

Edisto River Basin Council

**November 16, 2022, Meeting  
Minutes**

**RBC Members Present:** John Bass, Amanda Sievers, Brandon Stutts, Hank Stallworth, David Bishop, Hugo Krispyn, Will Williams, JJ Jowers, Joel Duke, Laura Bagwell, Eric Odom, Jerry Waters, Mark Aakhus, Alta Mae Marvin, Johny Haralson, and Jason Thompson

**RBC Members Absent:** Landrum Weathers, Kirk Bell, Alan Mehrzad, Alex Tolbert, and Jeremy Walther

**Planning Team Present:** John Boyer, Tom Walker, Scott Harder, Andy Wachob, Leigh Anne Monroe, and Pam Miller

**Total Present: 35**

1. Call the Meeting to Order (Hank Stallworth, RBC Chair) 9:00–9:10
  - a. Review of Meeting Objectives
    - Hank providing an overview of objectives
  - b. Approval of Agenda
    - Motion to approve – Laura Bagwell – 1<sup>st</sup> and Hugo Krispyn – 2<sup>nd</sup>
    - Approved unanimously
  - c. Approval of August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2022, Minutes and Summary
    - Motion to approve – Hugo Krispyn – 1<sup>st</sup> and David Bishop – 2<sup>nd</sup>
  
2. Public and Agency Comment (John Boyer) 9:10–9:15
  - a. Public Comment Period<sup>1</sup>
    - No public comment
  - b. Agency Comment Period
    - No comment
  
3. Old Business / New Business – RBC Open Discussion Opportunity 9:15-9:20  
(Hank Stallworth and John Boyer, CDM Smith)
  - a. For RBC members with 2 year terms, you will get email from us asking about intentions if you want to reapply or if you would like to end your term, so look for that email.
    - Comment: you might want to consider the 3 year people in case we need to start recruiting people if those people will not be reapplying.
  
4. Review and discuss Draft River Basin Plan (John Boyer) 9:20–10:20
  - a. We want to make sure the draft has everyone’s voice.
  - b. Review how the framework outlines the decision making process. Step 1 partly

done today and part 2 after rating and consensus for final, release to public and hold public meeting to inform final plan.

c. Today objective : Are there any major reservations or points of contention?

**Comments:**

- Any members that have significant reservations or would like to withdraw as a member? None
- Any members with endorsement of plan with minor or major points of content ?
  - RBC member providing editorial comments and maybe emphasize stronger recommendations.
  - I second that we need to call out what we recommend regulatory agencies do.
  - I would like to see us have a different basin by basin approach, at least the intelligent justification for a better way to do this.
    - I just see it as a problem that the river is overallocated on paper and everyone is grandfathered in – would like to see more guarantee that the water is there.
  - I think we all agree that everyone supports leaving water in the system – so was there a number or level we needed to agree on?
  - What if we strengthen this section of the plan in writing, talking about the end point we want to see but realize some of the regulatory constraints?
    - No, I'm fine with letting it go I just would have liked to have laid out a prescription.
  - Can we just say something to strengthen our stance on minimum instream flow requirements in a statement for regulatory agency?
  - I have a feeling the more prescriptive we get the less consensus we have – I do think we need to tweak our plan and executive summary a little more but I have hope that this isn't the last chance for us to provide input in the state water plan and what happens regulatory-wise, where we can unify when we need to.
  - If you want to see the marked up track changes version of the draft, we can send this to you.
  - Nobody in the basin right now is subject to MIF.
  - DHEC are you okay with the accuracy of the statement under the revision that no users are subject to MIF? Yes.
  - There should be nothing stopping us from working together to make our point for regulatory change.
  - Specific recommendation: 3<sup>rd</sup> point on Executive Summary (page 3)
    - From the beginning thought that this statement needs to be less wishy washy and was looking for appropriate rewording of this, would like to see replacing current 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point on page 3 so it says

“only about 17% of allowable permitted and registered water volumes currently withdrawn, the basin would be unsustainably stressed with frequent shortages and low flows if all withdrawers take”.

