

State Water Planning Process Advisory Committee

March 29, 2018 – 10:00am
SCDNR Archaeology Center
2025 Barnwell Street, Columbia, SC 29202

Greetings and Introductions – Jeff Allen, Clemson University

Attendance

Members present – Ken Rentiers, Jeff Allen, Jeff Lineberger, Clay Duffie, Jill Miller, Myra Reece, David Bereskin, Bill Stangler, Heather Nix, J.J. Jowers, Jr, Fred Castles, III, Eric Krueger, Charles Wingard, David Baize, John Baker, Scott Willett, Jesse Cannon, and Dean Moss, Jr.

Members absent – none.

Others present - Tom Walker, Joe Gellici, Alex Pellett, Rob Devlin, Scott Harder, and Alex Butler.

Interest in Water Planning: (in order of seating around table)

Discussion began with the possibility of the organizational group developing a formal charter with directional/institutional guidelines for the group to help steer the water planning effort. In the subsequent meeting two, a charter framework presentation will be made to be agreed upon by the committee.

1. Jeff Lineberger, Duke Energy – Would like to see a stakeholder-driven plan for each river basin that can meet the needs of water users and, at the same time, protect our environment. The planning process committee's purpose is to set the planning framework so there is consistency among the individual basin plans without dictating.
2. Clay Duffie, Mt. Pleasant Waterworks – Would like to see a State Water Plan, not just a document which proposes legislative changes with recommendations with teeth. Propose action items that will need to go through the General Assembly. The planning process group should be considered a peer group with all committee members having level standing. Clay offered to cut a check to help the process.
3. Jill Miller, SCRWA – Equal participation statewide to ensure smaller communities and water users are heard in the process and that water quality and quantity are important. The planning process committee can provide a big picture view and lay out a pact moving forward. Implementation requires buy-in.
4. Myra Reece, DHEC – Want to conduct and is a firm believer in real stakeholder engagement practice in the water planning process in order to get this right for SC. There are a lot of moving pieces and parts in water management. Determine how all of the efforts connect and how permitting will support the plan including safe yield being brought into the process.

5. David Bereskin, Greenville Water – Ensure that the water plan is done right and that all stakeholders are treated equally from the top to the bottom of the state. Determine how the models and plan will be used and understanding there are differences in safe yield between reservoirs and rivers or streams.
6. Bill Stangler, Congaree Riverkeeper – Ensure a robust stakeholder process including all users that takes into account environmental needs, flows, and services.
7. Heather Nix, Upstate Forever – Shared values for use of water resources. Smart use of water resources to ensure we have enough and can still allow growth.
8. J.J. Jowers, Jr, Edisto Engineers and Surveyors, Inc. – There is a need for balance between industry and conservation and bringing some common sense into the planning process.
9. Fred Castles, III, Catawba-Wateree Water Management Group – Need for a robust framework for all water basins to protect quality and quantity.
10. Joe Gellici, DNR – This effort needs to be a bottom-up approach that is stakeholder driven. The planning process committee can create a guidance document and drive what contents will be in the regional water plans.
11. Eric Krueger, The Nature Conservancy – the planning process committee can develop the body that will set the process for the larger development of the state water plan. It was also suggested that the committee could act as a fundraising support group. There is a need for win-win solutions for sustainability.
12. Jeff Allen, Clemson University – Clemson University would like the committee to bring in an independent facilitator in order to be a true stakeholder in the planning process. As of now, Clemson is more of a coordinator for the effort.
13. Tom Walker, Clemson University – Would like to see all planning process committee members leave their individual organizational hat at the door and come to the table in the interest of doing what is best for SC.
14. Alex Pellett, DNR – Looking for good feedback and criticism on his water demand forecasting modeling efforts.
15. Scott Willet, Anderson Joint Regional Water System – SC is blessed with water, however, growth is threatening water abundance. Would like to see relationships built among stakeholders in order to avoid some pitfalls where lack of relationships led to lawsuits in other processes. Building relationships can create a process to avoid future conflict. The future water plan needs to work with permits. Planning needs to be done to allocate for shortages. Empowering basins for allocating and prioritizing water use. Individual basin plans should reflect individual basin needs but are in a way uniform for consistency across the state. This committee can help determine who needs to be at the table in each basin. The committee should plan on having a long life until the state water plan is completed. The goal

of the plan is that it will be embraced and adopted in consensus, not by decree, and then it has a better chance of adoption.

16. Jesse Cannon, Santee Cooper – The committee can come up with something loose enough for basin tailoring but rigid enough for standardization. Is interested in both environmental protection and meeting customer needs.

