

Lower Savannah-Salkehatchie River Basin Council

March 6, 2025 Meeting Minutes

RBC Members Present: Bill Wabbersen, Brad Young, Brian Chemsak, Dean Moss, Ken Caldwell, Pete Nardi, Reid Pollard, John Carman, Lynn McEwen, Brandon Stutts, Jeff Hynds, Sara O'Connor, Larry Hayden, & Taylor Brewer

RBC Members Absent: Danny Black, Austin Connelly, Leslie Dickerson, Kari Foy, Samuel Grubbs, Heyward Horton, Courtney Kimmel, Brad O'Neal, Joseph Oswald, Tommy Paradise, & Will Williams

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

Total Present: 27

1. Call the Meeting to Order (Ken Caldwell, RBC Vice Chair) 10:00–10:10
 - a. Review of Meeting Objectives
 - b. Approval of Agenda
 - i. Couldn't approve because don't have a quorum
 - ii. Later on, approved
 - iii. Dean Moss – 1st and Bill Wabbersen – 2nd
 - c. Approval of February 6th Minutes and Summary
 - i. Can't approve because don't have a quorum
 - ii. Later on, approved
 - iii. Dean Moss – 1st and John Carman – 2nd
 - d. Newsworthy Items [**Discussion Item**]
 - i. Drought tabletop exercise
 1. Took place 3/5
 2. C: very good exercise. 5 scenarios, people talked about what they would do and the next steps. Interdependencies between groups, communication is critical
 3. Q: were there any numbers discussed? A: more assuming Drought Committee had already declared drought conditions. Talked about drought indicators briefly
 4. Q: after attending the drought tabletop exercise, did you rethink any of the RBC recommendations/ consider any new recommendations for drought response? A: The ag community feels it before it shows in the indicators. Once it's bad enough for them to get aid, most things are too far gone to get aid anyway. Power companies are dependent on the water supply. Dependencies should be highlighted. Triggers for crop insurance are sometimes misguided

- ii. IRBC meeting
 - 1. US and LSS met
 - 2. Discussed recommendations and ways to align them
 - 3. Some changes that LSS will bring to full group
 - iii. Pee Dee plan was approved and finalized
- 2. Public and Agency Comment Period (Grace Houghton) 10:10–10:15
 - a. C: Fines for water usage during a drought are very minimal. Could be discussed
- 3. February Meeting Review (Grace Houghton) 10:15–10:20
 - a. Supply-side strategies already in use
 - i. Info from the last meeting put into draft chapter 7
 - ii. Water reuse, onsite retention, conjunctive use, interconnections and regionalization, interbasin transfers, ASR
 - b. Demand-side strategies
 - i. Municipal support includes conservation pricing structure, public education, landscape irrigation program, leak detection and water loss control programs, AMI/ AMR, and water waste management. No prioritization
 - ii. Industrial and energy supported: water audits, rebates, water recycling and reuse, water-saving equipment, installing water-saving fixtures, educating employees. No prioritization
 - iii. Irrigation supported: water audits, irrigation equipment changes, soil management and cover cropping, irrigation scheduling, crop variety/ type/ conversions*, moisture sensors, and wetting agents. Soil management and cover cropping highest priority
 - 1. Talked to ag people, all of these are best practices anyway
- 4. Update on Draft Chapters (Grace Houghton) 10:20–10:30
 - a. Chapter description
 - i. Section 1: introduction
 - ii. Section 2: description of basin
 - iii. Section 3: water resources of US
 - iv. Section 4: current and projected water demand
 - v. Section 5: comparison of water resource availability and water demand
 - vi. Section 6: Water Management Strategies
 - vii. Section 7: water management strategies recommendations
 - viii. Section 8: drought response
 - ix. Section 9: policy, legislative, regulatory, technical, and planning process recommendations
 - x. Section 10: RBP implementation
 - b. Draft chapter review schedule
 - i. 2 and 8 distributed 2/5, requesting comments by 3/6