- Everyone okay with replacing this bullet?
- 3 Major issues are: overallocation, grandfathered and registered issue, and we need to openly acknowledge that we are talking about quantity here – only asking that when we put forth our watershed plan that we ID these as issues that we know exists and that our plan does not address but it needs to be addressed.
- Should be a place under recommendations for individual authored recommendation statements – would like to insert some of the comments in a section where they are heard.
- Show of hands would you like to see the 3 major issues in the implementation plan ? 9 hands raised.
- If we include those issues would it potentially make you change your vote to a lower number? Yeah, the devils in the details we would want to see the way its worded and what implications it could have.
- Would those that voted, would this increase the vote if we added the major issues in implementation? Yes, just need to work on language.
- We need a little more time than a week to review all of this – we need to have enough time to craft and comment on language.
- Anything else that someone would like to see ? No comments.
- Does the RBC like this two-pager?
  - I do not feel like we can condense to two pages, feel like things get left out – just believe we need to be careful when deciding what would be left out on a two pager and what gets put in.
  - Maybe we could reference at the end of each section where to find the full copy with more information?
  - Hearing mixed signals about the two-pager? Do not hear a lot of strong support for it show of hands if you really like it? Leaning towards getting rid of the two pager.

*Break*

*10:20–10:35*

5. Test Consensus on the Draft River Basin Plan (John Boyer) 10:35–11:05
  - a. Would like to go one by one to hear if you are ready to provide your score for testing consensus of the draft plan, if you want to hold off you can if you want to

vote now or reserve right to change vote you can- just want to document where we are currently.

- Fine with voting today and giving final over email.
- Let's go around the room and we will track the votes as we go around.
  - Hank- 2, want to see language as we get to implementation
  - David- 3 currently
  - JJ- 3 pending seeing changes
  - Eric- 2 as it stands today
  - Joel- 2 with ability to amend
  - Hugo- 2 pending
  - Johney- 2
  - Mark-2
  - Jason- 2.5 need to see draft
  - Laura- 2
  - Will- 2
  - Amanda- 2 see final
  - Alta- send later
  - Dr. Bass- email
  - Jerry- 2
  - Brandon - abstain

b. CDM will draft language for Hugo recommendation and send out for review

6. Prepare for first and second public meetings presenting the Draft 11:05–  
11:45 and Final River Basin Plan (John Boyer)

- a. Overview of draft agenda 2 hr meeting with 1 hr overview of plan with rest of time for comments and Q&A
- b. Providing draft slides to run by RBC
  - Change Williams, Will name
  - Second bullet phase 1 need grammatical change
  - Second bullet on surface water key findings
    - Can we say “are likely overestimated”
  - Say “drought of record flows” on third bullet point for surface water key findings, and add the date for the drought of record
  - Maybe we add a slide of what a definition of shortage or area of concern is
  - Maybe remove bolding under surface water key findings
  - Think the mark is in the wrong location on the groundwater areas of concern- CDM will try to fix that red dot location and correct
  - Change to public education “ about” water conservation instead “of” on the SW management strategies slide
  - Did we leave anything important out?
    - No comments
  - CDM will send out slides to RBC after making edits for RBC to review

- Want to stress that we point out that there are projected shortages
  - Maybe add scenario graphs to give idea or picture of shortages under different scenarios
  - Not sure about last bullet point ( drought management plant) for the surface water key findings- not sure this is a good point for this slide, think you can wordsmith this bullet to make it more clear and more room for other bullets
- c. What is the best way for us to convey editorial comments by comments on a PDF? Yes, comment on PDF works or if you want to write in email.

7. Meeting Conclusion (Hank Stallworth, RBC Chair) - Adjourned

11:43 AM

Minutes by: Kaleigh Sims and Tom Walker  
 Approved: 12/14/2022

**RBC Chat:**

08:31:10 From John To Thomas Walker(Privately):

I will have to leave meeting at 10:15 rather than 11:00

08:35:09 From Thomas Walker To John(Privately):

thanks john

08:58:44 From Thomas Walker To Everyone:

will probably get started a little after 9 to let folks get in and get seated

09:00:19 From Amanda Sievers To Everyone:



09:02:08 From Thomas Walker To Everyone:

we have a quorum, so we'll get started in a few

09:34:15 From Kirk Westphal To Everyone:

I think what I'm hearing is that we could add some verbiage to define the RBC's conception of the "ideal state" in the Edisto, and one strong recommendation is that state agencies and the legislature take the positions described in the table to work more closely toward that ideal state by addressing the issues specifically for the Edisto, however incrementally it may occur.

10:39:24 From Thomas Walker To Everyone:

break

10:56:52 From Amanda Sievers To Everyone:

I am fine with email

11:00:23 From Amanda Sievers To Everyone:

2 pending the discussed revisions and final draft

11:43:08 From Thomas Walker To Everyone:

adjourned

