

Lower Savannah-Salkehatchie River Basin Council

May 1, 2025 Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Pete Nardi, Ken Caldwell, Dean Moss, Courtney Kimmel, Brad Young, Brian Chemsak, Bill Wabbersen, Kari Foy, Larry Hayden, Tommy Paradise, Jeff Hynds, Lynn McEwen, Taylor Brewer, & John Carman

Members Absent: Danny Black, Austin Connelly (Angel Brabham, alternate, present), Leslie Dickerson, Sam Grubbs, Heyward Horton, Sara O'Connor, Brad O'Neal, Joseph Oswald, Reid Pollard, & Brandon Stutts

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

Total Present: 28

1. Call the Meeting to Order (Kari Foy, RBC Chair) 10:00–
10:10
 - a. Review of Meeting Objectives
 - b. Approval of Agenda
 - i. Agenda approved
 - ii. Pete Nardi – 1st and Dean Moss – 2nd
 - c. Approval of April 3rd Minutes and Summary
 - i. Officially approve minutes at next meeting
 - ii. Minutes later approved
 - iii. Pete Nardi – 1st and Bill Wabbersen – 2nd
 - d. Newsworthy Items [**Discussion Item**]
 - i. SRS Site Tour
 1. C: learned a lot
 2. C: doesn't appear that the Savannah River Site will be a huge drawer of water. Don't really have facilities. Have a lot of environmental issues. They're not telling us everything. Some concerns about contamination
 3. C: I didn't get that impression. I've worked there for 30 years. They showed us stuff from the 50s and 60s and what they've done to fix it
 4. C: I didn't get an impression in regard to water quality, more interested in water quantity
 5. C: In HH, have customers that are concerned about tritium in the water. Went there thinking that they do so much there we

shouldn't be concerned about it. Left thinking they're doing a lot but it's still an issue. In Beaufort/ Jasper, they have to put in their annual water quality report a tritium statement because of the SRS

6. C: we would want to document that we took the trip
 7. C: they have the capacity to crank the water up. When we look in the report we don't have a quantity problem.
 8. Q: their withdrawal is not in our model, right? A: withdrawal is in the permitted scenario. Assumed they would be pulling out all they are fully permitted for with all 3 pump houses running. But they can't physically do that
 9. C: that's the case with the permitted and registered scenarios, they can't do it because of infrastructure
 10. C: confused about the groundwater aquifer they were talking about. A: they call it the Tuscaloosa but really the Crouch and/or McQueen
 11. C: fascinating to see the 5 reactors
- ii. WaterSC meeting 4/25
1. Water reuse discussion
 - a. SC WaterReuse chapter is developing a marketing study and social media campaign to understand how to build public acceptance around water reuse
 - b. USEPA defers to states for developing water reuse laws, regulation, and policies
 - i. Process is first, start with the statute, have to get a champion in the General Assembly, state senator is a sponsor. Statute directs DES to create the regulations
 - ii. Q: Are there legislators from coastal communities that will champion it? A: State Senator from Beaufort County or Charleston
 - c. SC WaterReuse has prepared a draft reuse statute which is under review
 - d. C: WaterReuse and SCDES have had a working group for about 2 years
 2. Water conservation and improved efficiency
 - a. Energy sector ideas
 - b. Conservation sector ideas
 - c. Water utility sector ideas
 - d. Ag and forestry sector ideas
 - e. Industry sector
 - f. Discussion wrap up
 - i. Need to incentivize and fund these conservation and efficiency strategies
 - ii. SWP should identify and promote ways to incentivize and fund these strategies

- g. Q: what is the official water board in SC? A: don't have long term water board. Have WaterSC, but it's an advisory board that ends at the end of the year. Topic will be discussed in SWP. Plan envisions RBCs continuing
 - h. Q: what other industry representatives are on WaterSC? A: info available on website
- 2. Public and Agency Comment Period (John Boyer) 10:10–10:15
 - a. Katherine Smith from SCDES was introduced to the group
- 3. April Meeting Review (John Boyer) 10:15–10:20
 - a. Policy, legislative, and regulatory process recommendations
 - i. approved
 - 1. RBC encourages local governments and land managers to coordinate to reduce sediment loading to waterways
 - 2. RBC recommends that the legislature approve and adopt the SWP and subsequent updates
 - ii. Not approved
 - b. Sent out complete draft of chapter 9
 - i. Review the narrative and make sure we captured discussion
 - ii. Little window of opportunity if we want to include any additional recommendations/ remove recommendations
- 4. Finalize Implementation Plan and Prioritize Objectives and/or Strategies (John Boyer)

