

**SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT RELICENSING
FERC PROJECT NO. 516
Joint Agency & Public Meeting
July 18, 2006
7:00 P.M. Session**

HOST:

Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt Associates

PRESENTATIONS:

Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt Associates
Shane Boring, Kleinschmidt Associates
Bret Hoffman, Kleinschmidt Associates
Bill Green, S&ME
Dave Anderson, Kleinschmidt Associates
Comments and Questions from the Public

Produced by:

Capital Video
405 Timberpoint Court
Columbia, SC 29212
(803) 781-6747

Transcribed from recorded cassette tapes of Proceedings
By: Annette Gore, Court Reporter

MR. ALAN STUART: I think we can go ahead and get started. We will just allow those that are running a little late to come on in as they get here. I would like to welcome everybody to our Saluda Hydro Regimenting Quarterly Public Meeting. My name is Alan Stuart, I am with Kleinschmidt Associates. Tonight's meeting, we are basically going to give an update on our Resource Conservation Groups and Technical Working Committees that were formed during this relicensing. We have, as you see on your agenda, seven RCGs, is what we refer them to. You will see that throughout the presentation quite frequently. A couple of housekeeping items, there will be a question and answer session at the end of each presentation for the RCG Groups. If you have questions that pertain to the information that the facilitator presented, please ask him at that point. If you have other questions with respect to just how this process is going and other things, there will be some time at the end for you to ask those. So, if you could save those questions until the end. Also, we audio and videotape these meetings for the record. If you do have a question, I ask that you state your name and who you represent; if you are just a general concerned citizen, that's sufficient. If you are representing a Homeowners Association, or a State or Federal Agency, please indicate who you are with. Are there any questions? If you need restrooms, we will try to take a break about midway through, the restrooms --- there's a set down this way and set over here to the right as you go out the door.

Without further delay, we have quite a bit of information to present so I think it will take almost the entire two hours.

I am going to present what the Lake and Land Management Resource Conservation Group and Technical Working Committees have been working on. We received a number of issues. One of the first items of business that we decided was to develop a Mission Statement, each Resource Conservation Group decided it would be a good idea to develop one that kind of lays the foundation for where they want to go. I highlighted what I consider the most important part that the Resource Conservation Group will do: "Will gather and develop information, and study and consider all the issues relevant to and impacting upon the Saluda Hydroelectric Project, Shoreline Management Plan, and supporting Guidelines". That covers quite a few things as you will see as we go through this. Our first meeting, November 2nd, we developed this Mission Statement; February 9th, we developed what we call a Technical Working Committee. That's a much smaller group; it is comprised of individuals who were identified as experts in certain fields it represents, which I will show you in just a minute; a diverse number of agencies, Lake Homeowner Associations, and SCE&G representatives. April 26th, we convened a meeting with the RCG to go over the progress of the Technical Working Committee. We also developed a draft outline of what we think is going to encompass the new Shoreline Management Plan. Our next meeting is scheduled for August 22nd.

This is the Technical Working Committee. The Resource Conservation Group has about forty-two members, but to really try to get to the nuts and bolts of each one of these issues, we decided it would be more expeditious to get just those people that have a working knowledge of what is going on around the Lake. What we draft in this Technical Working Committee goes back to the Resource Conservation Group for their review and comment. As I said, you can see that there is quite a diverse number of individuals with varying backgrounds. You have Lexington County, Fish and Wildlife Service, DNR, and a number of the Lake Murray Homeowner Association members. Here is some of the work that we have done to date. You can see we developed what we call Buffer Zone Management Guidelines, Shoreline Woody Debris, Bank Stabilization Guidelines and Permitting, Erosion & Sedimentation Guidelines, Residential Dock Permitting, Limited Brushing Guidelines, Excavation Guidelines. We have addressed Environmentally Sensitive Areas and mapped them. And also mapped Perennial and Intermittent Streams around the Lake. Other items that we have addressed include moorings around the Lake, Boat and Personal Watercraft Lifts, Permitted Withdrawals for Residential Use. This does not include Municipal Water Supplies Withdrawals. That is done under a different permitting; that is done through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. And we have also addressed Aquatic Plant Management within the Lake. We have some outstanding issues that are yet to be resolved:

- multi-slip dock permitting;
- sale of fringe lands;
- land reclassification which includes re-balancing for recreational and wildlife habitats;
- general permit conditions;
- developing a shoreline management education program. This is something that Tommy Boozer with SCE&G thought would be a really good program. The intent will be to help educate homeowners around the Lake of the importance of buffer zone management, the importance of buffer zones and why we are doing this;
- addressing commercial marinas; and finally
- looking at the Lower Saluda River corridors.

A schedule, as I said, the intent is to draft a new Shoreline Management Plan; that needs to go to SCE&G management for review. As you notice, we do have a number of SCE&G participants

and we have a pretty good handle on where we think management will buy into. But it is still going to them for their ultimate approval. After that, it will go back to the RCG members for their review and comment, and then finally it will be drafted and put out for public comment, and hopefully in the draft application which will come out later next year. With that, I will entertain any questions with respect to Lake and Land Management and what we are trying to accomplish, and what we have accomplished to date.

(No response)

MR. STUART: Okay. With that, I am going to turn it over to Shane Boring, he is going to talk about Fish and Wildlife RCG and Water Quality Resource Conservation Group.

MR. SHANE BORING: Like Alan mentioned, I am Shane Boring. I am a Wildlife Biologist with Kleinschmidt. I am going to be reviewing what is going on with the Fish and Wildlife and the Water Quality Resource Conservation Groups.

We'll start with the Fish and Wildlife. This is the Mission Statement that is posted on the website. I am not going to read the whole thing; but, the first sentence is really the most important thing. *And the goal of this Fish and Wildlife RCG is to develop a protection mitigation enhancement agreement relative to wildlife and fisheries that will be included in the Saluda License Application, which will be submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in August of 2008 when the license is due.* We have had three meetings of the Fish and Wildlife RCG to date. The November 10th meeting was sort of a kickoff meeting where we developed a Mission Statement. The following meeting was on December 7th of 2005. And in a concurrent meeting with the Water Quality Group, there were several issues identified that folks wanted to see presentations on. So, we held a joint meeting and just had a full day of technical presentations regarding various aspects of the project. The February 22nd meeting was focused on formation of the Technical Working Committees for Fish and Wildlife; there are six of those which we will get to in a minute. And also, we reviewed the relevant study requests for the RCG and assigned those to the various TWCs.

Like I said before, there are six Technical Working Committees:

- Diadromous Fish;
- Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species;
- Instream Flow and Aquatic Habitat;
- Terrestrial Resources;
- Freshwater Mussels and Benthic Macroinvertebrates; and
- Fish Entrainment.

