

Lower Savannah-Salkehatchie River Basin Council

August 1, 2024

Meeting Minutes

RBC Members Present: Bill Wabbersen, Reid Pollard, Courtney Kimmel, Brandon Stutts, John Carman, Pete Nardi, Brian Chemsak, Lynn McEwen, Jeff Hynds, Tommy Paradise, Brad Young, Sara O'Connor, Leslie Dickerson, Heyward Horton, Brad O'Neal, & Kari Foy

RBC Members Absent: Ken Caldwell, Dean Moss, Austin Connelly, Taylor Brewer, Danny Black (Kathy Rhoad, alternate, present), Sam Grubbs, Will Williams, Joseph Oswald, & Lawrence Hayden

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

Total Present: 40

1. Call the Meeting to Order (Kari Foy, RBC Chair) 10:00–10:20
 - a. Review of Meeting Objectives
 - b. Approval of Agenda
 - i. Agenda approved
 - ii. 1st – Lynn McEwen
 - iii. 2nd – Courtney Kimmel
 - c. Approval of June 6th Minutes and Summary
 - i. Minutes approved
 - ii. 1st – Pete Nardi
 - iii. 2nd – Bill Wabbersen
 - d. Newsworthy Items
 - i. Resilient Coastal Communities Collaborative Program (Karen Hardison and Sophia Truempi)
 1. Purpose of program is to increase resiliency throughout the watershed
 - a. Distribute risk and vulnerability assessments and portfolio solutions equitably
 - b. Reaching out to county and municipal officials and getting input on flooding experiences
 - c. Had input from at least 1 person in 7 counties, more input on some counties than others
 - i. Please submit a survey or meet with them if haven't yet

- d. Selecting communities by end of August, posting requests for qualifications for consulting firms in the beginning of September and forming community action teams
 - e. Want a lot of community buy in- creating community action teams for each of the communities that are selected
 - i. 3-5 community members on each team
 - ii. Let them know if there are any community champions in your area
 - iii. Community members working with consultants
 - f. Will be here throughout the day if there are any questions
- e. SCDES Water Planning Website
 - i. DNR's water planning webpage is still there, but won't be for long
 - 1. Not getting updated
 - ii. All the water planning info is now on DES website
 - 1. Link got sent out
 - 2. Looks different but has same info
 - 3. Central repository for all meeting info
 - iii. Q: do we have any reason to go to DNR site at all or is everything over here? A: everything should be over here
- f. Phase 1 Survey Results [**Discussion Item**]
 - i. 14-15 people responded
 - ii. Do you think the info presented so far has given you a sufficient level of understanding to make informed planning level decisions as we move through phases 2-4? If not, list topics
 - 1. Better understanding of agricultural water needs and how they compare to registered amounts
 - a. Going to hear from Brad today about his operation. Can explore other ways to learn about it if needed
 - 2. More about what other states have done and their recommendations as they relate to quantity
 - a. Next 3-4 months, trying to get reps from Coastal GA Regional Water Planning Council to come speak
 - b. Worked in other states (CT, MO), can tell you what other states do
 - 3. Saltwater intrusion
 - a. Will learn more about that when we get to groundwater in a few months
 - 4. Projected growth vs water supply
 - a. Review what we talked about last meeting
 - 5. Would be beneficial to organize documents in a central, accessible location
 - a. DES website, can add if needed
 - b. Most respondents said they had gotten a good amount of info