[Discussion Item] 10:20–11:10

 - a. Comments or questions about implementation plan?
 - i. None
 - b. Proposed objectives
 - i. Can do 1-7 ranking or high, medium, low priority
 - ii. Prioritize strategies first then objectives
 - c. Improve water use efficiency to conserve water resources
 - i. Decided not to prioritize strategies because they apply differently to each user
 - ii. For ag, cover cropping and soil-related strategies were the most important
 - d. Engage GA in water planning
 - i. The Governor of SC communicates with the Governor of GA to establish water planning for Savannah River Basin
 - 1. Rated high priority
 - ii. RBC coordinates water planning activities with CGRC
 - 1. Q: what is the CGRC? A: synonymous with RBCs. Been in place for 10 years. Some differences- governor appointed instead of volunteers, but do the same thing
 - 2. C: could reach out but it would be awkward if there wasn't support from leadership. A: it's got to work its way up
 - 3. C: governor needs to understand the risk

4. C: both fine but the work's got to be done separately
5. Rated high priority
6. C: This is our biggest issue
- e. Communicate, coordinate, and promote findings and recommendations from River Basin Plan
 - i. SC Legislature continues to fund state water planning activities, including RBC
 1. Rated high priority
 - ii. SC Legislature establishes grant program
 1. Q: recurring theme is that smaller agencies don't have funds, why wouldn't that be high? A: agree, but medium in relation to others
 2. C: prioritizing is useful for 2 things. council has limited ability to implement a lot of stuff. Good to know what everyone is behind and think you should do right away or can push until later. Second reason is to compile all recommendations from RBCs, see similarities in recommendations, holds more weight with SWP
 3. C: weakness of high, medium, low, not granular
 4. Medium
 5. C: a lot of this stuff, we're relying upon other groups. How do we make these priorities and information available to people?
 - iii. RBC members communicate with legislative delegation throughout river basin planning process
 1. C: anything that happens in the state has to come through the legislature. Delegations have to understand what the changes are, why they're important, and be willing to support them
 2. C: don't know how you do it. A: we would take it to a committee.
 3. C: doesn't say when there's a bill generated by WaterSC. A: actions were to create talking points, provide consistent messaging, and track which representatives have been spoken to. There have been RBC members that have done that
 4. C: talked about developing slides
 5. medium
 - iv. SCDES designates staff to continue to coordinate and support ongoing RBC activities
 1. Rated high priority
 - v. RBC encourages WaterSC to consider the water planning recommendations developed by RBCs
 1. C: Encouraging isn't a real action-oriented word. A: there is an action associated with the strategy
 2. Rated high priority
 - vi. General comments
 - vii. C: think 1, 4, 5 are the most important. don't like A because it's self-serving (SC Legislature continues to fund state water planning activities, including RBC)
 1. Relative to other priorities in this objective

2. Q: what's the total SC use in Savannah River? A: permitted amount is couple billion gallons per day
 3. C: don't see them ever using billions. A: 2 major withdrawals on SC side, North Augusta and Beaufort Jasper. GA side has Augusta and area above Augusta. GA pulling 5-10x the amount of water out of the river. Nuclear plant not putting much back
 4. C: in modeling, including all GA withdrawals but don't include new withdrawal they're building
 5. C: total current surface water withdrawals for US and LS are 2900 MGD with thermoelectric, 134 MGD without thermoelectric
- f. Promote engagement in the water planning process
- i. Conduct regular reviews of RBC membership
 1. Q: how many people were originally appointed to this committee? We're at meeting 15 and the people in this room are the only ones who have been coming. Huge number of people who faded away, 2/3
 2. C: this one is important that there's constant process to update appointments to meetings and tend to the group
 3. High
 - ii. SCDES organizes an annual statewide meeting of RBCs and state agencies
 1. C: highest priority because without getting RBCs together and understanding what's happening throughout the state, we're kind of isolated. Would help us all to understand and know what's happening. Makes legislature understand it's not just LSS, its all of the regions
 2. C: before you get there, representation needs to be met. Need to be represented here before we can be represented as a group
 3. high
 - iii. RBC attempts to increase engagement with USACE planning division and US Department of Energy
 1. medium
 - iv. RBC supports and promotes outreach and education to increase awareness
 1. High
 2. C: talk to friends about it and they laugh and say, "don't talk to me about this anymore". Don't say what the value is, you will never get a bill
 3. C: will have a hard time turning my seat over because we're not communicating what we're doing and the value
 - v. Developers work with water/ wastewater utilities to ensure adequate availability of water resources and current and future capacity of infrastructure
 1. C: everything in E is covered in other permitting activities. A: water and wastewater are so different
 2. C: lower priority, happens in other places
 3. Medium