We will start with the Diadromous Fish Technical Working Committee. This is the membership at the top here. I am not going to read those folks out, but its various agencies. Diadromous species are those species that migrate from saltwater to fresh to reproduce or vice versa. Simply migratory fish. Representatives from South Carolina DNR, non-governmental organizations such as American Rivers; SCANA, of course; and also folks from National Marine Fishery Service; and Kleinschmidt. We have held three meetings so far. The primary things that this group is charged with is assessing the population of diadromous species in the Lower Saluda River downstream of the project. The sample during Spring 2005 and 2006 involved gillnet sampling

for blueback herring, American shad, and hickory shad. Also, eel pots were deployed for adult, sub-adult American eels. This next slide just shows the locations of the sampling downstream of the Dam. The squares, I believe, represent the eel trapping locations; and the circles are the gillnetting locations. Just to quickly run through the results. During 2005 we captured 14 species of fish, but there were no shad or herring captured. 2006 was just completed, I believe, around June 1st was when that sampling stopped. And again, there were no shad or herring captured; however, the report is still forthcoming from Dr. Jeff Isley at Clemson; and so we will have more details about how many species and numbers were captured. There were no eels captured during the sampling period, however there were several incidental captures outside of the sampling period by Steve Summer with SCANA, and South Carolina DNR, and I think also one of our traps, we captured an eel while we were sampling for crayfish. Due to the lack of success with the eel pots, we subsequently installed an experimental eel trap at the Saluda spillway; and basically is set up at the spillway is this rocky area, in the background is where the leakage flow comes down from the spillway gate, and it provides an attraction flow for the in-migrating eels into this plunge pool that sort of runs into the Lower Saluda River. Again, this allows us not only to try a different capture method, but also a different life stage, and that this will capture in-migrating juvenile eels that once they have hatched out in the ocean they migrate back up into the rivers to live out their life cycle. This is just a picture of an eel ramp after --- or, the eel trap after it was installed. You can see, we have our capture box at the top and there is a hose that provides the attraction flow down the pipe. Noting very complicated, it's quite simplistic. And you can see the attraction flow on the right over there. The bottom of the hose goes --- of this tube goes right into the bottom of that attraction flow.

The Fish Entrainment Group is another one of the Technical Working Committees under this Fish and Wildlife RCG. These are the folks that are on that Committee, a smaller group than some of the others. There have been no formal meetings of this group to date; however, through e-mail and other avenues we have developed a Study Plan for a Desktop Entrainment Study that's been approved by the Technical Working Committee; and, I believe, has been posted on the Saluda Relicensing website. And, by the way, if no one has mentioned it yet, the website address is on the pens that were handed out. So most of these documents will be available there.

The Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species Technical Working Committee, again a lot of the same folks from the other groups; we have had two meetings to date, March 8th and May 3rd. The sole purpose of this group is to address any rare, threatened and endangered species in the project area. In comments filed in response to the initial consultation document that was sent out to the agencies, and also filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in comments on that document the Fish and Wildlife Service cited 47 species as occurring the four county region surrounding the project. That does not say that those 47 species are within the project boundary; those are just --- that's just everything that's within those counties. And that is their standard starting point for this process. We are currently developing a tracking tool where we will be looking at which of these species actually occur within the project boundary based on known occurrences, and also looking at potential habitats to decide whether there is a possibility for them to be there. This process can provide a baseline for the "Exhibit E" of the license application, which describes the environment around the project and also will be used for "Section 7" compliance under the Endangered Species Act, which is a process that requires agencies such as the FERC to consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service regarding threatened and endangered species prior to any sort of permit or license issuance. We currently have three projects in progress related to threatened and endangered species. We have wood stork surveys

that are being conducted on the Lake. We initially located wood storks, which are typically a coastal species, on the Lake in the Summer of 2004; and subsequently developed a study plan and began doing surveys in February of 2005. And it runs February through November of each year, and we are in our second year of the study now. And since we first saw those storks in 2004, there have been no additional sightings since then. Another species that we are addressing is the rocky shoals spider lily. There was a flow trip survey conducted on May 31st of this year, and there were 2 possible plants located in the Ocean Boulevard Rapid of the lower Saluda. And we probably need to re-visit those to verify their identity. But other than that, we are not aware of any rocky shoals spider lilies until you get down into the confluence area where the Broad comes in. Shortnose sturgeon, we currently have a study plan that has been developed and finalized, and is available on the website. Pending the issuance of a permit from the National Marine Fishery Service, we will begin sampling in February of next year for this species. And basically the purpose of that will be to try and document the status of this species downstream of the project.

The Terrestrial Resources Technical Working Committee, again mostly South Carolina DNR and Fish and Wildlife folks, a few other agencies represented there. Again, two meetings March 8th and May 3rd. One of the primary study request assigned to this group is the request for a bird survey. After compiling some of the existing data from Riverbanks Zoo, Columbia Audubon, and other entities we ended up deciding --- or, the TWC decided that this could probably be addressed through existing data. We sent out a notice on the Carolina Bird "listserve" (phonetic), which is run by Duke University, and it is kind of a clearing house for all bird information in the Southeast, and got quite a few responses for the lower Saluda and Lake Murray. And from that we are developing a species list that will be included in the license application, and should close out this study request. Also, there has been a request for water fowl surveys during the winter on Lake Murray from several agencies. A study plan is currently being developed; it will document water fowl usage over winter months, December through February; and will involve a monthly aerial survey, most likely performed by Savannah River Ecology Lab that is run by the University of Georgia.

The Fresh Water Mussels and Benthic Macroinvertebrate Technical Working Committee, pretty much the same folks that are on the others with the addition of Dr. Jim Glover, who is actually with DHEC, not DNR. And he is their macroinvertebrate expert. We have had two meetings of this group to date. One of the primary studies in this group is the freshwater mussel survey of Lake Murray, Lower Saluda River, and the Congaree River. It was completed just last week. I believe Wednesday we did our last survey. There should be a report forthcoming within thirty days or so. We found approximately 16 native mussel species. None in the Lower Saluda River; there were about 8 in Lake Murray and in the headwaters, and also in the Congaree River. The second study request that will be addressed by this group is the benthic macroinvertebrate survey. This actually is a study that has been conducted in several years prior to relicensing by Shealy Environmental. There are reports associated with these years of study. I have those; if anyone is interested in them get in touch with me after the meeting and I can get those to you. There is being a study plan developed to incorporate a multi-habitat component. What is being done now is an artificial sub-straight, basically a big thing almost like a brick that you drop in and they colonize, and then they sort them out and identify them. What we are going to do is the multi-habitat component is the EPA rapid bio-assessment method; and that involves dip nets and time surveys.

UNIDENTIFIED: What is that? What is one?

MR. BORING: A benthic micro-invertebrate. Any micro-invertebrate that lives on the bottom is benthic.

UNIDENTIFIED: Bugs?

MR. BORING: Bugs, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: I understand that.

MR. BORING: Invertebrates that live on the bottom. I apologize.

UNIDENTIFIED: Just bugs (inaudible).

MR. BORING: The Instream Flow Aquatic Habitat, Technical Working Committee is one of the larger groups in the relicensing. There are a lot of issues to--- not a lot of issues, but they have a bit more work to do than some of the other groups. This is a fairly standard request for most relicensing efforts. And we have had two meetings so far, May 3rd and June 14th. And the notes from both of those are available on the website. The instream flow studies, currently there was a study that was done by South Carolina DNR in 1989, '90, in that area; and that study is currently being evaluated by the Technical Working Committee for its applicability to the current relicensing effort and whether or not there are any additional studies needed. Another study request that has been assigned to this group is the potential for self-sustaining trout fisheries in the Lower Saluda River. Currently there is a "put, grow and take" fishery with the fish being stocked in by South Carolina DNR. And, the Technical Working Committee in their most recent meeting decided that this request will be filled, or will be addressed through a technical white paper that will evaluate the potential for this type of fishery.