- iii. Do you feel that you have an adequate understanding of how data, surface water models, and other tools are being used to assess surface water availability, identify shortages, and explore surface water issues and concerns?
 - 1. 92.9% yes- generally understand, 7.1% needs more details (all but 1)
 - 2. Will reach out to the 1 to figure out where gaps are
- iv. Based on the RBC meetings held to date, do you have any suggestions for the facilitator or planning team to consider that might improve the meetings or planning process?
 - 1. Linking the info we are being provided to the structure of the final planning document would be helpful
 - a. Will start to do that now as we draft chapters of the plan. Will hear more in coming months
 - 2. Delineate on the agenda which items are intended for background info vs group discussion
 - a. Started to do
 - 3. Aren't major issues with water volume/ availability but there could be issues with quality/ salinity. It seems like there are opportunities to take on more meaningful questions and issues but we are beholden to the original scope
 - a. No issue with surface water availability, haven't talked about groundwater yet
 - b. Can we address other questions? Can to some extent but wasn't the intention of the 1st planning effort. Up to you, can lay groundwork for that. Don't have scope and budget to do other analysis outside quantity analysis but can set the stage to do that in a future phase
- v. Do you feel that you and other RBC members have been provided an equal opportunity to be heard and express your interests, ideas, and concerns?
 - 1. Most people said yes
 - 2. It will be important as we get into developing recommendations that we are intentional about hearing from all members
 - 3. Facilitator could consider polling members during the meeting on items needing feedback
 - a. Will try to do more of that
- vi. Are there any additional field trips (other than a potential field trip to the SRS) that you think would give the RBC a better understanding of how water is used and managed in the basin? If so, list
 - 1. Port of Savannah
 - a. Potential Savannah River Site trip in October
 - i. 10/3 potential date, would be our normal Thursday meeting time for that month
 - ii. Waste treatment facility, water treatment facility, river water system.

- iii. Have experts talk to us
 - iv. Protocol office will set up a website to provide info for background checks to get a badge. Without the badge, can't get off bus. Address, name, SSN
 - v. Most people interested in the field trip.
 - vi. OK to have 30 people attend
- 2. Savannah River Lock and Dam
- 3. USACE controlled dam
- 4. Irrigated farm
- 5. BJW&SA
- 6. C: will be done with harvests mid-October
- 7. C: Savannah Lock and Dam field trip more interesting to us, USACE dams less interesting because less of an impact on us
- 8. C: can any of the current ones be combined into 1 trip? A: they might be
- 9. End of the meeting, will talk about schedule. Waiting on USGS to finish Pee Dee basin before we can start groundwater. They will maybe finish in Pee Dee in November, plus they need transition time. Need to kill time with field trips or just pause
- vii. Other thoughts, concerns, or feedback on the river basin planning process
 - 1. Giving the members a brief pipeline of upcoming activities/ decision points/ work products might be useful. This would be a calendar-based summary of when certain decisions or work products are expected
 - a. Will try to do that especially at end of meetings
 - 2. At some point it would be good to know how other RBCs have worked through the same process for their basin
 - a. Will talk about what other RBCs did for drought management/ response during today's meeting and will continue to do that when we work on our own recommendations
 - b. Don't want to bias with what other councils have done but good background
 - 3. More about what other states have done and their recommendations as they relate to quantity
- viii. Other feedback
 - 1. None
- ix. 4 phases of the planning process
 - 1. Phase 1- understand baseline. Done
 - 2. Phase 2- assess future availability. Done half of the analysis
 - 3. Phase 3- develop strategies
 - 4. Phase 4- develop the plan
 - 5. Getting into phases 3-4.
 - a. Sending draft upfront chapters in the next couple of months

6. US moving at brisk pace because they don't have to deal with groundwater

2. Public Comment (John Boyer) 10:20–10:25

a. Public Comment Period

i. Chris Inglese- Deputy Administrator for Hampton County. Community planner- leading county plan, talking to people at the SEA grant and resiliency

b. Agency Comment Period

i. Joe Koon- Division Director of Water Resources and Department of Environmental Services Bureau of Water. More detail on reorg.

1. DHEC is now DES, hydrology program came over in water resources division. Going to rebrand them as water planning and assessment program. Joined with water quantity permitting program and the private well program in that division.