- g. Enhance understanding of groundwater resources
 - i. SCDES continues to work with USGS to develop a groundwater model of the LSS
 - 1. C: critical because we can't do what our mission was without it
 - 2. high
 - ii. SCDES seeks funding to add monitoring wells in deeper aquifers in the central part of the basin
 - 1. high
 - iii. USGS uses the groundwater model to analyze and predict chloride levels in Upper/ Middle Floridan aquifers
 - 1. C: medium because we don't have data right now anyways
 - 2. C: happens at local level
 - 3. Medium
 - 4. Q: does it have to be the USGS? A: could be privately contracted
 - 5. Removed USGS
 - 6. C: USGS is already working on the model, but if you want saltwater intrusion modeling the model is different
- h. Improve technical understanding of water resource management issues
 - i. RBC supports continued efforts to maintain and expand streamflow gages
 - 1. high
 - ii. Future modeling incorporates scenarios that further examine future uncertainties
 - 1. medium
 - iii. Future planning efforts include evaluation of surface water quality and trends
 - 1. C: when you're making judgements about new withdrawals, need to be able to evaluate the water quality impact
 - 2. C: every RBC has said so far as a part of future planning they wanted to look at water quality. Some debate about whether or not they should. No consensus on how
 - 3. C: water quality wasn't part of our mission A: originally was set up by DNR that doesn't do water quality. Now water quality and quantity are tied together in 1 agency
 - 4. C: we don't know what that governing agency looks like
 - 5. C: we're making a lot of recommendations with no structure
 - 6. Voting on high vs medium: medium won
 - iv. SCDES performs studies and analyses in support of surface water quality and trends
 - 1. C: don't like recycled water. Talk about reclaimed water. Not high compared to other things
 - 2. C: WaterSC originally talked about this as a priority. If our recommendations reflect what that team is doing, it does seem important
 - 3. C: capacity situation. That's why WaterSC and DES talk a lot about it

4. C: what's driving water use is discharge permits. The more you can recycle the less you have to get discharge permits
 5. Vote for high vs medium: high won
 6. C: golf courses south of the Broad River have to use recycled water for irrigation
 - v. SC Legislature funds and establishes a mesoscale network of weather and climate monitoring stations
 1. high
 - vi. RBC encourages local governments and land managers to act to reduce sediment loading to waterways
 1. Medium
- i. Improve drought management
 - i. Water utilities review their drought management plans and response ordinance every 5 years, update every 10 years
 1. C: can't remember discussion, drought management plans aren't required to be updated. A: we made a recommendation that these are old and haven't been updated or reviewed in forever
 2. high
 - ii. SCDES and SCDNR lobby for state funding to support review and update of drought management plans
 1. high
 - iii. RBC develops materials and outreach strategy for public suppliers to implement drought management recommendations
 1. medium
 - iv. State requests and costshares in the completion of phase 2 of USACE Comprehensive Study and Drought Plan Update
 1. Q: Army Corps didn't finish it? A: affects how much is released from Thurmond. Worked on phase 2 comprehensive study in 2020s but ran out of money. Came up with some alternatives that would have affected the drought plan, one was seasonal release of flows from Thurmond. Ran out of money, could pick it up if they got money from SC, GA, other regional partners
 2. Medium
- j. Objectives
 - i. Q: where is this going? A: first table in chapter 10. Table 10-2 includes priorities for strategies
 - ii. C: if we used high, medium, low for strategies, we should be consistent
 - iii. C: agree, but there's a strategy with 4 highs and it ends up being a medium because we're comparing relatives
 - iv. C: GA most important because they're taking up all the water
 - v. Some councils ranked some objectives the same
 - vi. C: 5, we have no understanding because we don't have the model
 - vii. C: some people in DES think we have all the modeling we need
 - viii. 2, 5 rated high
 - ix. 6 is hard because there's a lot of technical studies we're recommending
 - x. 6 high