Floodplain Flow Evaluations, which is related to Congaree National Park, I believe this request was from the National Park Service. Currently there are a number of studies that have been done by the National Park Service, USC, and other entities that we're gathering together so that the TWC can review those and evaluate their applicability to relicensing. And then we will make a determination of what other studies need to be done. Comprehensive Habitat Assessment, that refers to aquatic habitats, has also been requested. The agencies Fish and Wildlife Service and South Carolina DNR specifically are developing the criteria for what they would like to see for the GIF coverages for this request. And as soon as they get that back to us, we will start developing that. Any questions on Fish and Wildlife?

MR. CARLISLE HARMON: Carlisle Harmon, I am a landowner on the Lake. What is the purpose of doing all these studies to see if these fish or eels are --- if they exist, or whatnot? You say we are doing a study, but what is the purpose of the study? What are you going to do with it? Does that mean to determine what you can relicense the Lake or not, or whatnot?

MR. BORING: There is a number of reasons for doing these studies. First of all, we have to prepare what is called an "Exhibit E", which describes the existing environment around the project for inclusion with the license application. That is one section of the license application. Also, there are several Federal Statutes, the Federal Power Act, Endangered Species Act, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Acts that require that you assess any potential impact to fish, wildlife,

water quality, just any environmental impacts of the Federal action; in this case the Federal action is issuing a new license for the project. And most of the studies that you saw listed up there were ones that, in response to issuance of that initial consultation document, we received study requests from the agencies specifically for those studies. They said, "This is what we would like to see before we can make a determination on this project." Any others?

UNIDENTIFIED: Who pays for it?

MR. BORING: The relicensing? The applicant. And which in this case is SCE&G. If there are no other questions, we can ---

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)

MR. BORING: The next group is the Water Quality Resource Conservation Group. Again, I am not going to read the entire mission statement. That is available on the website. But the purpose of the --- or, the goal of the group is to develop a protection mitigation enhancement agreement that basically reaches consensus on all of these issues that were raised by the agencies, homeowner groups, or whatever have you, to address all these upfront, and come up with this agreement that will become part of the license application. We have had three meetings of the Water Quality Resource Conservation Group thus far: the November 9th meeting was the kickoff meeting basically where we developed a mission statement; the December 7th meeting, as I mentioned before, was a joint meeting with the Fish and Wildlife group that was a series of technical presentations by various experts; the meeting on February 21st was for development of the Technical Working Committees, and to assign and review the study requests. These are the folks that are on the Water Quality Technical Working Committee. They are folks from Midlands Striper Club, American Rivers, South Carolina DHEC, University of South Carolina. So this is one of our more diverse groups. There have been five Water Quality Technical Working Committee meetings to date. As with the other groups, all the meeting notes are available on the website. Just a quick review of the study requests that this group is actively working on:

- the effects of project operations on Summer Habitat for Stripe Bass. Currently there is a model that is being developed by Jim Ruane at Reservoir Environmental Management in Chattanooga, Tennessee, that evaluates potential effects of Operating Unit Five on that Summer Habitat for Stripe Bass.
- a second request is being addressed by this group as to potential DO and temperature effects on fresh water mussels.

Before we can assess those effects, of course, we had to find out if we had mussels, and if so what kind? So, the mussel survey was really the first step of this; and already as I said before, that was completed on July 13th, and the report will be forthcoming. So the next time this groups meets we will look at that report and decide how to proceed on this study request. Downstream temperature impacts of the cold water release is currently --- there is a study plan in place that was developed and approved by the Technical Working Committee. And it is on the website. It is currently being executed. There are paired temperature sensors in the lower Saluda and Congaree Rivers starting at the base of the Dam all the way down to approximately the 601 Bridge on the Congaree River, adjacent to Congaree National Park. Can I go back to a slide, please? I missed something. Yeah. An additional request being evaluated by this group is the potential for

development of a TMDL for Lake Murray. TMDL is first, the total maximum daily load. And that is a management framework for reducing point and non-point sources of various pollutants. And in the most recent meeting South Carolina DHEC indicated that budgetary and other reasons they are not in the position to pursue a TMDL for Lake Murray at this time. This is a regulatory framework that they are the ones that have the regulatory authority to implement it. However, they are continuing to develop a TMDL strategy for the basin. However, that does not fit in with the relicensing process and time lines. We have to file this application in August of 2008, and they do not have any intention in the near future of initiating this process. So, unless something changes pretty rapidly that won't be part of this relicensing.

The status of existing downstream water quality conditions, that was requested by agencies to provide baseline of the water quality conditions that we have in the River, downstream of the project now. This is related to the resulting improvements in water quality associated with hub baffles that were installed to improve the aeration effectiveness of the turbines. And those were tested, several units were tested, in Fall of 2005; the remainder will be tested in the Fall of this year. And then we will have a better idea of exactly what the dissolved oxygen conditions are downstream of the Dam with the current equipment. Cove water quality in Lake Murray, currently Lake Murray Association has implemented a program where they are sampling the cove water quality. I believe they got a small grant to do this project, and we are going to --- Roy Parker and some other folks from Lake Murray Association are on the Water Quality Technical Working Committee; and they are going to take their data, put it together with what SCE&G, DHEC, and any other data that we can find, and figure out whether or not that addresses this study request. If not, then we will have to figure out how they want --- the Technical Working Committee wants to proceed with this study request. That's all I have on water quality. If there are any questions? Yes, sir.

MR. BILL EAST: Hi, I am Bill East. I have this question regarding TMDL. Notwithstanding the State DHEC's responsibilities for TMDL evaluation and action, is there any other requirement or any other portion of the relicensing itself, any acts, or any aspects of it that would indicate that we need a TMDL evaluation on the Lake?

MR. BORING: I think to trigger development of TMDL water body has to be listed on the 303D impaired list. There are portions of Lake Murray on Bush River and some other areas that are on that list. However, at this time SCDHEC is not pursuing implementation of the TMDL for those waters. From my understanding, SCE&G is more than willing to contribute any water quality studies that we develop during this relicensing, if they want the data or they want the studies to help develop the plan, they are more than willing to contribute those to that effort. But really, DHEC has to take the lead on that. So, I am not certain if I answered your question or not, but please follow up if I didn't.

MR. EAST: Well, I guess, the root of my question is --- by the way, I am with the Lake Murray Association. But the root of my question is, irregardless of what DHEC does or does not do, do we have any other responsibilities to know what are the limits of the daily load of potential pollutants in our Lake? And, are there other aspects of our evaluation that we should --- that would make us want to require these evaluations no matter what DHEC does or does not do?

MR. BORING: A TMDL is not a evaluation, it is not a study. A TMDL is something where if you have got five or six different point sources that are coming into the Lake, they develop a

plan where this one is going to reduce what they are putting in by 10%, this one is going to reduce what they are putting in by 10%; and then there is also a non-point source aspect where you try to encourage landowners to implement buffer zones or a no-cut policy between their yards and the Lake, something to reduce the non-point source that is coming in. The point source has to do with permits that are issued by the State. And, of course, SCE&G can't tell the water treatment plant that they need to reduce their loading by 10%, or something like that. Now, on the other hand, not necessarily for pollutants like phosphorous and nitrogen, but for things such as dissolved oxygen there are water quality standards for each water classification in the State. And, for example, downstream of the Dam they are required to meet a standard. And that is related to the 401 Water Quality Certificate for compliance with the Clean Water Act. So, there are checks and balances in terms of water quality.