2. Planning and assessment program will still be managed by Scott Harder. Water quantity permitting program will be managed by Leigh Anne Monroe as an advisory role. Will continue collaboration with RBCs and grow relationships with stakeholders

3. June Meeting Review (John Boyer) 10:25–10:30

a. Surface water scenarios

i. Current surface water use, Permitted and Registered surface water use, Moderate water demand projection, high water demand projection, unimpaired flow

ii. Moderate and high demand projections added in June

1. Use high for models

2. Difference between the 2: moderate is business as usual. High assumes a lot more economic growth and a little more population increase

3. Even under high demand scenario, don't have a lot of issues

b. Lower Savannah- Summary of average annual surface water demands by scenario

i. 50 years in the future

ii. High demand scenario is only 504 mgd in 2070, less than 1/3 of what's been permitted and registered in the basin

1. SRS site has been permitted a lot of water withdrawal that they never use

2. Public water supply also has a lot more permitted than they project to be using in 2070

c. Lower Savannah model results

i. 2070 moderate demand scenario- no predictive shortages

ii. 2070 high demand scenario- only 1 shortage, happened less than 1% of the time, impoundments that aren't included in the model may eliminate shortages

- d. Salkehatchie- Summary of average annual surface water demands by scenario
 - i. All surface water use is agricultural
 - ii. Small compared to LS
 - e. Salkehatchie model results
 - i. 2070 moderate demand scenario- some shortages, lots of impoundments
 - ii. 2070 high demand scenario- more shortages but infrequent, lots of impoundments
 - iii. Q: Do impoundments create uncertainty or are they insurance? A: Would not assume it would be safe to operate without impoundments. There is a lot of flow variability in these streams. If you don't have an impoundment to store water, not going to be able to pull water out. There is uncertainty in the model because they're not in the model
 - iv. Q: is there any incentive for landowners to have impoundments? A: State discouraged impoundments to some degree. Without them we wouldn't have farming operations
4. Agricultural Operations and Irrigation in the Salkehatchie Basin (Brad O'Neal, Austin Connelly, and Joseph Oswald, RBC Members)
- 10:30–11:25
- a. Coosaw Farms
 - i. Fairfax, SC
 - ii. Grow watermelons, blueberries, blackberries, field corn, cotton, sorghum
 - iii. Family farm founded in 1983
 - iv. Donated 800000 pounds of food to local food banks
 - b. Synergy of triple bottom line (people, profit, planet)
 - i. People
 - 1. Relationship between our customers, our community, our employees
 - 2. USA started as an agricultural society. Now 2% of US population work in agriculture.
 - 3. Don't know where your food comes from
 - ii. Profit
 - 1. Profitability, growth, long term viability
 - 2. Long term viability
 - a. Relationship between planning, efficiency, sustainability, and resiliency
 - b. Resiliency=grit, ability to thrive in an adverse situation
 - 3. Profitability-ability to produce an income greater than expenses
 - 4. Growth- increase in value
 - iii. Planet
 - 1. Conservation, waste management, resource use
 - c. How we use water
 - i. Center pivot, micro emitters, solid set sprinklers
 - ii. Q: When did they start moving center pivots down toward the crop? A: At least 10-15 years ago. There is a federal program to help people upgrade – bigger drops are more efficient