- ii. 3 distributed 2/28, requesting comments by 3/14
- iii. 7 distributed 3/7, requesting comments by 3/21
- iv. 4 and 6 distributed 3/14, requesting comments by 3/28
- v. 1 and 9 distributed 3/21, requesting comments by 4/4
- vi. 5 and 10 distributed 4/11, requesting comments by 4/25
- vii. Q: key chapter is chapter 5. Is there enough quantity of water in the basin to satisfy current and projected future needs in different scenarios? We don't know if there's a problem. Is there anything we can do to accelerate #5? A: could send a draft chapter 5 with surface water. Waiting on Brooke to complete the groundwater availability.
- viii. C: missing a critical piece of info with the groundwater data. A: groundwater model will not be ready for this iteration. I hope that DES can show results in the next year/ year and a half.
- ix. C: The water plan should state that the groundwater model was not done as intended. A: will be noted.
- x. We are mandated to finish these. Plans get reviewed every 5 years
- xi. C: critical recommendation: if we have to say to SC that they should not permit any groundwater withdrawals in certain areas because we don't know
- xii. C: I don't think we have a problem. Model is just a tool. Hesitant to put restrictions on it
- xiii. C: only problem is that Savannah and SE GA are impacting the groundwater and we haven't done anything about that. Need to sit with GA and work out a deal. A: RBC has a draft recommendation about coordinating with GA
- xiv. C: participated in IRBC meeting. Startling what they discussed in the call about chaos going on in GA. "Private city"- big fight in Pooler. Do we need someone from GA to tell us what's going on there? A: could be a part of the implementation plan
- xv. C: attended GA water planning meeting and there were mentions about working with SC
- xvi. C: Governor McMaster and GA Governor need to agree that we need to work together so that pressure comes down from governor's office through state agencies and legislature on both sides.
- xvii. Added "communication between SC and GA governors" to parking lot
- xviii. Q: has there been another GPS model done of the groundwater? A: yes, there is an old one. One more related to saltwater intrusion- 2005-2010, USGS made one in 2010 for this area. Don't have anything to fall back on. Making progress with USGS to get the new model out
- xix. Q: has USGS done any modeling in Savannah? A: GAEPD is putting out a request for proposals sometime within the next 2-3 months for groundwater technical support
- xx. C: a year ago in HH, we had to force trade with DHEC a reduction in permit from one part of the aquifer to get an increased permit to withdraw from the brackish part of the aquifer. Concerning we're not basing it on what's actually available

- xxi. C: a lot of uncertainty in what GA's going to do, uncertainty in groundwater, uncertainty in climate
- xxii. C: private cities go back to Florida. Disney built a city called Celebration that enables Disney to do whatever it wants. Now GA is inspired to make private cities
- xxiii. Send out what we have of chapter 5 for the surface water assessment. Make sure any chapter where groundwater is discussed, analysis of what you've been able to do is really discussed/ explain that groundwater model is not available and there's a lot of uncertainty
- xxiv. Make sure that everyone who wanted to review the chapters has had a chance
- xxv. C: agree with table overload but understand how much info you have to put in the paper. A: there will be an executive summary too. Other RBPs have a 30-page document that is simple and tries to pull out the highlights of each chapter. Could also prepare a 2-page summary which Broad, Saluda, and US RBCs have all suggested- like an executive summary of the executive summary
- xxvi. Q: in table 3.1, we have this endless table that has ancient data and a lot of N/As. What are we trying to show? A: table listing USGS gauges in both basins. Quite extensive since we're covering both S and LS. Think N/As are for specific statistics that there's not info available but can add a note to explain. Can pull out a lot of the inactive gauges and put them in the appendix
- xxvii. Q: do you need negative reports from those who have read it but don't have substantive comments or is that not helpful? A: nice to know that RBC members reviewed it
- xxviii. C: send over updated info for the table in chapter 8 about the Beaufort Jasper Water system

5. Finish Discussion and Development of River Basin Plan Recommendations (Grace Houghton) [**Discussion Item**] 10:30–12:00