MR. BOB TAYLOR: Yes, my name is Bob Taylor, I am a resident of Lake Murray. I am curious, SCE&G has been monitoring water quality on the Lake for a number of years, and there are buoys marking sub-stations. What is actually done with those data? And are they analyzed in any way to suggest that there might be or might not be water quality issues to deal with? That is my first question. My second question is, I am not familiar with the intake towers of the Lake, and I am not sure at what depth SCE&G is capable of drawing water from? Is it just one depth, or could it be many different depths?

MR. BORING: Okay. The first question, if Tom Bowles from SCANA doesn't mind addressing that one, I will let him.

MR. TOM BOWLES: Tom Bowles, SCE&G. We have twelve sites on Lake Murray that we take monthly profile data from, and we also have eight of those sites --- no, seven I believe, that we take semi or bi-annual samples for laboratory analysis. And that data has been collected over a number of years and has been included in part of the modeling --- am I correct on that, Shane? Would that be a correct term?

MR. BORING: I think so, yes.

MR. BOWLES: And it is going to be used as part of the framework for determining how to operate the Lake. Is that --- does that answer your question? Would you like to address the intakes?

MR. BORING: Do you want to address the intakes, Alan?

MR. STUART: No, I wanted to just elaborate a little bit more on what Tom was saying. DHEC issues what they call a 305B Report, I believe comes out every five years. And they go through doing tests of the lakes and rivers in the State. And that document is where you find out, quotes, you know, if a water body is impaired, or there are certain issues around it. And it is available at their website. Just type in the key word "DHEC" or "SCDHEC", and you will find it. It is called the 305B Report.

MR. BORING: Who wants to address the intake tower? There you go.

MR. STUART: Units 1, 3, 4, and correct me if I am wrong, pull from around 180 feet, unit 5, from what we have gathered so far, pulls from a range, it is somewhere around 60 to 80 feet. Is that right, Steve?

MR. STEVE SUMMER: I think that's approximate enough. Those ranges are approximate with the Lake levels. They are not all the same, but there are four small units pull from the bottom (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED: So you must have a --- discharge from the Lake from those four units?

MR. SUMMER: Most of the time the units are run most often the units one through four. Unit five, particularly in the summertime there is a --- in the summertime there is a last on, first off unit calls --- it pulls from water strata that's important for the stripers late in the summer and also to be **habitat to that area (on DVD 36:47)**. Number five is a bit larger unit than the other four units, about twice the size of them. But most of this summer the generation --- actually the generation would be flowed through one unit, there is really not enough water flow through there to actually call it generation, other than rainfall.

MR. BORING: Other questions?

(No response)

MR. BORING: Do we need to take a break, or keep going? Bret next? The next speaker will be Bret Hoffman. He will be giving a review of the Operations, RCG.

MR. BRET HOFFMAN: Good evening everyone. I am an engineer with Kleinschmidt Associates. My name is Bret Hoffman. And as Shane mentioned, I am going to give you an update on the Resource Conservation Group for the Operations. Basically, what the function of the Operations RCG is to develop a model of the reservoir and the watershed, and the River below to balance out needs of the resource. We basically take a physical model of Lake Murray, take a physical model of the watershed, and of the River below, and all the water that goes into it, and where it's released and how much. There are requests from various groups for water quality, for instance, in certain locations; they may want a certain amount of water at a certain location, or a certain depth of water in a certain location the Lake or the River. And we have to balance all of these allocations. As you can see this year, there is not always as much water as everyone wants.

We have had a handful of meetings. The first couple were for just the RCG itself, and developing the Mission Statements and deciding on what computer model to use for simulating the system. The last several meetings have been Technical Working Committee meetings. We have two Technical Working Committees for the Operations RCG. The first one of the Operations Technical Working Committee is functionally responsible for developing this model, and defining the extent of it, and then later on gathering input for it. The other Technical Working Committee that was formed is the Generation Review; and basically they are looking at how Saluda is operated to meet demands of SCE&G's generation system.

Participants in the Operations RCG come from all of the RCGs because there are needs within each of the others that are related to how the project is operated. So we have representatives from

each one of the others. Also, we have hydrologists from resource agencies. There is an individual from DHEC, an individual from DNR who is, I believe, the State Hydrologist. We have a hydrologist in our Company is actually building and developing the model. And then SCE&G has some representatives, they are familiar with how their current operation model runs.

Again, the objective of the model is to balance the resource. A variety of interests, like I said, and I will have a slide up here in a minute that will show you a few of those interests. But when there are needs for water in so many different places and there is not enough water, you have to determine how you are going to allocate that for the different demands. Again, it takes in the physical constraints; that's primarily storage of the Lake and availability of water.

There are a few of the issues that are from various RCGs that are important for balancing the water use. You see, hydropower is up there. The in-lake and downstream fisheries, and water quality issues, as Shane touched on. Flood control, there is years where you too much water and you have to plan for that, as well. And then on the opposite end of the spectrum you have drought events; in that situation you have to prioritize where the water is going to be allocated.

The model that we are using for this is called HEC Res-Sim. The Army Corp of Engineers developed this. It is something that they initially developed the first program, probably in the '70s. That's their hydrologic engineering center, and Res-Sims stands for the reservoir simulator. This is the national standard for relicensing projects. They use this program to model the entire Savannah River, which has multiple reservoirs and power facilities on it. It incorporates the user-defined goals, which are those requests that were on the previous slide such as water quality issues, or fisheries issues, and what we will request from each individual group is a stage and/or a flow at a specific location. We don't take into consideration, for instance, the exact water quality that they are looking for; they translate all of their needs into stage and/or flow. And they hand it to us, and we run it through the model and see what we get back. Long term planning is what we are using it for. It can be used for operations if SCE&G decides to do so.

The structure of the model is basically the extent of the watershed. And I will show you a map of that here on the next slide. And the downstream river system, not only the Lower Saluda River, but it goes all the way down to the Congaree National Park. And since it goes that far down below the confluence, that also includes Broad River flows. So, we actually have to use Broad River in the model, as well, and take it all the way back up to the next gauge station, which is at Parr Reservoir, about twenty-five miles upstream of Columbia. Here's a map of the watershed. This is actually a screen shot from the program. Obviously, you can see the drainage basin for the whole facility in the green, and then you can see Lake Greenwood, a couple of river systems and tributaries that feed in. And those points on there, the green points, are contributions to the water. They would be from either gauged inflows such as from Chapels, right below Greenwood, or maybe calculated from rainfall, other points that we have basically taken an area of rainfall and then considered that a contribution into the system.

The closer shot from a different screen, and that actually shows some of the calculation points that are used when the model does the simulation. Again, a couple of the ones up top, those are contributors to the water in the Lake. As I mentioned, the hydrologic inputs are, there is inflows from gauged and ungauged sources. The gauged sources are the ones below Lake Greenwood that are let go with the Buzzards Roost Project, Bush River and Little River, ungauged inflows, includes some other tributaries. Basically we capture all of that from basin runoff. Outflows and

evaporation are the other hydrologic factors in the model. It's pretty simple, releases from the project and evaporation is significant Lake Murray; it actually --- you can have more evaporation in some days than you actually get inflows. It happens on occasion. And when they do run this model, they will take a typical year based on a certain period of average from USGS data; and they will run a typical year and then they will do allocations for different requests. And they will also run the same requests for heavy water years and for dry years, because that is going to give you your flood control situations and your drought allocations.