- iii. Filter station- filter to enable reuse of water
 - iv. Solid set sprinklers
 - v. How we monitor our water use
 - vi. Strategy for conservation: capture rainwater out of season, capture excess runoff in season
- d. Farm map
- i. Water systems
 - ii. Q: The reservoir on 278 was empty? A: Yes its empty and went dry 4 weeks in June. We never ran out of water – blueberry fields require a lot of water. Can almost start to recharge with all of the rain we got in July
 - iii. Q: Pumping water from ditches? A: Yes water from 278 drains to us. We got a lot of water and used it to flood on the Fairfax end
 - iv. Q: Need a sleeve? A: In St Helena yes “sock pipe”
 - v. How many groundwater wells are on the property? A: 8 I believe groundwater wells are low flow. 200 – 300 ft and set the pump at 180 feet – St Helena 100 ft and much easier
 - vi. Q: How many acres does the enterprise have? A: 2000 acres in production, 1000 acres in timber, 50% produce and the rest are row crops
 - vii. Q: Where does sorghum fit? A: Gives us something to hold dirt together (quail feed) sometimes we don’t harvest it. Cover crop
 - viii. Q: What takeaway do you want us to keep in mind? A: Probably going to have to be 100% irrigated in the future. Produce is not insured, row crops have the option of buying government backed insurance, which creates an unnatural market. Irrigation is becoming more efficient.
 - ix. Q: The integrated irrigation and drainage system you showed is not very well-represented in our surface and groundwater modelling efforts so far. How common is agricultural water re-use in your area or among farmers you know? A: very common, especially if you have topography to sustain it
 - x. Q: If a treated recycled water system was available to you (municipal) you’d take it? A: Yes
 - xi. Q: How common is it for farms to solve flooding issues? North Beaufort County has a lot of flooding. A: We took it back to the original USACE canals – cleaned them up
 - xii. Q: what’s the difference between a small farm vs large farm? A: lot of consolidation of farms on the berry side. Tremendous amount of very small farms that are only what they can do themselves. Homesteading is trendy now. Will inflate the numbers in the next 5 years. Have to be audited to be organic, have to pay for each audit. Not worthwhile to be organic until you sell enough. Able to do this because we own our own excavators and other construction equipment. Average SC farm size is 204 acres. SC is a very small pond
 - xiii. C: If they could answer the question if this is their primary form of income that would be helpful
 - xiv. Q: Do you have a registered surface water intake on this property? A: no

- xv. Q: When we had 4 weeks of no rain in June, you still had enough water stored to keep corn crop viable? A: yes, low enough to where we got nervous but never ran out
- xvi. Q: did the 4–6-week drought cause loss of corn crops that didn't have irrigation? A: yes, saw some pretty drastic impacts on crops
- xvii. C: state drought monitor directly affects water utilities and is designated by county lines. US drought monitor uses spatial data. State drought monitor declared moderate; US drought monitor had 3 designations
- xviii. Q: Is this common? A: Yes, Brad is doing the same on his golf course. Fairly common practice
- xix. Q: What are you doing about bugs because of all the water sitting around? A: We don't have a big mosquito problem. Have air movement and sand

Break

11:25–11:35

- 5. Results of Flow-Ecology Relationships (Dr. Luke Bower and Dr. Brandon Peoples) 11:35–12:10
 - a. Flow ecology relationships
 - i. In stream flow is critical for aquatic communities
 - ii. Flow is the master variable
 - iii. “Quantifying flow-ecology relationships across flow regime class and ecoregions in South Carolina” paper
 - iv. Goal: to provide insight on the potential response of organisms to the alternate water withdrawal scenarios produced by SWAM
 - 1. Put SWAM results into a biological context in aquatic communities
 - b. How this works
 - i. Step 1: biological community data from over 1000 locations in SC
 - 1. Relate that to hydrological data
 - ii. Step 2: Random forest statistical modeling to determine relationships
 - iii. Step 3: combine relationships and SWAM results
 - c. Biological data
 - i. 492 fish sites with 8 biological response metrics
 - ii. 530 aquatic insect sites with 6 biological response metrics
 - d. Characterizing aquatic diversity
 - i. Species richness: # of species
 - ii. Shannon's diversity: accounts for percentages
 - iii. Diverse biota= healthy ecosystem
 - e. How can we use these relationships?
 - i. Define biological response limits
 - ii. Predict responses
 - f. Mean daily flow (MA1) biological response limits
 - i. Lines defined by working group
 - ii. Performance measure
 - g. MA1 predictions
 - h. Key to understanding results of surface water modeling scenarios