- xi. C: 3's saying we want you to adopt this plan
- xii. Q: isn't 3 self-evident? A: actions are lobbying and talking to people, trying to influence
- xiii. Q: why do we have to prioritize it here if we've already prioritized it in the detailed plan?
- xiv. C: average each of the individual objectives they average high. A: looking at strategies relative to each other
- xv. Q: what's the criteria? A: subjective thought of what's more important
- xvi. Planning framework suggests RBCs prioritize the objectives. Sometimes they can't
- xvii. 7 medium
- xviii. 4 high
- xix. GA surface water withdrawal is 171 MGD from LS and 22 MGD from US
- xx. C: this whole plan is intended to conserve water. To say that 1 is lower priority would be flying in the face of the whole planning process
- xxi. 1 high
- xxii. Changed to no prioritization, just focus more on the strategies

Break

11:10–11:20

- 5. Develop Progress Metrics (John Boyer) **[Discussion Item]** 11:20–12:00
 - a. Progress metrics
 - i. Benchmark used to monitor the success or failure of an action taken by an RBC
 - ii. Planning framework requires each RBC to develop progress metrics
 - iii. Framework envisioned doing these at the beginning, we've been doing it more at the end because they deal with actions RBC takes, and actions are from the implementation plan
 - b. Proposed progress metrics
 - i. Improve water use efficiency to conserve water resources
 - 1. 1a. Water utilities establish a baseline water loss/leak detection measure and improvement is seen over 5 years in subsequent surveys
 - 2. (And/or) utilities meet industry standards for water loss/leak detection
 - a. C: generally, do survey 1x a year
 - b. Figure out baseline and measure improvement
 - c. Q: why would this be a better metric than gallons per person per day? A: this one focuses on water loss leak detection. GPD incorporates nonrevenue water loss and other things. Hard to track per capita residential water use
 - d. C: every utility or system will have water loss that might not be related to customer efficiency or conservation
 - e. C: could simplify and say real water loss- system side leaks, make a baseline and improve it
 - f. C: this is a progress metric for the RBC. Indication that RBC is doing a good job of encouraging water utilities to

- improve. A: yes, strategies are to encourage utilities to fix leaks and help them find funding and then we see progress
- g. Could add one related to per capita use
3. 1b. Added track per capita usage
 4. Removed “utilities meet industry standards for water loss/leak detection”
 - a. C: someone asked how quickly utilities respond to leaks, I said immediately. Not like that in other towns. Costs more to fix than cost of the water
 5. 1c. Funding opportunities and technical assistance are identified and used to implement conservation strategies
 6. C: for 1a instead of looking to see improvement over 5 years, try to track to see what is the water loss to utilities in the basin
 7. C: if you tie metrics to improvement, you’re never going to meet that. A: doesn’t get to objective of trying to improve water use efficiency, just collecting data
 8. C: without knowing the numbers, it might not be worthwhile for utilities to find leaks and fix them. A: inherent that first part is being done. Our goal is to promote water use efficiency and conserve water resources. Metric should be measuring improvement
 9. C: might not be done in 5 years. A: due to a lack of funding and ability
 10. C: never made a proactive effort to go find leaks. A: you’re arguing for not having that as a metric and just tracking per capita usage
 11. C: without knowing everyone’s numbers, don’t know if it’s worthwhile
 12. C: % loss number isn’t explanatory enough of where the water is going
 13. Removed 1a
 14. Q: how would this happen? If you decide to track per capita usage as an RBC you send out a survey and ask about per capita usage and how much water are you pulling.
 15. C: maybe enough info to track changes over time
 16. Q: if we’re already measuring loss leak, shouldn’t that be tracked too?
 17. Unremoved 1a
 18. C: so many variables that go into making the judgement about improved efficiency that there should be 1 basic measurement. Want to say per capita use is getting smaller as time goes on
 19. Q: can you measure leaks on customer side? A: yes, there are leaks that happen on the customer side
 20. C: could set metric around whether water users are implementing strategies
 21. Q: how would you know? A: have to survey