Like I said earlier, all of the requests we are asking that they all be submitted in the form of stage and/or flow at a specific location. We run the simulation with requests from all the different RCGs, and the constraints, and then what we get as a result is a report that tells you how often each individual request, or the frequency that it was met, it might --- there is never enough water to get everybody's needs. You might only have enough for one specific request 50% of the time. Or, maybe 80% of the time. And then the rest of the say 20% if you didn't meet that request, how bad did you violate the request?

Ultimately what we are looking for is going to be a compromise, something everybody can live with. Once we get the reports back of the frequency and the magnitude of violations or requests for each individual RCG, those will be returned to the stakeholders, and they will have to in turn take them back to their respective parties and say, "Can we live with this?" And you might be willing to accept 80% of the time. 50% of the time? Maybe not. Or maybe the order of magnitude that they missed your target by for that 20% was too low; you can't handle that. You have to go back and forth with them. This is an iterative process. I wish it would happen one time, but that's just not how it is going to work. Ultimately we come up, once everybody finds that they can agree on what we have, we come up with the PM&E, which has been alluded to already. It's the agreement that we come up with, and Operations will be part of that.

Moving forward, we are working --- our hydrologist should have the base model finalized this month, and we are scheduling a meeting for August 23rd to meet with the Technical Working Committee. The Operations Technical Working Committee again just to QC it and let everyone look at the final product. After that we are going to present the model to all of the RCGs. And then after everybody has seen it, we are going to put out requests for the user-defined inputs that I discussed earlier. In other words, the stage and flow requests. Everybody is going to have to come up with those and turn them in to us, and then we run them through the model and see what the simulation gives us. Any questions?

(No response)

MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Do you want Bill to come up, or do you want to take a break?

MR. STUART: I'll leave it to the room. We have kind of a break as we did earlier at this morning's meeting to try to decide. I will leave it to the group. Do you want to move forward with this presentation? We have got about an hour left. If you would like to take a break about ten minutes? No. We'll move forward.

MR. HOFFMAN: Bill Green is going to give us update on Cultural Resources RCG.

MR. BILL GREEN: I am Bill Green, I am with S&ME. My presentation is a little bit different from the other ones because the Cultural Resource Conservation Group has only met one time, about nine months ago. We have another meeting scheduled on September 8th of this year. Really, we have to get these studies in ahead of time to know --- to get the input from the Cultural Resource Conservation Group. So, I am going to describe what we have done so far to date.

The primary participants in this process as far as Cultural Resources are concerned are the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, SCE&G, The State Historic Preservation Office, the Catawba Indian Nation, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Other participants include SCDNR, the South Carolina Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, other federally recognized Indian Tribes on a somewhat limited basis; there's the Cultural Resource Conservation Group, and the public. These are just a list of the Cultural Resource Conservation Group participants. We have members from SCE&G, Regional Tourism, Lake Watch, State Historic Preservation Office, and various other Catawba Indian Nation, Irmo Chapin Recreation Commission, and various other groups.

The Laws, Regulations and Guidelines that tell us what to do as far as Cultural Resources are concerned include the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, that's the major one, I will discuss that in a little more detail in a moment. But the primary section of that Act that we are concerned with is Section 106 and its implementing Regulations, which is the protection of historic properties. There is FERC Guidelines for environmental assessments, and Historic Properties Management Plan, which is our ultimate goal. That's the final document we have to produce. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, and State Historic Preservation Office Guidelines for Archeological Investigations and Surveys of Historic Properties.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act says, "The head of any Federal Agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or Federally assisted undertaking --" which in this case is the relicensing --- "shall prior to the issuance of any license take into account the affect of the undertaking on any district site building, structure or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The head of any such Federal Agency shall afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to such undertaking." There are really four basic steps to doing all this:

- The first part is to initiate the Section 106 process, and that we have completed already;
- Second step is to identify historic properties; we are in the process of doing that now; and also
- We are in the process of doing step three, which is assessing the adverse effects of the project; and
- The fourth is the resolution of adverse effects. And that will be done probably after the license is already issued.

The first step, again, is initiating the 106 process:

- You define the undertaking;
- You identify the participants and coordinate with the State Historic Preservation Office; and

- You define the area of potential effects, which includes any area that could be affected by the undertaking.

The second step is to identify historic properties. We have already completed a stage one reconnaissance survey where we identified previously recorded historic and archeological sites, identified areas for additional archeological survey using models, and recorded historic structures in the area. Upon completion of this study, the area examined were 620 miles of shoreline along Lake Murray, 25 miles of river bank on the Saluda, Little Saluda, and Lower Saluda Rivers and their major tributaries.

The results of the stage one reconnaissance survey were we identified 42 previously recorded archeological sites; we found 40 new archeological sites; there were 7 previously recorded structures that are listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register, including the Power House at the Dam. And there are 8 newly recorded structures, one of which was eligible for the National Register, that's Epting's Campground.

In the stage two intensive survey areas that we are looking at now were 735 acres on 139 islands in Lake Murray. It's 89 miles of shoreline identified in 177 areas in Lake Murray. Four miles of riverbank on the Lower Saluda River, and 19 acres on 7 islands in the Lower Saluda River. The areas that we have examined to date that we are still in the process of doing this as we looked at 71 islands so far; 21 shoreline areas in Lexington; 2 miles of riverbank on the Lower Saluda; and Corley Island found here at the Park. The areas we have remaining are 68 islands in Lake Murray, mostly small privately owned islands; 79 shoreline areas in Lexington County; 77 shoreline areas in Richland, Newberry and Saluda Counties; and 2 miles of riverbank at 6 islands in the Lower Saluda River.

To date so far we found 50 new archeological sites during this stage of the study; so altogether there have been 90 archeological sites found. We re-visited 4 sites from the initial stage one survey. And of these sites, 12 are pre-historic sites ranging from the early archaic period to the Lake Woodland period, which is about 10,000 years ago; the early archaics were about 1,000 years ago, which is what we call Lake Woodland period. We have 31 historic sites, which are mostly 19th and early 20th century home sites; there are also 5 cemeteries identified; and there are 7 sites of both prehistoric and historic components.

By far the most interesting site we found so far is on the Lower Saluda River. It's site, we call it 38 which stands for the State, 38 is South Carolina of those 50 states in order. LX is Lexington County, and 531 is the 531st site identified in that County. The site is about 12 acres in size; it has excellent preservation; and very deeply buried artifacts; and numerous features. That's a picture of the bluff up there where the site is located. And then if you see it look in this picture, right here is a cluster of quartz cobbles that were fired; they were used in a hearth; and that probably dates to about 4,000 or 5,000 years ago. The know occupations at the site go back more than 5,000 years. We have potential occupations at the site, maybe going back as far as 13,500 years. And it could be one of the most interesting and important sites in the Southeastern U.S. And working with SCE&G now to develop a plan for how to take into account the adverse effects there occurring to the site. Are there any questions?