- i. Ecoregions
 - i. Piedmont, Southeastern plains, middle Atlantic coastal plains
- j. Stream classes
 - i. Perennial runoff, stable baseflow, perennial flashy
- k. Lower Savannah
 - i. Strategic nodes
 - ii. Selected metrics
 - 1. Mean daily flow- How much water on average flows past a given area on a given day
 - 2. Low flow duration- how long does low flow last
 - 3. Mean daily flow/ fish richness
 - a. 75% of current value see low changes
 - b. 52-75% of current value sees medium changes
 - c. Less than 52% of current value sees high changes
 - iii. SAV28 Horse Creek: MA1- richness
 - 1. Small changes with 2 lighter scenarios
 - 2. 35% reduction in this metric under full allocation
 - 3. Mean value of 7% biodiversity/species loss (se 10.3), up to 35% of potential species loss
 - iv. SWAP listed fishes in LSS
 - v. What this info
 - 1. IS: guidance based on best available data and analysis tools, based on models with compounding statistical uncertainty, representative of 30-year flow regime characteristics, applicable to streams and small rivers, relationships between organisms and flow
 - 2. ISN'T: arbitrary recommendations from "expert advice", perfect (more data- less uncertainty, changing climate and land cover- more uncertainty), one time withdrawal thresholds, large rivers and reservoirs, parsing out other factors that affect organisms
 - vi. Flow chart
 - vii. Results summary
 - 1. Most scenarios showed little to no change for fish richness and Shannon's diversity
 - 2. Full demand scenario could result in species loss
 - 3. Report to follow
 - viii. Questions
 - 1. C: in other basins, have a lot more points where we can measure the relationship between flow and species richness. In this basin, there not as many wadable streams and not having withdrawals on streams, so not a lot of locations to do the analysis. Salkehatchie's flow regime and lack of fish/ macro invertebrates specific to those types of streams didn't allow for the same type of analysis

2. C: Sometimes timing/ duration of high flows is important. High flow metrics aren't actionable in a basin plan. Actionable is to limit impervious surfaces and runoff from storm water
3. Q: is this tilted towards Savannah River or is it a mix of both? A: Horse Creek is in Savannah, that's the only location they could develop the relationship. Did a good job of sampling the creeks proportionally to the size of the basins
4. Scott brought Broad and Edisto RBPs and executive summaries with write ups of this work in chapter 5

Lunch

12:10–12:45

6. Updated Surface Water Modeling Results and Discussion (John Boyer) 12:45–1:05
 - a. Updates to the Savannah model
 - i. Updated stage storage curves for Hartwell, Russell and Thurmond
 1. Reported decrease in conservation storage since construction due to sedimentation
 - ii. Hartwell, Russell, and Thurmond “rule sets” were updated to reflect the new state storage curves
 - iii. Q: What happens to the dead pool? A: dead pool elevation is defined by where the intakes are. A lot of the sedimentation occurs below the dead pool.
 - iv. Q: will the percentages continue to increase in later years assuming more sedimentation? A: haven't assumed they're going to increase, just kept it static. They're going to keep losing storage
 - v. Q: Where the dredge is, is there an issue with the quality of the dredge spoils? A: depends on the reservoir, getting rid of material can be a challenge
 - b. Comparisons to Minimum Instream Flows
 - i. 2009 SCDNR instream flow policy
 1. Adopted results from studies in the '80s
 2. Developed thresholds that depend on the time of year and part of the state you're in
 3. Thresholds to keep flow above to protect aquatic health and recreation
 4. How do different plan scenarios compare with each other and how do they compare with regard to the amount of time that stream flow drops below those thresholds?
 - ii. Minimum instream flows in the SW regulations
 1. Only impacts new permits
 2. Almost every water withdrawal permit is grandfathered in
 3. Adopted minimum instream flows
 4. 40-30-20% of mean annual daily flow for the whole state
 5. Different if you're downstream of a flow-controlled impoundment
 6. Rule doesn't come to play 99% of the time but useful to compare
 7. US River basin

