including additional disclaimers for members of the RBC working for entities that are members of other associations

4. Perform the Test of Consensus on the Draft Plan (Grace Houghton) 9:00–9:15
    a. Q: can we talk about 2 pager?
        i. 2 pager isn't formally a part of the plan
        ii. C: Diagram answers whether there's enough water through 2070. Don't have supplied amount A: hear you, not sure what the number of supply would represent. Availability varies with time, hydrologic conditions, and space
        iii. C: should be a line we can put that there's an expected amount from surface and groundwater in normal and drought conditions. A: answered with a more detailed look at fully hydrologic record using SWAM model
        iv. Q: isn't there a number we can put on the chart? We don't have a conclusion of whether there's enough water by numbers. A: might not be accurate to give a single number.
        v. C: either supply is going to stay the same/ increase/ decrease. Would give a clear indication of whether supply is enough to meet registered and permitted users amount
        vi. C: if we're looking at a single supply system, it's the firm yield of the safe yield of the supply. When we look at a combined system, it does change in time. Answer is in chapter 5 with water availability study.
        vii. C: we have a demand curve but we don't have a supply curve
        viii. C: numbers change based on location
        ix. C: we don't have groundwater model, but we have surface water model. A: we have the graphs for surface water but the graph in question combines surface and ground water and we don't have groundwater.
        x. C: we interpreted numbers in the plans.
        xi. C: this requires discussion and interaction with chapter 5. Deeper discussion
        xii. Q: Two page isn't bound and included in the plan? It's put out there on the website where someone can get the full plan? A: DES posts it together. Other RBCs thought it would be helpful to develop. Wasn't initially called for as a part of the planning framework.
    b. Decision making- RBP approval
        i. Get full updated draft in a week, after 30 days have a public meeting. Talk to RBC about changes from public meeting, then have final plan that gets voted one
        ii. Step 1- draft plan
            1. 1 (full endorsement) to 5 (withdrawal, member leaves)

2. USRBC: 13 full endorsements, 6 endorsements with minor points of contention
3. Results of consensus get included in the public draft

iii. Step 2- Final plan
1. Support or disagreement
2. By supporting final plan, each member acknowledges their concurrence with the plan and commitment to support implementation of the plan

iv. Test of consensus
1. (pre-meeting vote) Lawrence Hayden: 1
2. (pre-meeting vote) Lynn McEwen: 1
3. Danny Black/ Kathy Rhoad: not online
4. Taylor Brewer: 1
5. Kenneth Caldwell: 2
6. John Carman: not online
7. Brian Chemsak: 1
8. Austin Connelly/ Angel Brabham: vote has to come from primary
9. Leslie Dickerson: 1
10. Kari Foy: 1
11. Samuel Grubbs: not online
12. Jeff Hynds: 1
13. Courtney Kimmel: 1, supply
14. Dean Moss: not online
15. Pete Nardi: 2, issues with capacity and recycling terms
16. Sara O'Connor: not online
17. Brad O'Neal: not online
18. Joseph Oswalt III: not online
19. Tommy Paradise: 1
20. Reid Pollard: 1
21. Brandon Stutts: not online
22. Bill Wabbersen: 2
23. Will Williams: not online
24. Brad Young: 2

5. Review the Plan's 2-Page Summary Sheet [**Discussion Item**] (Grace Houghton) 9:15–9:30
   a. If people don't read anything else, they might read this
   b. Bring to legislature or other groups
   c. Highlights key findings
   d. Question at the Saluda public meeting was what are the key takeaways

e. First page: brief background of the planning process, discussion of current water use and how it compares to permitted and registered amount, discussion of 2 demand projections compared to the permitted and registered amount
f. Second page
    i. talk about key findings from surface water quantity models
        1. For current demands, generally a low risk of shortages. May have been some small shortages throughout history for ag users but there were offline impoundments that users could pull from
        2. 2070 demands showed low probability of shortages for all different users
        3. Full permitted and registered scenarios: if everyone were to pull their full permitted amount there would be shortages. Generally, not enough water in the basin to fully meet those amounts
    ii. Groundwater conditions
        1. Haven't been long-term declines
        2. Greatest concern with Upper Floridan and saltwater intrusion
        3. Could talk about limitations with models
    iii. Important recommendations
        1. Supply side, demand side and adaptive management
    iv. QR code leads to full plan and executive summary
g. Discussion
    i. C: 1st page, 2nd column go through detailed analysis of current water withdrawals. Say we have findings without any data. Need to present data. Permits were not scientific. Too subjective for key findings
    ii. C: went through chapter 5, look at analysis, we determine there is enough water in the basin to satisfy current demand. Projected shortage for high demand 2070 projection. Planning framework focused on reliability of supply at different levels and not a single yield. Planning framework focused on reliability at different levels, maybe there's a way we can summarize it. We can quantify the availability of water through assessment of shortages and get some of that language or a graph. Caution against putting a line on the graph
    iii. C: difficult to meaningfully put a single supply curve on the graph because it varies by where you are in the basin. Combining LS and S, which are 2 different watersheds also complicates it. Framework intended to focus on shortages at specific user intakes, not intended to have a single water supply number for the basin as a whole. Have enough water for all users.
    iv. C: good to include some way to address that and talk about it
    v. C: main question, what's the basin's current available supply and demand? Have demand, don't have supply. Can put something and put caveats

