

Location:

Harbison State Forest Environmental Education Center
5600 Broad River Road
Columbia, SC 29212
10:00AM – 2:00PM

Action Items for February 7th:

1. **DNR staff to create a budget matrix/outline for each of the state's 8 river basins**
2. **DNR to begin work on framework outline and draft document**
3. **Review subcommittee reports ahead of meeting**

Meeting:

Group breakout work and Discussion

- Summary of 2018 Interactive Session
- State Water Plan Components
- Scenario Planning Breakouts

Old Business

- (SUB11) Outline of how the Regional Water Plans fit into the SWP
- (SUB12) Metrics for Success
- (SUB13) Water Demand Projections – Corrective Actions for Shortages

New Business

- Budget Matrix (DNR) Update
- Kirsten Lackstrom Proposal
- (SUB4) Outside Contractors

Running Consensus and Contention Points

August 2nd - **Contention and Consensus** - Basin stakeholder approach, when to assemble the basin stakeholder groups to maximize momentum/prevent stagnation (contention). How to notify and achieve broad stakeholder inclusion (general idea consensus with details needed in future topic discussion). Further discussed the issue on September 6th with some preliminary subcommittee reporting due October 4th and November 1st (Process of designating members to River Basin Councils and Public and Stakeholder Notification and Participation).

September 6th - **Consensus** - The PPAC changed Basin Advisory Committees to River Basin Councils (RBCs) to reflect the level of autonomy and decision-making power that will be included in Regional Water Plans. Still in an advisory role without legislative ability.

September 6th – **Consensus** - Vision in the Charter.

October 4th – **Contention** – Size limits on RBCs - Texas has 20 members on planning groups. Number of spots for RBCs allotted vs open - 8 broader categories vs (over)specifying RBC membership requirements.

November 1st – **Consensus** – RBC maximum member number, state and federal agency role as advisory in RBCs, specific groups on RBCs as identified in draft document in Process of Designating Members to RBCs.

December 6th – **Consensus** – Letter to the Editor, SUB1 Process of Designating Members to RBCs draft, SUB2 Roles and Responsibilities of the RBCS, SUB7 Table of Contents as annotated, SUB10 Committee report and DNR to detail implementation.

January 3rd – **Consensus** – Top priorities for 2019 are a Budget for the planning process to be completed and an Implementation approach.

Meeting Summary (January 3rd)

The PPAC Facilitator, JD Solomon, called the December meeting of the PPAC to order at 10:11 AM. The PPAC held a public comment period with no public comment received. Approval of minutes and summary documents from the December 6th meeting were unanimous as was approval of the January 3rd meeting agenda (10:23 AM).

The meeting began with a brief rundown of 2018 PPAC meetings and schedule of work and a plan for the current meeting (January 3, 2019). The purpose of the group breakout discussions and exercises for this meeting are to pull back from the details involved in subcommittee work, reporting, and editing and refocus on the bigger picture and purpose of the PPAC. This exercise should help refocus the committee for 2019 with a goal of getting the regional water planning framework document approved and finalized in the next 4-6 months to provide guidance to the RBCs.

The next discussion item was an update of the instream flow feasibility investigation by Eric Krueger. In summary, SCDNR (fisheries) have good quantitative data that are geographically well-distributed with which to perform the investigation. There is also a possibility of funding to address gaps in the data and to perform the analysis. Once the data is collected, a stakeholder review team with PPAC participation would be encouraged to have another tool to supplement SWAM and current regulations.

The meeting then moved on to the interactive session, which was a summary review of 2018 PPAC meetings and work. Highlights of the results point to favorable responses to questions about: committees being effective in content development, committees helping PPAC members get to know one another with respect to the (state water) plan, and the meeting place, day of the week, and time. Several questions received neutral responses: the pace of the work has been effective in developing team understanding and a clear understanding of the deliverables needed over the next 6 months. Several other questions had less-than-favorable responses: the pace of the work to date has been effective in covering topics that needed to be covered, a clear understanding of the schedule for 2019, and the group or sector that you (PPAC member) represent understands the mission and schedule of the PPAC. Finally, top priorities were ranked and weighted based on response position with the top three priorities identified as: (1) budget, (2) implementation approach, and (3) draft framework document.

Group breakouts and discussion were the next agenda item and covered state water plan components and scenario planning (budget). The state water plan components identified by the different groups were as follows:

(group 1) administration/selection of RBCs, technical facilitator for RBCs, RBC deliverables, moving from RBC plan to state water plan after the RBC step,

(group 2) administrative components (who, how, what, limitations), resources (table of contents template, water demand forecast, budget, facilitation, technical components), and miscellaneous (communications plan, approval process, documentation of coordination), and

(group 3) process (reports, chapters, identified gaps), technical requirements (table of contents in the RBC report and deliverables), recommendation summary, and appendices.

There was some overlap in group breakout discussions and identified state water plan components.

Scenario planning breakouts and discussion focused on options for the planning process under two scenarios, one with the funding request of \$10 million and another scenario with only \$1 million. Recommendations included: shelving the process if there is insufficient funding, if there was only \$1 million then identify an easy basin to do the RBC work, and, again, do one basin and the group settled on the Edisto basin and recommended not moving forward with the 8 basin RBC plan with only \$1 million of funding. Another plan developed under the \$1 million scenario is to form the RBCs and then go after the funding, which would provide for diffuse political pressure to finish the 8 basin RBC planning process.

The final agenda items that were covered were: the DNR budget matrix, which was incomplete and is a top agenda item for February 7th and the framework document outline and deliverable which will be developed by DNR with the proposal to contract the framework document work not being considered. In addition to the budget and framework document development, other identified agenda items for the

January 3, 2019
PPAC Meeting Summary
Harbison State Forest Environmental Education Center – Conference Room
Columbia, SC

next meeting are: SUB12 report, SUB13 report, SUB15 report, SUB4 revision, and SUB5 revision. The meeting concluded at 2:00 PM.

Summary: Tom Walker

Approved: 2/7/19