- a. USGS gauge data
 - b. Even under the unimpaired flow condition- 4% of the time dropping below that mean stream flow
 - c. Not very much difference between the scenarios
 - 8. LS River Basin
 - a. Only Horse Creek gauge
 - b. Not much difference between the different scenarios
 - 9. Salkehatchie River Basin
 - a. Coosawhatchie River- unimpaired flow 44% is lower than mean stream flow
 - b. Median is 1/3 of the mean, flow is very variable. 1000 cfs skews average high
 - c. Other than that, don't see very much difference
 - 10. Not a lot of useful info doing this type of analysis
 - a. Not sure why there's such variability in flow in Coosawhatchie.
 - b. C: Sand bottom swamp and flowing in and once its full its flowing and then pinched at all of the bridges
 - c. C: When its dry there's very little base flow basically runoff based
 - d. C: Makes it flashy
 - e. C: Roads and bridges affect it
 - f. C: Altered the system
 - c. Updated Extended Drought Analysis Results for the Savannah River Basin (Thurmond Releases)
 - i. Methods: 5 driest water years, single year drought, synthetic drought year
 - ii. USACE emergency drought operation plan
 - 1. Goal: to provide a continuous water supply to the greatest population as long as possible
 - 2. Drop water level in Russell first, then Thurmond, then Hartwell once Thurmond supply is depleted
 - iii. Lake Thurmond outflow and storage
 - 1. Drought scenario 1- still maintain 3600 release downstream throughout the whole period
 - 2. Drought scenario 2- very low, still can release 3600
 - 3. Drought scenario 3- very steep decline, can't release 3600 after 3 years, it's unrealistic
7. Development of Drought Response Strategies and Recommendations [**Discussion Item**]
(John Boyer) 1:05–1:50
- a. Specific drought response related obligations of the RBC are
 - i. Collecting and evaluating local hydrologic info for drought assessment
 - ii. Provide local drought info and recommendations to the DRC regarding drought declarations
 - iii. Communicating drought conditions and drought declarations to the rest of the RBC, stakeholders, and the public

- iv. Advocating for a coordinated basin wide response by entities with drought management responsibilities
- v. Coordinating with other drought management groups in the basin as needed
- b. Planning framework outline for chapter 8 drought response
 - i. Summarize existing drought plans and drought advisory groups
 - ii. Summarize any drought response initiative developed by the RBC
 - iii. List recommendations on drought management or drought management strategies
 - iv. Include a communication plan to inform stakeholders and the public on current drought conditions and activities regarding drought response
- c. SC Drought Response Committee
 - i. 5 state agency members get info from 4 drought management areas
 - ii. Western DMA goes to the top of Savannah and all the way down the coast, Salkehatchie is more in Southern DMA
 - iii. DRC carefully and closely monitors, conserves, and manages SC's water resources in the best interests of all South Carolinians
 - iv. DMA map meeting: hour of data from different state agencies on surface water/ groundwater levels, 5/6 different indices. Then go through DMA and people declare for their county and it becomes an actionable motion for the whole DMA
 - 1. SC drought map
 - 2. Tough because the data shows that it isn't a drought but there is anecdotal evidence from people saying it is a drought
 - 3. Some counties jumped from incipient to severe, maybe first time that's happened
 - 4. Last meeting before this map was in December. Wet December and carried on into March. Got really hot in June
 - 5. Indicators all seemingly fine
 - 6. Streams popped up because nothing soaked in
 - 7. Designations done by county lines
 - 8. Didn't get as much rain as we normally do in the summer
 - 9. (Hope Mizzell) Q: how do you collect the rain data? A: CO-OP stations drive the indicators (cocorahs). Also, Clemson extension installed a network of tempest stations, so will look at those if they need more data
 - 10. Desire to have a meso network with rainfall station in every county.
 - a. (Hope) SC is 1 of 12 states without meso network of weather stations. They're \$20-30000. Provide 5–15-minute data. Currently have a handful of hourly stations. Stations also report rainfall, temperature, humidity, soil moisture, solar radiation and wind, and could do a lot more calculations with additional parameters
 - b. Could partner with local entities within the basins to get 1-2 per basin