- a. Policy, legislative, regulatory, technical and planning process recommendations can include
 - i. Suggestions for improving the river basin planning process
 - ii. Considerations for additional technical info or tools
 - iii. Potential changes to state policy or to the existing regulatory or legislative environment that would benefit the water planning process
- b. RB planning process recommendations include
 - i. Changes to the RBC membership, bylaws, meeting schedules, or procedures
 - ii. Ideas to improve communication among RBCs and other groups
 - iii. Funding needs and sources of funding
 - iv. Improvements to the public outreach program

- v. Implementing the RBP and continued RBC activities and actions
- c. LSSRBC planning process recommendations from last meeting
 - i. SCDES should organize an annual statewide meeting of RBCs and state agencies
 - 1. No comments
 - ii. The SC legislature should continue to fund state water planning activities, including RBC-based river basin planning
 - 1. Alt policy recommendation from December: Recognizing that SC is growing rapidly, the demand for water is increasing and water resources are finite, water planning at the river basin and state level should continue
 - 2. Last month mentioned funding specifically, December's was implied
 - 3. C: important that US and LSS say the same thing. What's shown for US has been approved by them
 - 4. C: December conversation: talking about RBCs getting funding could be seen as self-serving
 - 5. Q: is WaterSC taking over the role of the RBCs? A: WaterSC is not a permanent group, but may turn into one. It has a couple of remaining tasks; the future is unknown. Not the plan for them to take over RBCs
 - 6. C: RBCs were a creation of DNR, not legislatively created. No state law that transfers us to DES. A: General Assembly agreed and acted on funding to get these going
 - 7. C: prefer language from December because it doesn't sound self-serving
 - 8. C: could add funding language to the end of December's
 - 9. C: prefer December's- needs to be simplified
 - 10. Changed to December's language
 - iii. RBC members should communicate with legislative delegations throughout the river basin planning process to promote their familiarity with the process and its goals and to generate buy-in on its recommendations
 - 1. Q: what are we going to tell our legislative delegations? What's the message? A: details would come in with the implementation plan. Edisto recommended this first, talked about having consistent messaging. Develop a list of talking points and keep track of who's talking to whom
 - iv. The RBC should support and promote outreach and education to increase awareness with the general public
 - v. SCDES should designate staff to continue to coordinate and support ongoing RBC activities
 - vi. Request that WaterSC consider recommendations from the RBCs
 - vii. SCDES, the RBC planning teams, and RBCs should conduct regular reviews of RBC membership to sustain and make sure all interest categories are

- adequately represented and attendance across all interest categories meets the requirements of the RBC bylaws
- viii. The RBC, with the support of SCDES, should communicate with GADEP and request to coordinate water planning activities with the CGRC
1. Implementation plan is when prioritization happens
 2. C: not sure RBC is the one to do it. Recommendation should be state should formally create a relationship with GA to manage water planning in Savannah River Basin
 3. C: that has to come first but we still have to coordinate
 4. Q: is there any value in having 2 recommendations, one working within the RBC process and one looking for coordination at a higher level
- d. IRBC recommendation discussions
- i. GA
 1. USRBC: increase coordination and planning with GAEPD on Savannah River water resources issues, with support from SCDES. *Meetings with other planning bodies in the Savannah River basin should occur annually at a minimum*
 2. LSSRBC: the RBC, with the support of SCDES, should communicate with GADEP and request to coordinate water planning activities with the CGRC. *Meeting with other planning bodies in the Savannah River basin should occur annually, at a minimum*
 3. IRBC meeting suggested that coordination should happen at least once a year
 4. C: leave it as it was and then add specificity in the implementation plan
 5. C: other planning bodies referred to by USRBC are the Savannah Upper Ogeechee Regional Council and CGRC. 4 different planning bodies
 6. Added water resources to LSS
 7. C: history of organizations that only exist for 1-2 meetings and then go away
 8. C: let's get more specificity in here
 9. C: ok with it but unless there's outreach at the top, it doesn't mean anything
 10. C: Governor to Governor compact
 11. C: could settle in court
 12. C: standing group in the Catawba between the 2 states, so not asking for something new
 13. Add additional specificity about least one annual meeting
 - ii. Army Corps of Engineers
 1. US: as part of future water planning efforts, the RBC should attempt to increase engagement with USACE, especially with the Operations Division

