

Notes for Ga/SC Subcommittee  
Teleconference Meeting

October 27, 2003

Members Participating

Dean Moss  
Mike McShane  
Bob Waldrep

Guests

Mike Vaquor  
Lynn Stokes-Murray

Staff

DHEC-Alton Boozer  
David Baize  
Sally Knowles  
DNR - Freddy Vang  
Hank Stallworth  
Bud Badr

The meeting began shortly after 9:00 AM. The Notes from the October 20, 2003 meeting were approved as distributed.

A discussion followed regarding the sufficiency of existing data and models. DNR staff reported the ongoing Ga/SC/Corps study of the Savannah River was compiling existing data and creating new data on water availability and water demands. (See the memo on this subject on the web site.) Staff also reported that the first part of the dynamic flow (water quantity) model was delivered this month, that there would be approximately six months of learning its operation, and then another six months of “what if” simulations. At that point, real negotiations about flow strategies could begin. DHEC staff provided information on existing and developing data (also on the web site) and issues that needed further work. The subcommittee members wish to support the agencies’ needs for additional data where it is necessary for decision making and will make those recommendations on a case-by-case basis.

The next topic involved the “content” of the Committee Report. Again this meeting, all members agreed that a binding agreement was the direction they wanted to go. The question to be resolved was whether it should be limited to quantity issues or should be more comprehensive in nature. This led to a discussion of water quality models (Ga/SC/EPA river model has to tie into the Ga/SC TMDL harbor model – should be done in about a year), other assimilative capacity issues, Upper Floridan aquifer issues (again a quantity affects quality issue), the necessary involvement of the US Corps of Engineers together with both states on quantity issues, meetings of committee members with city officials from Augusta and Savannah, the difficulty of separating quantity and quality, and the sufficiency of separate agreements for different issues. A consensus developed that a comprehensive approach would provide greater long-term benefits.

Staff was requested to provide the subcommittee with a description of different styles of comprehensive approaches ranging from the Great Lakes model (coordinating but not mandatory) to the Delaware Compact (mandatory, with its own administrative staff). A

review should be made of the ACT/ACF situation in Georgia, Florida and Alabama, which started with litigation and where the compact negotiations have failed after much time and money were expended. A difference in the case of a dispute between Georgia and South Carolina is that there are many citizens of both states who have a common desire for resources they share in the Savannah River Basin.

The subcommittee should also review the Supreme Court litigation as it provides a “strand of reasoning” that the State will need to follow in any compact negotiations or decision about litigation. They asked staff to insure that the Corps’ Colonel and General are not caught unawares of the discussion of these issues in South Carolina. They asked staff to follow up on Georgia’s possible initiative to develop a state water plan. As South Carolina is preparing one and there is the common, shared resource, there should be an effort by both states to coordinate a planning effort in the Savannah Basin.