- c. Q: have you considered using satellite data for rainfall. A: we do but nothing can replace the actual rainfall data. See discrepancies when you have real data vs satellite estimated data
 - d. Drought response communication plan
 - i. How does the RBC want to communicate to the rest of the RBC, public, and stakeholders?
 - 1. General approach adopted by Edisto, Saluda, Broad, and Pee Dee RBCs
 - a. RBC Chair, Vice Chair, or liaison solicits input from RBC members on drought conditions and responses for their location and interests -> They compile drought info from the RBC members -> RBC chair reports to central DMA representatives and DRC -> DRC, SCDNR, and water utilities have mechanisms to communicate and coordinate drought responses with the public
 - b. This group could report to Brian or Brian could be liaison since he's on DMA.
 - i. Maybe Brian isn't reaching out to others to ask for drought impacts. That would be new
 - 2. US RBC
 - a. Recommended an approach that would eliminate the DMAs and replace them with RBCs or subset of the RBCs
 - b. This would require a change to the SC Drought Response Act and supporting regulations
 - c. RBC members know the basin well. Sometimes struggles to fill DMAs
 - d. Q: What would be the standards by which the RBC members would be reporting on to consolidate and come up with recommendations? Is it based on individual data or is there some other data we have access to? A: Data generally come from info that DNR, state climate office, and other agencies collect and provide, not directly from DMA reps. DMA reps provide anecdotal info. Maybe wouldn't need a committee if there was more data?
 - e. Q: How is it done nationally? Is there a committee? A: US drought monitor. Have physical gauges that are calibrated. \$300 subscription for unlimited locations.
 - f. C: Doesn't rain the same everywhere and even on the same farm
 - g. This group echoes Scott Willett's recommendation for the purpose of the RBC. We have all the stakeholders and we have surface water utilities. Scott has done stuff nationally so he knows. 1 DMA has 4/5 vacancies.

- i. Could pare it down to where there's representatives of each sector. Have a meeting as needed
- h. Q: is the output just for municipal organizations? A: Municipal is the only one that has to have a drought response plan but DMA is for everyone
- i. C: if you change the Drought Response Act, you should make the response more meaningful as well
- j. Should have reps for each sector
- k. C: recommendations vs mandates
- l. (Hope) C: how to get RBC involvement without changing legislation and if we have to change it, we have to. Will be a very big challenge to change based on 2000 rewrite of Drought Response Act. We could come down and share experiences
- m. C: Another option is to make the model work and then have them fix it based on what we work out. Work towards coming up with a plan that is an intermediary
- n. Write up chapter 8 to suggest Scott's idea. To show the idea works, you can serve on a committee that provides info. Follow the general approach suggested by other RBCs
- o. Next drought committee meeting August 13th, open to public. Good to see what the process looks like

8. Upcoming Schedule and Discussion Topics

1:50–2:00

- a. Next meeting September 5
 - i. Continuation of drought management and response discussion
 - ii. Groundwater resources part 2
 - iii. Low Country and Western groundwater CUAs and management plans
 - iv. Tentative: groundwater model overview (move to November)
- b. Remaining 2024 meeting schedule
 - i. October 3: field trip
 - ii. November 7: discuss and identify surface water management strategies, draft chapter review
 - iii. December 5: groundwater model planning scenario results
- c. IRBC: US moving into recommendations, going to have a meeting to hear what they've come up with and what we've come up with. Need to get meeting on the schedule. No location in mind

Kari Foy closed the meeting and asked for a motion to adjourn at 1:59 PM.

1st – Brad O'Neal

2nd – Heyward Horton

Minutes: Taylor Le Moal and Tom Walker

Approved:

RBC Chat:

10:00:06 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

trying to troubleshoot our ag presentation. will get started soon

10:07:04 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

we're about ready. john getting reconnected

10:24:09 From Leslie Dickerson Augusta University to Everyone:

Interested

11:31:58 From alex.pellett to Everyone:

The integrated irrigation and drainage system you showed is not very well-represented in our surface and groundwater modelling efforts so far. How common is agricultural water re-use in your area or among farmers you know?

12:00:22 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

break until about 12:20

12:01:12 From Tommy to Everyone:

Thanks, just want to say that was interesting and very educational. A lot more to it than I anticipated

12:09:07 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

thank you Tommy

13:40:18 From Leslie Dickerson Augusta University to Everyone:

sounds good

13:59:29 From Thomas Walker to Everyone:

meeting adjourned