

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
LAKE AND LAND MANAGEMENT TWC**

**SCE&G Training Center
March 28, 2006**

Final ACG 5-4-06

ATTENDEES:

Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt Associates
Alison Guth, Kleinschmidt Associates
Tommy Boozer, SCE&G
David Hancock, SCE&G
Ron Ahle, SCDNR
Laura Boos, USC
Steve Bell, LW

Amanda Hill, USFWS
Bill Argentieri, SCE&G
Rhett Bickley, Lexington County
Van Hoffman, SCE&G
Norman Boatwright, MFC

DATE: March 28, 2006

HOMEWORK ITEMS:

Due for next meeting:

- Ron Ahle- to prepare a strawman of guidelines for limited brushing, will be discussed as first item on Tuesday.

Due at a future date:

- Tommy and David - Maps should be updated to include setbacks, Easement property that is not owned by SCE&G, and ESA's on Forest and Game Management Areas. It was also recommended to have percentage/mileage tables (similar to the ESA percentage tables) that reflects all updated items. It was also suggested that the number of ESA's on the lake be attained by county.
- Tommy and David - to develop criteria on permitting docks in shallow coves. Will be discussed further in the dock discussion.
- Tommy and David - to develop criteria for docks requested on ESA's in easement property. Although the group was leaning toward not allowing this, it was decided that some alternatives needed to be developed to present to the RCG along with the preferred alternative. To be discussed at dock discussion

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
LAKE AND LAND MANAGEMENT TWC**

**SCE&G Training Center
March 28, 2006**

Final ACG 5-4-06

AGENDA TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING:

- **9:30 to 10:30** Discussion of Homework items from previous TWC meeting – Ron Ahle to review strawman of guidelines for limited brushing
- **10:30 to 10:45** Break
- **10:45 to 11:45** Group Discussion on Sedimentation and Erosion Control Plan
- **11:45 to 12:15** Lunch
- **12:15 to 1:15** Continued Discussion on Sedimentation and Erosion Control Plan
- **1:15 to 1:30** Break
- **1:30 to 2:45** Identification and Resolution on Items Discussed, Identification of any Solutions
- **2:45 to 3:00** Develop List of Homework Assignments, Agenda and Date for Next Meeting

Adjourn

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING: April 25, 2006 at 9:30 a.m.
Located at the Lake Murray Training Center**

INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Alan Stuart opened the meeting and after brief introductions Ron Ahle began a picture presentation on Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA's). Ron Ahle's presentation can be viewed on the website. Ron gave a brief explanation of the habitat types as well as the species present in each classification. He noted that he was working with several USC graduate students to identify other various plant species present and their significance.

The group then directly began discussion on ESA's. Tommy noted that the ESA's have been updated twice. During discussions Tommy distributed a handout to the group which specified the miles and percentages associated with ESA's and Future Development ESA's (document attached

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
LAKE AND LAND MANAGEMENT TWC**

**SCE&G Training Center
March 28, 2006**

Final ACG 5-4-06

below). The group discussed this table further in order to gain a better understanding of the data it presented. Norman Boatwright noted that they surveyed all of the setbacks in 1994, however, it is not included in the numbers listed in the table. He noted that in 2002 they had surveyed all of the easement areas and updated the future development lands. During further discussion the group decided that information the current maps lacked that needed to be incorporated into updated maps included setbacks, Easement property that is not owned by SCE&G, and ESA's on Forest and Game Management Areas. It was also recommended to have updated percentage/mileage tables that reflects these items. Steve Bell pointed out that it would be interesting to know how many ESA's are on the lake. Tommy noted that they could identify that by county.

Alan then directed the discussion toward the management of the ESA's. Tommy began to explain that before they received the order from the FERC asking SCE&G not to permit docks on continuous ESA's, they would occasionally allow people to place docks on an continuous ESA, depending on the ESA. He continued to explain that currently, in order to place a dock in a ESA that was not continuous, it was stated in the Army Corp of Engineers (Corp) General Permit (GP) that the individual would have to apply for a permit through the Corp. Ron Ahle and Amanda Hill expressed concern over this and noted that although it may give the agencies an opportunity to comment, they do not recall ever being notified of such. Ron noted that he would be much more comfortable if the permits went through SCE&G instead of the Corp, and SCE&G allowed the agencies to comment. The group decided that one key item to accomplish was to take the ESA permitting out of the GP. The group also noted that all dock requests on continuous ESA's on easement property would be discussed by SCE&G, USFWS and DNR and they would collectively decide upon mitigation, community docks etc. The groups initial response was to not allow docks in ESA's on easement property, however it was decided that some alternatives need to be developed to present to the RCG along with the preferred alternative. SCE&G was tasked to come up with general criteria regarding the permitting of docks in ESA's on easement property to present to the group.

Tommy noted that one problem that SCE&G deals with is when an individual owns the land under the lake and another individual would like to put a dock in that area. Ron Ahle asked if SCE&G would consider buying that property. Van Hoffman noted that they have tried to in the past but the landowners decided not to sell.