(No response)

MR. GREEN: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. DAVE ANDERSON: Y'all are sure you don't want to take a break? All right, last chance.

My name is Dave Anderson, I am with Kleinschmidt Associates. I will be giving updates on the Recreation Resource Conservation Group and the Safety Resource Conservation Group. The first one, Recreation RCG, like all the other RCGs, we have developed a Mission Statement for our first few meetings. I think that an important part here is *“ensuring adequate and environmentally-balanced public recreational access and opportunities related to the project for the term of the new license.”*

We are going to have five meetings by Friday of this week. We have one scheduled on Friday. Like Shane mentioned, all of these meeting notes are available on the website if you want to go back and look in detail as to what has taken place. I obviously don't have time in my ten or so minutes here to talk about everything that has happened.

One tool that we are using that kind of guides our process at looking at developing new recreation sites or expanding existing recreation sites, is what I am calling the standard process. I apologize for it being so small, but that's just the way it worked out. There are basically four steps associated with this process. First, we have determined the desired future condition of the project. We have done that through a vision statement for Lake Murray and the Lower Saluda River, which has not been finalized yet. That's what we will be working on at our meeting on Friday. Pretty much just laying out what our goals are for the term of the new license and identifying what I call solution principles, how do we want to guide our efforts if we develop new sites or expand additional sites. The second step is to establish a baseline condition; that's about the step we're on right now. Going out looking at existing conditions, reviewing any agreements that SCE&G has with any entity concerning a recreation site like Saluda Shoals Park and the Irmo Chapin Recreational Commission. And also, looking at future demand; and we do that several different ways. The third step is to determine what is needed and when. Once we figure out what we have we need to figure out what we need, when do we need it? Which ties into the fourth step. Determine how these needs will be met and who is responsible. SCE&G, while they are in the recreation business, has indicated that they would be interested in more agreements such as this one where perhaps they provide the land or funds for building a site. But the O&M costs are shared by Lexington County and Newberry County, something like that.

We have several work products that we are working on. First is what we are calling a work plan, that basically lays out what our identified issues are, the tasks and responsibilities for this RCG to address those issues, and also a work scope and product. And in this case their ultimate product will be a consensus based recreation plan. Talked a little bit about the vision statement, that's basically --- oh, it's about maybe a page right now. Like I said, it hasn't been finalized yet. But basically, what do you want to see, and you being represented by members of the RCG want to see Lake Murray or the Lower Saluda River, what do you want it to look like in fifty years, which is the term of the license that SCE&G is applying for. Mentioned the solution principles. This is basically like a guiding light, for lack of a better word, that kind of spells out, all right if we figure out we need a new site or need to expand an additional site, we need some sort of guidelines as we go through that process. And part of them, we're trying to reduce impacts to commercial operations. We certainly don't want to put anybody else out of business, you know, by putting a public site right next to a marina or something like that. Taking into accounts other

environmental resources; we are not going to throw a recreation site in an environmentally sensitive area. So on and so forth.

We also have a standard process form, which is a list of about forty questions that we will be answering over the next year or so that basically is just our guidelines. We need to answer these questions in order to get where we need to get by 2008. And finally, a recreation plan. And a straw man, which is kind of just a little draft has been submitted to the RCG for our meeting on Friday; and we are going to start flushing that out after we start getting some data back from some of the studies we are conducting.

Identified issues being dealt with in this RCG; and this is just my interpretation, trying to fit down the issues that we are dealing with in the five bullets. It gets a little more detailed than this if you look at work plan. There's many more sub-bullets to these:

- Looking at recreational facilities, what do we have? What do we need? Do any sites need improving?
- Conservation of lands, especially for future recreation.
- This concept of adaptive management, which my best analogy is it's kind of like a sail boat trip. You are trying to get from Point A to Point B, but along the way maybe you figured out you steered off course a little bit; so, you take a look at where you are at; still need to get to Point B, so you kind of correct your course. And that will be a component of a recreation plan we come up with.
- Downstream flows related to recreation, and also lake levels associated with recreation.

We have formed three Technical Working Committees to deal with these issues:

- The Recreation Management TWC is basically dealing with recreational facilities.
- We have a Downstream Flows Technical Working Committee that is dealing with flow issues in the Lower Saluda River, has kind of been tasked with also safety issues associated with those flows, and also
- A Lake Levels TWC that will make suggestions as to what lake level is most conducive to recreation on the Lake, which will then be put into this operation's model and balanced among other computing uses.

Right now we have three ongoing are plan studies; one is ongoing, the recreation assessment. Basically we have gone out and inventoried, I believe it's 16 or 18 SCE&G owned public recreation sites. Went out and looked at how big the sites are, how many parking spaces there are, bathrooms, whether the site is ADA compliant, which is American with Disabilities Act. Just a whole list of variables which will --- are getting put into a database that SCE&G can use and RCG can use to determine what kind of upgrades are needed at certain sites. The next two are plan studies: boat density study plan has been submitted to the Recreation Management TWC, and we are actually meeting on it tomorrow afternoon. This is basically going to take some existing data and look at number of boats on the Lake on 13 different dates, I believe. And what we will do is, using existing research, there is guidelines that say how many acres do you need per activity? You know, obviously somebody that is fishing doesn't need quite as much water as somebody that is water skiing. That's kind of the basic concept. And we can determine whether segments of Lake Murray are at capacity as far as boat densities; under capacity? And finally we

have a downstream recreation flow assessment, which is undergoing a review process right now internally. I will get a little bit to the goals of that in a second.

Here are the goals of the Recreation Assessment study. Like I said, we are characterizing existing recreational use of SCE&G's recreation sites, and identifying future recreational needs. I had mentioned we are doing that a number of ways. We are looking at population projections for the areas surrounding the Lake and the River. Looking at existing studies that are done by the State as far as what activities people participate in. And then using the RCG as a stakeholder group that is representing the public and identifying what needs are available and wanted around the Lake and the River. The boat density study plan, the goals of it. Like I said, we are assessing the area available for boating activity on Lake Murray. We will basically look at maps, take away areas that are not accessible by boat, come up with a number; there are so many acres of Lake Murray that are usable by boat. Assess the boat densities under normal, which are weekend days, and peak, which are holiday days. And conduct an analysis of whether Lake Murray is currently above, below, or at optimum recreational boating capacity.

The draft goals right now of the downstream flow assessment, to characterize existing available recreation opportunities on the River; that is being done as part of the recreation assessment. Not only are we doing the sites on the Lake, we are doing the four sites on the River that SCE&G owns or leases, and also some sites down at the Mill Race area to determine what activities are taking place, number of people. The second goal is to understand the rate of change of the Lower Saluda River at various flows at the various River reaches. That's to collect data as far as what happens when the Saluda starts operating, what happens in the River, how high does it rise? And then identify any potential public safety issues associated with Lower Saluda River flows.

Here is our schedule. Our upcoming meeting on Friday, we are going to pretty much knock out that first bullet. We are hopefully --- identify the studies we are going to conduct and are in the process of getting those study plans in place. By the end of this year, beginning of next year, the results from the studies should be starting to become available, and we will start taking a look at those. Cram everything together and come up with a recreation plan, which we will submit to the larger relicensing group for their approval. Does anybody have any questions on Recreation RCG?