- 22. C: not sure what RBC is after initial plan. We keep meeting frequently but don't know about funding and state water structure.
- 23. C: who in the RBC is going to survey? Setting up metrics there's no way to measure
- 24. C: talk about success or failure of actions taken by RBC, but we don't take actions, we make recommendations A: read into it as whether your implementation actions are getting implemented
- 25. C: only way they get implemented is if they're in the SWP, otherwise just a recommendation
- 26. Q: have we identified funding sources? A: yes, some in chapter 10
- 27. C: a recommendation is the state to establish a funding mechanism, could track to see whether basin users are getting the money and using it to implement strategies
- 28. We don't know how well the RBCs will be funded in the future. Right now, assuming you'll meet 2x a year and have some support
- 29. C: should say that
- ii. Engage GA in water planning
 - 1. 2a. a governor coordinated state level water planning and management process is reestablished between GA and SC
 - 2. 2b. annual meeting between Savannah River basin SC RBCs and GA RCs are held
- iii. Communicate, coordinate, and promote findings and recommendations from RBP
 - 1. 3a. RBC meets regularly with support from SCDES
 - a. C: Be more specific. Don't believe in meeting just because, has to be efficient
 - b. Changed regularly to biannually
 - c. C: maybe one's state meeting and one's local meeting
 - 2. 3b. Outreach leads to local, legislative, or federal actions, decisions and funding that support implementation strategies and actions
 - a. Hard to measure, kind of vague
 - 3. 3c. SC SWP incorporates the LSS RBP
 - a. C: Make 3c 3a
 - b. Moved up
- iv. Promote engagement with the water planning process
 - 1. 4a. RBCs continue beyond 2025 with a diverse, active, and representative membership with balanced representation from all 8 interest categories
 - a. Q: how does the RBC cull the membership for those who aren't here and who continues on? A: at next meeting, ask 2-year members to see if they're interested in continuing and ask 3–4-year members if they are comfortable continuing on. Every term after this is a 3-year term

- b. Q: so, if people don't show up, we assume they've dropped and others can slide in? A: yes, in other RBCs people didn't show up to 5-6 meetings so we reached out and they didn't respond. We recommend to DES that they be removed. DES would remove them and find a replacement. 1-2 instances where people who aren't on RBCs say they would like to participate so they get added to a list to fill in if needed. Up to DES and RBC members to id replacements. Problem with GRWPCs because they're governor appointed and governor is slow to appoint, have 5-6 active members
 - 2. 4b. collaboration has occurred with other RBCs, GA, GRWPCs, and USACE. At least 1 meeting with each entity has occurred annually
 - a. Q: if we're meeting biannually, one is a state one, would it be one meeting with everyone there?
 - b. C: doesn't match with biannual meeting. Too optimistic
 - c. Removed "at least one meeting..."
 - d. C: collaboration is good because there's many ways to do collaboration without having meetings
 - e. Unremoved "at least 1 meeting...", changed meeting to collaboration event
 - f. Q: do all RBCs have this recommendation? A: no
 - g. C: Corps only involved with US and LS. C: should be a combined meeting
 - 3. 4c. coordination occurs with groups that have existing education and outreach efforts focused on water conservation
 - v. Enhance understanding of groundwater resources
 - 1. 5a. USGS-led groundwater modeling effort is completed and results presented to RBC and incorporated into next update of RBP
 - a. C: if groundwater model is done sooner, we should update the plan based on the groundwater modeling
 - b. Q: do we have an idea of how long it's going to take? A: fall this year
 - c. Changed next update to 2026 update
 - 2. 5b. funding is identified and allocated, and additional monitoring wells are installed by SCDES in the deeper aquifers of Colleton, Bamberg, and/or Hampton Counties to monitor groundwater levels and trends
 - a. Q: any indication of whether you could get additional funding for monitoring wells? Are there other priority areas in the coastal plain that aren't included? A: don't see a future right now for getting money from the national groundwater monitoring network for drilling. High priority in the middle of the basin to get more wells. Related to agricultural irrigation. Money could be appropriated out of

- state legislature funds but don't want to make a claim that that's a sustainable funding source. No areas of external funding
 - b. C: if WaterSC comes forward with a forceful proposal, that would be very helpful
 - vi. Improve technical understanding of water resource management issues
 - 1. 6a. USGS streamflow gages in the basin are maintained and increased.
 - a. Difficult to measure Salkehatchie rivers because they're extended wetlands and hard to measure flow
 - b. Q: should we be specific about Salkehatchie? Don't think Savannah needs a lot of gages
 - c. Removed "and increased"
 - d. Sometimes talk about planning basin as one basin, sometimes talking about individual basins
 - 2. 6b. future modelling incorporates RBC developed scenarios to address future uncertainties
 - a. Q: how do you measure that? A: tells us that we're doing future modeling and looking at helping reduce the amount of uncertainty
 - 3. 6c. water quality issues and concerns in the basin are identified and a strategy to study approaches to address them is developed.
 - vii. Improve drought management
 - 1. 7a. 100% of public water suppliers' drought management plans are updated within the last 10 years and submitted to SCO for review
 - a. Updated to at least 2015 and don't have any that are older than 10 years ever
 - b. Q: it was worded like that in other plans? A: yes, some of them were like that
 - c. Q: who collects that info? A: the State Climate Office. Don't think in the Drought Act there's a requirement to submit to Climate Office
 - d. Q: how can we have a metric to get 100% to submit them? A: got Climate Office to give us all of the drought plans, 80% were 2003 plans. Do something similar, asked Climate Office to give an updated list and then contact them as an RBC
 - e. Q: who's going to do all this? A: recommendation that DES fund and support a position to help RBCs, contractors, or volunteer
 - f. C: there's a lot of things to do to manage water resources. Hopefully this provides a push for DES, governor, and legislature to do things. C: we take the recommendations to the entity, and this is how we know the entity is succeeding. Doesn't have to fall on the RBC