Steve Bell asked the group if docks were allowed in the backs of coves. David Hancock pointed out that it depended on the location. He explained that they would have to go out and observe the cove and the vegetation and determine how a dock would impact that. Steve asked if they could develop criteria for permitting a dock in the back of a shallow cove. The group began to discuss this issue, one item that was proposed was for a trade off to occur, for example, a dock would be permitted in certain cases, if a 25 foot buffer was planted above the 360'. Ron Ahle added that it could be tied

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
LAKE AND LAND MANAGEMENT TWC**

**SCE&G Training Center
March 28, 2006**

Final ACG 5-4-06

directly to the dock permit to prevent the landowner from then clearing all of the vegetation. Steve requested that one of the requirements be that the dock be a certain distance away from the back of the cove. It was decided that any criteria that was developed needed to be consistent. SCE&G would begin by developing a strawman of criteria and it would be discussed further in the discussion on docks. Ron also suggested that the group look at how Duke has handled similar situations.

Ron Ahle also requested that a 50 ft buffer be established on either side of a continuous ESA. He noted that it was more significant to have buffers on either side of a continuous ESA because an intermittent ESA did not have as much value. Ron referred to a FERC letter and he added that it requested this. Tommy noted that it was not how it was interpreted by SCE&G, he noted that to his knowledge FERC was referring to 50 feet back from the ESA. Ron then explained that he would like SCE&G to consider this, he pointed out that buffers would prevent individuals from slowly encroaching upon the ESA. Tommy replied that SCE&G would agree to consider 15 feet adjacent to a continuous ESA on easement and future development property. Ron agreed that they would accept 15 feet if SCE&G decided to implement it.

After lunch the group began to discuss the Woody Debris Management Plan that was filed with the FERC.

In a discussion on stump removal, SCE&G explained that at this point all that they are allowing is that stumps located next to docks be chainsawed off. Tommy noted that they have relocated docks in areas where there are many stumps, however most of the time when this issue is raised it is only regarding a single stump. Ron Ahle noted that he was okay with this, and asked SCE&G to put it into writing. He explained that he was initially concerned because stumps are an important form of habitat in Lake Murray.

The group began to go through the comments that the USFWS and DNR raised in regards to the Woody Debris Management Plan. Amanda Hill noted that all of her comments were answered satisfactorily and all of DNR's comments were incorporated into the plan. Alan then asked the group if everyone was comfortable in taking the Woody Debris Management Plan as a component of the Shoreline Management Plan. Everyone agreed.

One of the final items for discussion pertained to the management of areas below the 360'. Tommy Boozer explained that they have allowed people to perform limited brushing of non-critical vegetation below the 360'. He noted that it is evaluated on a case by case basis on the brush that is already present. Tommy described that if they go to a property that has quite a few pine trees and a lot of pines in danger of falling, that they allow individuals to take some out. Ron Ahle noted that clearing below the 360' was one of the biggest complaints received by DNR. He noted that he is

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
LAKE AND LAND MANAGEMENT TWC**

**SCE&G Training Center
March 28, 2006**

Final ACG 5-4-06

concerned about the removal of large button bushes and willows. Ron explained that he would like to see the group develop a limited brushing permit that included a species list. Ron also noted that it may be beneficial to have examples (photographs, etc.) to show the landowner. Tommy noted that they could come up with a definition of limited brushing but it would need to take place on a case to case basis. He further noted that it should be done by species as well as condition.

After continued discussion on this topic, Alan asked Ron Ahle if he would prepare a strawman of guidelines for limited brushing which will be presented to the group for consideration at the next meeting.

It was noted that the next item for discussion would be on Erosion and Sedimentation. The group agreed that the next meeting would occur on April 25th at 9:30.

The group adjourned.

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
LAKE AND LAND MANAGEMENT TWC**

**SCE&G Training Center
March 28, 2006**

Final ACG 5-4-06

**2005 Shoreline
Management Prescriptions**

Shoreline Easement Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA)

ESA	Miles	Feet	Percent of	Percent of
Button Bush Continuous	21.65	114,312	3.32%	26.64%
Button Bush Intermittant	8.19	43,243	1.26%	10.08%
Shallow Cove	4.61	24,341	0.71%	5.67%
Bottomland Hardwood	5.20	27,456	0.80%	6.40%
Wet Flat	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	39.65	209,352	6.08%	48.79%

Shoreline Future Development Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA)

ESA	Miles	Feet	Percent of Total Miles	Percent of Total ESA Miles
Button Bush Continuous	30.29	1,599,615	4.64%	37.28%
Button Bush Intermittant	4.10	216,521	0.63%	5.05%
Shallow Cove	5.96	314,748	0.91%	7.33%
Bottomland Hardwood	1.25	66,013	0.19%	1.54%
Wet Flat	0.01	528	0.00%	0.01%
Total	41.61	2,197,424	6.37%	51.21%

Total Shoreline Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA)

ESA	Miles	Feet	Percent of Total Miles	Percent of Total ESA Miles
Button Bush Continuous	51.94	274,243	7.96%	63.92%
Button Bush Intermittant	12.29	64,891	1.88%	15.12%
Shallow Cove	10.57	55,810	1.62%	13.01%
Bottomland Hardwood	6.45	34,056	0.99%	7.94%
Wet Flat	0.01	53	0.00%	0.01%
Total	81.26	429,053	12.46%	100%