2. LSS: as part of future water planning efforts, the RBC should attempt to increase engagement with USACE, especially with the Planning Division
 3. C: coordination with the federal government
 4. C: add to LSS to increase engagement with the Department of Energy
- e. Technical and program recommendations may include
- i. Need for more data
 - ii. Model improvement
 - iii. Need for additional models
 - iv. Improved water use data, population data or estimates, water demand estimates, land use data, etc.
 - v. Recommendations for technical studies to improve knowledge of specific issues
 - vi. Need for additional technical training for the RBC members
 - vii. Improved instream flow requirement info
- f. LSS RBC technical and program recommendations
- i. SCDES should continue to work with the USGS to develop a groundwater model covering the LSS basins and use the model to better understand the capacity of each aquifer
 1. C: capacity vs demand
 2. C: don't know how it works with current demand. A: have some groundwater info that gives current information
 3. Added "and its ability to sustain future demands"
 - ii. Estimate the index of biotic integrity (or similar scoring measure) for the Salkehatchie River within 5 years of plan approval as a baseline for this basin, which has fewer environmental impacts than other basins. If the scoring for this river is poor, determine the root cause and use this info to assess other stream reaches
 1. Difficult to do IBI and that's why they didn't calculate anything. Don't think we should put it in
 2. Red bucket
 - iii. The RBC supports continued efforts to maintain and expand streamflow gauges
 1. C: suggest we cluster surface water and groundwater recommendations together
 - iv. Future SWAM modeling should incorporate scenarios that further examine future uncertainties, such as changes in rainfall and hydrology, alternative population growth scenarios, and potential impacts of future development on runoff
 - v. Future planning efforts should include evaluation of surface water quality and trends, including nutrient loading and sedimentation
 - vi. Funding to be provided to SCDES to add monitoring wells in the central part of the basin in deeper aquifers
 1. Crouch Branch and McQueen Branch
 - a. 2 aquifers with the most uncertainty

- b. Map of potentiometric contours from most recent mapping efforts
 - i. Dashed lines are where its inferred water levels
 - ii. No wells in Jasper and Beaufort
 - iii. Able to sustain water levels over time
 - iv. Q: is central part too generic for what you said? A: issue with citing groundwater wells is that we need publicland and permission. To not put constraints, should drill within the central region of Bamberg County and northern portion of Colleton County
 - v. Working on getting wells in Lexington County
 - vi. Issue with production wells is that you don't get a continuous record
 - vii. Q: how do you do a groundwater study without monitoring wells? A: USGS is going to use pumping wells and calibrate with old water levels
 - viii. Because Upper Floridan and Middle Floridan and Gordon aquifers are productive, those are the most used
 - c. Q: Does the RBC want to add more specificity to the central part of the basins- specific counties and aquifers- or leave it as is? A: think we should mention counties.
 - d. Added "such as Colleton, Bamberg, and Hampton."
 - g. IRBC recommendation discussion
 - i. The state should request for and cost share in the completion of phase 2 of the USACE Comprehensive Study and Drought Plan Update
 - 1. Study that was going to have the Army Corps revisit their original drought plan. Stopped a few years ago
 - 2. US thought it was worthwhile to include a recommendation saying it should be completed
 - 3. C: makes sense to support their position. Benefits for both basins
 - 4. Added
 - 5. C: both GA and SC contributed to funding phase 2. Nature Conservancy was a significant contributor, as was other agencies
 - ii. The RBC encourages local governments and land managers to act to reduce sediment loading to reservoirs
 - 1. C: This one is unusual since we don't have reservoirs in our basin, so we don't have influence
 - 2. C: we depend on storage in those reservoirs, so having sediment in the reservoir is bad
 - 3. C: Discussion was state vs local requirements
 - 4. Q: change the wording to reservoirs and small impoundments or just to small impoundments
 - 5. Changed reservoirs to impoundments