vi. C: need to rephrase the question, it's too general. When you talk about the surface water supply in the basin, you're mainly talking about the outlet of the basin. It's meaningless unless someone is at that particular location. It's not informative and can get misleading
vii. C: if people interpret the permitted and registered as available supply, they won't see the problem
viii. C: could say there is a level where current use patterns would run into shortages. Tricky part is to caveat it to not be misleading
ix. C: comment about looking at black line and thinking it's the amount is correct. We know that's not the amount because there was no science for the permits
x. C: state should look at part of the water planning process.
xi. C: paragraph that talks about overallocation below. No visual cue that says this is where we run into problem. Could say at this level of demand, we see shortages in supply
xii. C: utilities struggle with supply line, it turns out to be a step function or a curve for an individual system. Very tricky to do at the regional level
xiii. Q: why is the black line static? That anticipates no more permitted and registered users in the next 50 years. A: should label it as the current permitted and registered amount
xiv. Q: is this surface and ground? A: yes
xv. C: should put only a surface level layer to the graph
xvi. C: only have 2 pages
xvii. C: need a visual. We have a visual for demand, let's see visual of supply. Entices the reader to read more.
xviii. C: could put a band for supply. Gives reader an idea of what potential availability is
xix. C: better to keep simple
xx. C: good to have something that would be an alert to the average reader to read more of the plan
xxi. Will make edits and send revisions

6. Discuss Public Meeting and Presentation [**Discussion Item**] (Grace Houghton) 9:30–10:15
    a. Public meeting
        i. RBC shares RBP to the public, 30 days after we have the plan posted
        ii. Targeting week 7/14
        iii. Evening, 6-8 pm
        iv. Location?
        v. Other RBCs held public meetings on Tuesdays or Thursdays. Church groups have meetings on Wednesdays

vi. Not everyone is going to be able to attend but want to encourage as much RBC participation as we can
vii. 7/15
    1. Kari can't attend
viii. 7/17
    1. Couple people can't attend that whole week
ix. Next week
    1. Could do 7/22
    2. People are generally available
x. Location
    1. Hampton
        a. Been doing it at church
        b. Lake Warren State Park
            i. Nice community room, but WIFI bad
            ii. Can reserve it online
    2. Beaufort-Jasper
        a. Don't know about evenings

b. Public meeting agenda
    i. Agenda
        1. Welcome and introduction
        2. Overview of planning process
        3. Draft RBP highlights
        4. Public comment period
        5. Q: does every public meeting have the public show up? A: historically limited attendance except for Saluda meeting
        6. Q: what number is a good amount? How many people attended? A: 50 people attended Saluda meeting but that included RBC members and DES staff
        7. Q: has there been any instances where no one's shown up? A: had occasions where only 1 or 2 have shown up

c. Draft slides
    i. Agenda
    ii. Welcome and introductions
    iii. Overview of planning process
        1. History
        2. 8 basins
        3. Timeline
        4. PPAC
        5. Interest groups
        6. What is an RBP?
        7. Focus on quantity
        8. RBP phases
        9. Stakeholder participation
    iv. Draft LSS RBP highlights
        1. Agenda
        2. Vision statement

3. Goals
4. Current water demands for LS and S
    a. Provide context
5. Key finding- Current use vs permitted and registered
6. Future water demand scenarios for LS
7. Future water demand scenarios for S
8. Current and future water availability assessment
9. Surface water key findings
10. Extended drought scenario analysis
11. Streamflow ecology relationships
    a. Only done at 1 location
12. Surface water management strategies
    a. Demand side strategies
13. LSSRBC recommendations
14. Implementation plan
15. Call to action
16. Link to RBP, executive summary and 2 pager.
17. Q&A
18. Will update discussion of surface water availability assessment

d. Assigning discussion spots
    i. Vision and goals: Ken
    ii. Water demands/ surface water availability- John
    iii. Streamflow ecology relationship
        1. Q: do we have a recommendation of looking at more locations in the plan? A: some RBCs made that recommendation. We did not, has to be wadable and most of our tributaries are not.
        2. C: will likely confuse
        3. Cut
    iv. Water management strategies: Pete, follow up with ag
    v. Plan recommendations/ implementation
        1. Q: do you recommend splitting it up? A: if there's enough volunteers, we can do anything.
        2. Pete volunteered. Maybe Dean?
        3. Pete technical, Dean rest of recommendations
        4. Kari and Ken to close
    vi. Discuss Saluda success in planning team meeting
        1. Have planning meeting scheduled for June 19th
        2. Currently scheduled for same day as WaterSC meeting
        3. Will try to get a sooner meeting set up

7. Review RBC Membership and Term Limits (Grace Houghton) 10:15–10:25
    a. Moved to next meeting

8. Upcoming Schedule and Adjourn (Grace Houghton) 10:25–10:30
    a. Public meeting 22nd. Look into space in Hampton, hopefully it's available. Reach out if any issues

b. Virtual RBC meeting late August
c. Final plan August/ September

Meeting adjourned: 10:29 AM

Minutes: Taylor Le Moal and Tom Walker

Approved: 9/4/2025

RBC Chat:

08:25:24 From Bill Wabbersen to Everyone:

can you hear me?

08:26:24 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

couldn't hear you bill

08:27:19 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

if you play with the audio in the bottom left of the screen it should help

09:44:39 From larhayden to Everyone:

Folks. I have another meeting. Gotta go. Enjoyed being a member of the RBC. Learned alot. Let me know if I can help in the future

09:45:16 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

Replying to "Folks. I have another meeting. Gotta go. Enjoyed...":

there's still a final vote after the first public meeting. we'll see you then