MR. BOB CULLER: I'm Bob Culler, resident of Lake Murray. I have a question about your boat density study. As Lake levels rise, usage increases. And when will you be doing this boat density survey? During the period when the Lake is low? And will it be an underestimate of potential use?

MR. ANDERSON: We are actually using, or it's in the study plan that has been submitted to the TWC, so I don't want to say it's a fact when we are still going through the process of getting comments on the study plan and finalizing it. But the study plan, right now we are planning on using existing data that was collected in 2001. We understand that the Lake is down this year, and any counts of boats that take place this year might not be an accurate reflection of normal use during a, quote, unquote, "normal year". I personally feel that the 2001 data, since it was before the remediation probably provides a more accurate depiction of boat densities during a, quote, unquote, "normal year" than we would collect this year and, you know, unknown for next year. We get the rain and the Lake comes back up. But, since we are under this time line of

getting done by 2008, the term you will hear a lot is we are going to use the best available data, and go from there.

MR. CULLER: Does your boat density information you are going to collect include information on the size of boats that you see on the Lake?

MR. ANDERSON: No, it does not. Photographs, there are I think, around 450 photographs that we have that were collected by an airplane from around 3500 feet. And from that distance and because of the angle the photographs were collected, it is going to be virtually impossible to tell the size of the boat or anything like that. We could certainly --- and it is something that I believe was presented in the ICD looking at boat registrations for the four counties around. You know, there's other ways to get that kind of information.

MR. CULLER: I am just concerned. There seems to be a lot more bigger boats, with bigger wakes, and more shoreline erosion.

MS. FRAN TRAPP: Will your recreation plan take into consideration the various types of water craft you have out there, such as sail boats which cannot use the Lower Saluda River, or a large portion of it, because of the mast? And will it take into consideration other than recreation centers land that will be left vacant for the public to enjoy boating where there are no houses, and other buildings?

MR. ANDERSON: The second part of your question is a definite "yes". Part of the Recreation Plan --- I don't know if it will necessarily be in the Recreation Plan, but part of the responsibilities of the Recreation RCG is to make recommendations to the Lake and Land Management RCG as to, "Here are the size and the number of acres of lands we feel need to be set aside for either future recreation sites or to remain in a natural undeveloped state that will still support certain types of activities." The first question, are you talking --- are you concerned with sail boats on the River?

MS. TRAPP: Yes. Some of us can't get --- I mean, I am concerned with undeveloped property. I am Fran Trapp, by the way, from Windward Point Yacht Club. I am concerned of the development of property that --- on this side of the Lake such that there is no longer any coves that you go anchor out in and that you are not looking in someone's window, and they are looking and ---

MR. ANDERSON: SCE&G has no control on the activities that take place on the water. To address your concern as far as natural undeveloped cove that you can go anchor up in, that would certainly be addressed through the Lake and Land Management, making sure that there is enough natural undeveloped lands around for that to occur. I know today we had some concern from the past update of the SMP on the designation of Hurricane Cove and Two Bird Cove as special recreation areas. That was handled through the Shoreline Management Process, which is different from this Recreation Plan Process. Does that answer your question?

MS. TRAPP: Uh huh, thanks.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Anybody else?

(No response)

MR. ANDERSON: All right. Save the best for last. Safety Resource Conservation Group. Perhaps the most animated and exciting of the Resource Conservation Groups that I am associated with. Here is the Mission Statement that we have developed in the first couple of meetings. Basically just in that first sentence, the mission is *“to make Lake Murray and the Lower Saluda River as safe as reasonably possible for the public. The objective is to develop a consensus-based safety program”*, is where the terminology is heading and the newest iteration of this that will be included *“in the FERC license application”*.

We have had --- or, will have had six meetings by the end of the week. We have one scheduled for Thursday. There is about --- and I didn't actually count them, estimating about 25 members of this RCG that are representing not only the agencies, but we have Lexington County Sheriffs involved, Columbia Fire Department, City of Columbia Parks and Recreation, Lake Murray Power Squadron, Coast Guard Auxiliary, local hospitals are going to get involved, I hope, if they accepted my invitation. Meeting notes are available on the website just as with all the other RCGs; so if you want to go take a look at what's been happening, and this Group, you are welcome to it.

A couple of work products that we are working on. First is the Work Plan, kind of dovetails nicely along with the Recreation RCG since I am doing both of the Groups. Basic sections in the Work Plan are the identified issues where people within the RCG have expressed their concerns and have been recorded. Have a section on Task and Responsibilities, again; how do we address those issues that have been brought up, and what tasks do we need to accomplish to make sure those issues get addressed? And also, a Work Scope and Product, and in this case the product will be a safety program that will be included in the license application. An outline of the safety program has been submitted to the RCG, it will be one of the items that we discuss on Friday, or on Thursday, I'm sorry, so I don't want to get a whole lot into it right now, it's just basically an outline; it has got about 12 sections and a few sub-sections. But we are going to try to start flushing that out beginning on Thursday. The identified issues, again this is my attempt to amalgamate what is contained in the Work Plan into about five or six bullets:

- Fluctuating lake and river levels;
- Shoal markers and the identification of shoals on the Lake;
- Communications concerning releases from the Dam and also Lake levels;
- Boat traffic and congestion especially in cove areas;
- Systematic collection of accident data. Surprisingly accident data is collected but is not as thorough as we had hoped, and we are working on that; and also
- Ingress/egress points on the Lower Saluda River for safety concerns. We get people into the River, how do we get them out safely?

There has been one Technical Working Committee formed under this RCG, the Hazardous Areas TWC, which has been tasked with identifying unmarked hazards and proposing potential solutions to those hazards. We have one Ongoing/Plan Study, which is related to safety; and that is what I described a few minutes ago, the Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment, which has a safety component to it. Just to run through what the goals of that study are:

- Characterizing recreation opportunities on the River;

- Understanding this rate of change on the River as to what happens when the Saluda starts to operate; and
- Identifying potential public safety issues associated with those flows.

Schedule for this RCG, Thursday we are going to --- well, the Mission Statement has been finalized, we are hopefully going to finalize the Work Plan on Thursday. In the process of identifying studies, getting study plans in place. At the end of this year we will start flushing out this safety program 2007 we will have the safety program completed, we will be making our recommendations to the Operations RCG as to what kind of inputs we want into this operations model. In 2008, we will have this Safety Program finalized and be taking a look at the draft license application. Any questions on the Safety RCG?

(No response)

MR. ANDERSON: I wish it would go that smoothly Thursday. All right, with that I will turn it back over to Alan, who will take any general questions on the Relicensing Process and wrap this thing up.

MR. STUART: Are there any questions for us, for SCE&G, while you are here?