6. C: US example: Greenville County's recent change in their stream buffer ordinance, stricter buffer requirement than what the state requires
7. Yellow bucket
- iii. Encourage the building permitting process where applicable to require developers work with water/ wastewater utilities to ensure adequate availability/ capacity
 1. C: previous discussion about whether or not it happens already
 2. C: in our standpoint, it already happens
 3. C: example- in Aiken, the county is responsible for water treatment and the city provides fresh water. A plant was looking into coming into Aiken. City Council supported it, County Council realized there was 0 capacity left and voted against it. The County administrator said it has a ghost of a chance of ever coming back. Well-intended economic activity that wasn't based on reality. Aiken is permitted at capacity for the next 2 years
 4. Changed building to new development

Lunch

12:00–12:25

6. Finish Discussion and Development of River Basin Plan Recommendations (Grace Houghton) **[Discussion Item]** 10:30–12:00
 - a. Parking lot of potential technical and program recommendations
 - i. Groundwater modeling analyses of high demands in coastal portion of basin
 1. Have the recommendation to develop a groundwater model. Do you want to add specific modeling scenarios or just leave it as supply and demand?
 2. C: continued saltwater intrusion based
 3. Changed to "groundwater model should be used to analyze and predict saltwater intrusion in Upper and Middle Floridan aquifers in Beaufort County"
 4. C: model that USGS has developed is of the entire coastal plain. Not dual density model, can't look at saltwater migration.
 5. C: previous models show looming of the saltwater and freshwater parts. Better to say chloride levels
 6. Changed saltwater intrusion to chloride levels
 7. C: when doing freshwater and saltwater modeling in NY, had different models to try to determine chloride level, believe we were using dual density model
 8. Q: could you put in a plume that represents the chloride concentrations?
 9. C: existing model might not be the most appropriate model to answer all the questions, but can do some of what Pete is suggesting

10. C: Added USGS should acknowledge that the models will be changed. A: have recommendation about the models already
- ii. Study on the potential for ASR throughout the basin
 1. Q: where is it applicable? A: could be done all throughout the basin. Orangeburg has good potential
 2. Q: is there a need for it?
 3. C: it could be a drought strategy
 4. Chapter 7 has a section on adaptive management. Will talk about a number of strategies that might not be necessary but could be needed if conditions change
 5. C: river varies by 18 ft in a year. Aquifer isn't the smartest place to store the flood. See reservoir as an easier solution
 6. Red bucket
- iii. Creation of a groundwater barrier via injection of treated wastewater effluent to prevent saltwater intrusion
 1. Changed wastewater effluent to recycled water
 2. C: being used throughout US to help stop saltwater. Needs to be studied, and needs to be regulatory changes
 3. Changed to "study the use of recycled water as a groundwater barrier to prevent saltwater intrusion"
 4. Q: maybe say DES should study? A: added SCDES
 5. Different RBCs have just said what should happen and then specify who does it
 6. Changed to SCDES should study the use of indirect potable reuse
 - a. Additional discussion for chapter: recycled water as a groundwater barrier to prevent saltwater intrusion
- b. Document of all technical recommendations from other RBCs
 - i. Q: we don't have very good stream flow model. A: have a recommendation
 - ii. Fund and establish a mesoscale network of weather and climate monitoring stations
 1. Every RBC except for Edisto recommended this
 2. Added
- c. Policy, legislative, or regulatory recommendations may include
 - i. Modifications to existing state or local laws, regulations, or ordinances
 - ii. New state or local laws, regulations, or ordinances
 - iii. Ideas for recurring funding for water planning work
 - iv. Restructuring existing groups or agencies
- d. LSSRBC consensus-based RBC policy recommendations
 - i. Improve the current laws that allow for regulation of water use, so they are effective and enforceable
 - ii. The SCSWWPURA should allow for reasonable use criteria to be applied to all surface water withdrawals, like those that currently exist for groundwater withdrawals