17. Dean Moss, Jr, Formerly of Beaufort-Jasper Water and Sewer Authority – the committee can define the purpose of the plan. The process will need to be structured in a way to drive the regulatory process and how it will impact the permitting process.

18. Charles Wingard, Farmer, SC Farm Bureau - would like to see the planning process committee move forward as a group. Agricultural water users want common sense planning.

19. David Baize, WEASC/SCAWWA – Ultimately the key feature is about planning for water shortages.

20. John Baker, International Paper – Older plans were more of guidance documents that had no teeth for enforceability, this document needs to have regulatory teeth.

Status Reports:

Surface Water Assessment: Scott Harder

The SWAM model is in draft form until the final review is complete and it is an ongoing review process. Some changes in reservoir operating rules and some data fixes have been made. QA/QC. CDM Smith has made model enhancements and 8 new baseline models. CDM Smith has a model enhancement and recalibration for the Edisto River Basin using some updated data.

Basin specific review process update:

Salkehatchie and Pee Dee basins are complete. Saluda River basin reservoir rules are being revised. Savannah River basin has operating rules for the Army Corps that are being updated. Broad River basin is beginning final review. Others have not started final review (Catawba and Santee). Edisto receiving recalibration and enhancements.

The SWAM model might be held on a FTP site instead of the cloud due to funding. DNR still plans on a training session for the SWAM model upon completion and rollout. TAC has had good feedback through the process – sectoral perspectives and additions.

Groundwater Assessment: Joe Gellici

Identified the process of assessment ahead of planning efforts. MODFLOW model for assessing groundwaters. Discussion points: Hydrogeologic framework, Groundwater recharge model, SWB soil water balance. MODFLOW work with the USGS. Closing in on recalibration phase of the assessment.

Committee member question about forming an advisory committee for the groundwater availability assessment and framework, strongly suggested.

Committee question about areas other than the coastal plain where groundwater is important. Piedmont has much less groundwater. Using brackish water near the coast. Using aquifers that used to contain fresh waters. Some aquifers haven't been tested yet.

Committee member question about what constitutes the coastal plain – fall line. Follow up about if the coastal area is the only capacity use area. All coastal counties and some in Pee Dee and proposed western capacity area. Recommended that all counties in groundwater areas be designated capacity use, not there yet. With the proposed western capacity use area, there would still be four counties not included: Lee, Sumter, Chesterfield, and Richland.

Water Demand Forecasts: Alex Pellett

Preliminary basin is in the Savannah basin and the Army Corps is going to help complete the forecast work for 2015-2065.

Discussion of sectoral caveats and modeling:

Agriculture – Committee member question about efficiency of application and what crops are being grown and how agriculture is using water.

Committee member question about use under the 3 million gallon per month threshold and capturing the data. Clemson University is researching agriculture use in its Agricultural Water Use and Irrigation Survey.

Industry committee member question about employment changes and modeling use. One assumption is county and multicounty area growth is represented at each enterprise and growth will influence future use.

Public Water Systems – using statistical regression modeling.

What process are we going to have and how do we update the data sets? Do we segregate surface and groundwater demands across the state?

Surface evaporation on lake systems? Water loss, climate change incorporated into the model. Heavier rain followed by dry periods. Evaporation modeling is improving (Devendra) plus incorporated into the SWAM. Reservoir losses belong in a model. Increases in evaporation in the model. Golf courses evapotranspiration problem (ET). Drought variable on irrigation demand. Work group TAC for Alex and his water demand forecasts.

Regional Planning: Ken Rentiers

Thoughts on what makes sense for basin committee advisory groups and who should be included in those groups to make policy recommendations to the legislature. States to look at for regional water planning: Texas, Georgia, Oklahoma, Kansas, Virginia, North Carolina.

Closure of meeting comments – already many positives of the planning process committee members looking to work together and a general agreement on the focus of the planning process committee work. Discussion of facilitating future meetings and a charter draft to review for meeting number two. Immediately need to focus on the charter and hiring an independent facilitator for the planning process committee meetings to stay on track and be equitable. In the future, if there are presentations, please mail to committee members 24-48 hours ahead of time to enhance meeting pace and preparedness. Putting together a contact list of all members including e-mails and phone numbers. Future meetings will be open and plan to put time into the agenda for questions or comments from the public or media. Committee members should speak to their organizational involvement in the process and allow others to speak to their organizations in the media. Thoughtful communication between committee members.

Minutes: Tom Walker

Minutes Approved: 5/24/18