2. 7b. state funding is designated to complete phase 2 of the USACE comprehensive study and drought plan update

Break for Lunch
12:20

12:00–

6. Review the Draft Executive Summary and Discuss Draft Chapter Comments (John Boyer)
[Discussion Item] 12:20–12:50

- a. 98% ready
- b. Cover photo shows Augusta.
- c. C: going to get a drone and take pictures
- d. No ag pictures
- e. Forward
- f. Acknowledgements
- g. What to know about this plan- highlights
- h. Summary of chapters
- i. Draft chapter review schedule
 - i. 9: distributed 4/28, comments by 5/9
 - ii. 3, 5 (updates): distributed 4/30, comments by 5/9
 - iii. 10 (updates): distributed 5/5, comments by 5/9
 - iv. 1, 6, 7, 8 (updates): distributed 5/5-7, comments by 5/9
 - v. Executive summary: distributed 5/5-7, comments by 5/16
 - vi. Draft plan: distributed around 5/16, test of consensus 6/5
 - vii. June meeting virtual, will be 1-2 hours

1. Q: could we move the meeting to 8 or 9 am and be done by 10?

7. Plan for Next Meeting and Adjourn (John Boyer)

12:50–

1:00

- a. RBC planning process schedule
 - i. 6/5: test of consensus on draft plan
 - ii. Mid/late July: 1st public meeting
 - iii. July/August: address draft plan comments
 - iv. August/September: finalize plan (and possible 2nd meeting)
- b. Q: where will public meeting be? A: we'll figure it out next meeting. Maybe Walterboro
- c. Lately only doing 1 public meeting because attendance is low
- d. Saluda basin really trying to increase attendance, doing door prizes
- e. Move June meeting to 8:30-10:30. Virtual
- f. If you can't attend the meeting, send in test of consensus vote
- g. C: could send out a test vote and have people get back to you
- h. C: concerned about where we leave the groundwater modeling in chapter 3. A: have you read the groundwater part of 5? 5 has more than 3
- i. Think about if you want to speak at the public meeting mid-late July
- j. C: good to have someone from each interest group speak
- k. Q: have you had any really substantial public comment that influenced the plans in any of the basins? A: in Pee Dee, there were substantial comments but they didn't impact the plan, a lot of quality related comments. Edisto and Broad had 3 or 4 people, US just had 4 or 5. Looking for clarification

Meeting Adjourned: 1:04 PM

Dean Moss – 1st and Bill Wabbersen – 2nd

Minutes: Taylor Le Moal and Tom Walker

Approved: 6/5/25

RBC Chat:

00:47:13 Leigh Anne Monroe - SCDES: <https://www.des.sc.gov/programs/bureau-water/watersc-water-resources-working-group/watersc-participants>

01:07:55 Grace Houghton: total current surface water withdrawals for Upper and Lower Savannah are about 2,900 mgd with thermoelectric, 134 mgd without thermo

01:27:30 Grace Houghton: got it!

01:38:37 Tommy: I would vote medium

01:49:58 Thomas Walker: thanks grace, I will go ahead and squeeze it in for context

01:51:01 Grace Houghton: Reacted to "thanks grace, I will..." with 👍

01:52:06 Tommy: I would agree with not prioritizing

01:52:40 Thomas Walker: break for lunch until 11:50

02:51:46 Taylor Hudson Brewer - Beaufort County: I have to leave a little bit early. See everyone next time!

02:52:11 Thomas Walker: Reacted to "I have to leave a li..." with 👍

02:52:23 Thomas Walker: thanks taylor

03:28:17 Thomas Walker: adjourned