- iii. Recognizing that SC is growing rapidly, the demand for water is increasing, and water resources are finite, water planning at the river basin and state level should continue
 - 1. Replace this with no funding version
 - iv. The SC legislature should establish a grant program to help water users implement the actions and strategies identified in the legislatively approved State Water Plan
 - v. The water withdrawal permitting process should specifically assess the permit application's alignment with the legislatively approved State Water Plan
 - e. IRBC discussion suggestions
 - i. The RBC recommends that the legislature approve and adopt the State Water Plan
 - 1. Would likely happen but recommendation makes it definitely happen
 - 2. C: not clear how this process is going to work. Will state water plan have anything to do with the work we're doing here? Need to say that RBCs are officially created by legislature. Currently no record of RBCs
 - 3. Q: how does that relate to the earlier discussions of having RBC meet and be funded? A: DES needs to ask legislature for money in their budget to fund outside organization
 - 4. C: benefit of RBC is that it is consensus based
 - 5. Water Resources Act does give DNR authority to put planning bodies together. Through that authority we put PPAC together which called for the creation of the RBCs.
 - 6. C: let's not create bureaucracy where we don't need it
 - 7. C: seems like it would have to come from the legislation
 - 8. C: confounded by the governor creating WaterSC before these plans were complete
 - 9. C: need to figure out how this all works together
 - 10. Q: when is this plan going to be complete? A: draft plan in May
 - 11. C: last WaterSC meeting, there was requests for RBC leadership to talk to them. May be an upcoming meeting where chairs/ vice chairs can talk to WaterSC
 - 12. C: one RBC noted that they wanted the RBPs to be included in State Water Plan as an appendix
 - 13. Yellow bucket
 - ii. RBC recommends that as a part of the comprehensive planning process each local jurisdiction consult the Resilience Plan, Hazard Mitigation plans, and RBPs
 - 1. Act requires that when local jurisdictions do their comprehensive planning process, they have to include resilience
 - 2. C: HH doing a comp plan update and creating resilience planning

3. Vice Chair of Saluda wanted to make the point that there's a lot of great documents that discuss resilience, so local governments should review anything that has to do with resilience
 4. C: seems outside our wheelhouse
 5. C: does no harm
 6. C: it dilutes our recommendation if we include things that aren't crisp
 7. C: assume people will know what to do
 8. C: worth noting it. Part of implementation
 9. Added note resilience planning rec in outreach recommendation-aligning RBP with other planning efforts in the state
- f. Parking lot of potential LSSRBC policy recs
- i. Communication between SC and GA governors
 1. Recognizing that the resources of the Savannah River Basin are finite and shared between states, Governor of SC should communicate with the governor of GA to establish a coordinated, state-level planning and water management process for the Savannah River Basin and their shared groundwater aquifers
 2. green
 - ii. Whether water law and their implementing regulations should distinguish between registrations and permits
 1. No ag representatives
 2. Genesis of this recommendation was Broad RBC. They wanted to do away with registrations and just require permits. Other councils have considered but not agree with it
 3. C: if ag guys were here, they would say no
 4. yellow
 - iii. 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. Where there's a large corporate agricultural entity created and they don't exist here, they exist where it's created. It creates friction between other ag produces and water users
 2. Nothing in state law that addresses corporate entity vs smaller family-owned entity
 3. SC is predominantly small family-owned farming
 4. Q: how are you defining corporate farms vs contract growers for large corporations? Going to have contract growers all across ag
 5. Q: why are we contemplating this? How does it affect the plan? A: definitely political. Creation of the farm in Aiken County is the reason RBCs were started
 6. C: 96% of farms are family farms
 7. Yellow bucket, send to ag
 - iv. Reevaluation of permit requirements/ MIF for Salkehatchie where there is a unique flow regime

1. C: not that many draws on it. A: no surface water permits in the Salkehatchie basin. All ag registrations
2. Not a current discussion, but could happen in the future
3. Q: has this happened outside of the Salkehatchie where someone's tried to get a permit and had to deal with this issue? A: hasn't happened
4. Red bucket
- v. Recommendation on strengthening state laws around protection of wetlands, given the 2023 Sacket vs USEPA Supreme Court decision which ruled nearly half of the 118 million acres of wetlands in the US cannot be protected by the Clean Water Act
 1. C: a lot of background needed to understand this one
 2. C: this has a lot of impact on the RBC but not within this iteration of the RBP
 3. C: Sacket decision did not affect salt marsh. Deals with surface water wetlands in particular situations
 4. C: too complicated, too soon
 5. Q: should it be mentioned somewhere else in the plan?
 6. C: other states have started to take action
 7. C: nowhere in this basin has non-navigable wetlands
 8. Could make recommendation that DES maps out wetlands in the state that are impacted
 9. C: don't understand how it impacts the quantity of water flow vs demand
 10. Yellow bucket
- vi. SCDES should refrain from requiring the trading of permitted groundwater withdrawal capacities between aquifer systems in order for permittees to obtain withdrawal permits absent an analysis of available capacities within these aquifers
 1. In order to obtain groundwater withdrawal capacity from one aquifer system, permitted capacity in another aquifer system had to be given back
 2. State was trying to meet certain goals
 3. Concern is without using the capacity standpoint, is the practice problematic?
 4. This is for groundwater
 5. Someone comes to DES, wants 100 mgy, seems reasonable, they get a permit for 100 mgy. After first 5 years, they only have 5 years of data, keep 100 mgy. After another 5 years, we look at their water use. Highest use over 10 years is 40 mgy. Take highest number, multiply by 1.2, recommend getting a permit for that number instead of 100 mgy. I would talk with the permittee and see if there were plans for expansion. Talk about potential increases and reductions
 6. C: Between different aquifer systems. A: if someone adds a well in a different aquifer, DES makes them public notice the new aquifer

because they are increasing their withdrawal volume in a new aquifer compared to what they currently have. Shouldn't cause a problem because current permittee with 2 wells hasn't caused an issue

7. Q: if we don't have data about the aquifers, how can you give someone a certain amount of water? A: depends on who it is and how much they plan to withdraw. Water suppliers do pump tests or well drillers will know. Look at reported use and bathymetric maps
8. C: we have data to come to some conclusions for groundwater without the model. A: looking at the maps, we can make educated decisions
9. Q: why wasn't HH just granted the additional capacity? A: hard to say
10. Yellow buckets represent a level of interest or need for some inquiry in some of these areas that would be useful. A: chapter 3 has a place where we can talk about concerns/ add discussion

7. Development of Implementation Plan (Grace Houghton) [**Discussion Item**] 12:25–1:50

- a. 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 the first 5 years following adoption of the RBP
 - iii. Budget
 1. Budget needed to accomplish each objective
 2. Identifies potential funding sources

8. Upcoming Schedule and Discussion Topics (Grace Houghton) 1:50–2:00

- a. Schedule
 - i. 4/3- finish implementation plan and develop progress metrics
 1. Read implementation plan and metrics prior to meeting
 - ii. 4/22- SRS site tour
 1. Need to register
 - iii. 5/1- draft executive summary and plan review
 - iv. June- final draft plan and first public meeting
 - v. July- address draft plan comments
 - vi. August- finalize plan and second public meeting
 1. Will share format for public meetings in April/ May meeting. Potentially in Waltherboro and northern part of the basin

2. Q: has there been substantial public participation in other RBC public meetings? A: attendance has been minimal, there have been public comments
3. Q: how much notification is given for the meetings? A: post it 30 days in advance on our website, do a press release, and have Clemson send it out. Have a state and federal list and send out press releases to media outlets

Meeting Adjourned: 1:58 PM

Minutes: Taylor Le Moal and Tom Walker

Approved: 4/3/25

RBC Chat:

00:23:58 John Boyer: If Grace is plugged into that outlet in middle of stage, it doesn't work.

00:24:18 Thomas Walker: she's not, i'll get her to plug it in

01:07:17 Leigh Anne Monroe - SC DES: Hey I need to drop off and join another meeting. I plan to re-join here once done. Thanks!

01:07:25 Thomas Walker: Reacted to "Hey I need to drop o..." with 👍

01:16:20 Thomas Walker: break until 11:15

02:12:55 Thomas Walker: break until 12:30

03:46:23 Leigh Anne Monroe - SC DES: Could I get a bit of clarification on that last one?