MR. CARLISLE HARMON: My name, again, is Carlisle Harmon. I think you have answered some of the questions here that I am here about the recreational area that was set up, announced in the paper last week about the Hurricane Cove and Two Bird Cove. I want to make some comments about that and my concerns as a landowner who adjoins that cove, one of those coves. But I think from what was said, just said, I believe we are talking to the wrong people if we were going to say something. Is that right, or is there another committee that is actually doing that, or

MR. STUART: Actually, we touched on this very subject this morning. To kind of give you a idea of what went on. Randy did a good job of explaining this morning. The Two Bird Cove and Hurricane Cove, how that whole thing originated, it started --- there were --- the SCE&G revised their Shoreline Management Plan back in 2001; they sent that out. As part of that process, it went out for public review. An individual that lives on the Lake, or frequents the Lake, sent in a comment indicating to the FERC, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, that he was concerned that area may not be available for sail boating and other activities, and wanted it to be designated as a special recreation area to give some type of protection so that that area would be available. In response to that, the FERC ordered SCE&G to designate those two coves as special recreation areas based on that gentleman's comment. What we talked about today, that Order has been finalized; however, we will be reviewing the new --- or, redeveloping the new Shoreline Management Plan. If you would like to provide a comment and possibly persuade the FERC to require SCE&G to un-designate that area, then this would be the opportunity to do that. However, that does not necessarily mean FERC will do that. If there is enough --- you know, I'm not to ask it either way, but I suggest if there is concern with that, that you need to --- you know, this will be the time that you --- your opportunity to do that.

MR. HARMON: Okay, one question before I make my comments then. You say this was sent out in 2001. In what form was it published and made available? The first I heard of it was when it came out in the paper, and that's why come I am asking.

MR. STUART: I wasn't involved with that. I am not sure exactly how it was issued. Tommy, will you touch on that?

MR. TOMMY BOOZER: Well, when it went out to the public, it went out to all the Resource Agencies, you know, the DNR, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and all the other Resource Agencies had the opportunity to comment. After that it was posted on the web, the FERC website, for review by the public.

MR. BRIAN MCMANUS: And I believe it was also posted on the SCE&G website. Correct?

MR. BOOZER: Right, during that process.

MR. BRIAN MCMANUS: A public notice was issued by the creation of a on-line inviting public comment on that item.

MR. HARMON: It was put on the website, so if you didn't know anything about the website, you wouldn't know anything about it?

MR. BOOZER: No, I think --- Brian, do you want to elaborate on the FERC ---

MR. BRIAN MCMANUS: Brian McManus, I am counsel of the company. The FERC once it gets an application of the type we submitted for the land use plan, posts a Notice, publishes a Notice, in the Federal Register and in the local papers of this application, inviting the general public to come in and comment upon the application. And I must agree that unless you read the -- have nothing else to do on Saturday and read Public Notices or Legal Notices, it does slip by. But that is how the public is formally made aware of the filing, and that's how the Commission receives its comments. So, somebody saw that and filed a comment concerning sailboat access to those two coves. The Company did not propose this; in fact, the Company wasn't too supportive of the suggestion. But unfortunately, just because we are not supportive the Commission does tell you what to do, they are the Regulatory Agency.

MR. HARMON: And this was published like the Notices in the want-ad section of the paper, right? It wouldn't be like the ad for the meeting ---

MR. MCMANUS: No, no. As far as I know, it would not.

MR. STUART: It would be in the Legal Notices probably.

MR. HARMON: Pardon?

MR. STUART: In the Legal Notices.

MR. HARMON: The Legal Notices, okay. The real fine print.

UNIDENTIFIED: Probably so.

MR. STUART: The reason you saw our ad for tonight's meeting, and this is about the third one we have had, is we tried to make this relicensing process very open and very informative. And

that's why we take out --- or, SCE&G takes out these quarter page ads, I guess, is about what they are, to try to get individuals to come out, and we want to hear their comments and get their concerns raised early so we don't come to the 11th hour in 2008, and have a bevy of comments that we have not addressed.

MR. HARMON: Okay. Can I make my comments now?

MR. STUART: Certainly. Do you want to make some type of formal --- I mean, if you do, you can come up here and speak, and you can be ---

MR. HARMON: No, I just have some notes here of what I wanted to cover and kind of go over. Like I said, this decision apparently was made without any kind of input, apparently it was without any of the landowners on these areas being actually notified. Now, whether we own the property bordering the Lake or not, we are affected by anything like this that goes on. So, I think SCE&G should have made a point to at least contact to make sure that Notice got to the landowners that would be involved by the adjoining land. Just one of my comments I wanted to make. And, what concerns me is maybe what are the environmental impact of all these boats coming in this cove is going to have on that cove, because it is --- part of it is already marked site as your environmental sensitive areas. It's a very shallow cove. You have got a little deep water at the front end where you come in off of, and that's it. And, you know, what's going to happen with the cove if we start having folks come in there, docking, and staying? If they start dumping any fluids on the --- in the water, who is going to be monitoring all of this to make sure this --- you're talking about the cove water quality control here, if you haven't even done that yet, how can you determine whether these boats are going to come in and are going to affect the quality of that water at the cove? Because you said that was still one of the things you still had to do was go in the coves and access --- determine what kind of quality the water was.

You know, and like the thing about the guys, the people, wanting the sailboats saying they want to have a private place where they can go, and they say they --- quote the guy in the newspaper, David Allen, he was quoted as saying, "I want my boating buddies without being --- go out with my boating buddies without being a nuisance to those living on shore." So, to me they must be taking it --- doing some partying on those boats if people are already complaining about if they go somewhere where people live. So just because I don't live there, maybe down the road I may decide I want to. Why should --- you know, are they going to move out if I come in and say, "Well, this is a nuisance," are they going to get up and pull out and stay out? They probably won't. They are going to say, "We were here, we're going to keep coming. You are out of luck." I have got to put up with whatever they bring in, you know. And there's complaining now that the other cove they have got is too much of a party cove. What's going to keep this from becoming a party cove, is my concern. And are we going to have beer cans all over the shoreline? Boat wakes washing the water away, which is already --- has a lot of erosion in that cove. And what is the future plans for the development of the fringe land around that cove? That was something I would like to know, also. Are there plans to put restrooms, or docking areas on for these people to use? Or whatnot?

MR. STUART: The development of the fringe lands is one of the things that we are going to discuss in one of our next Technical Working Committees. Right now, I don't ---

MR. BOOZER: You know, as far as right now, the only plans that SCE&G has is what we're ordered to do is that --- and that was to identify that area as a recreation --- special recreation area. That just applies to the water, it does not apply to any of the land.

MR. HARMON: Exactly what is a special recreation area?

MR. BOOZER: Well, it's a special area where people can come and anchor their boats, whether it's a sail boat or a motor boat. It's not specific and it's not only limited to sail boats. I mean, it's open to the public. Just like every cove on Lake Murray is open to boats.

MR. HARMON: I know on the Lake it is. But why do you have to designate that one special one?

MR. BOOZER: Well, to get back to the history, and the comments and the requests, and FERC's decision to require us to do that, so that particular cove does carry that special recreation classification. But, you can do the same thing in any cove on Lake Murray; and what attracts this cove is the fact that it is close in, it one of the few areas that have not been developed, and it is easily accessible to two of the major sail boat coves. And that's the attraction there. But as far as doing anything with the land, no, we have no plans to do anything. But there again, like Alan said, we will be discussing the use of the fringe land in our Land and Lake Management Technical Working Committees. So that will be discussed on what can and cannot ---

MR. HARMON: When will that meeting be held?

MR. STUART: Beg your pardon?

MR. HARMON: When will that meeting be?

MR. BOOZER: We haven't set a date for that yet. It's got some --- We haven't set a date specifically. The next date we are talking about mostly is docks. But we haven't set the date to talk about the fringe land yet. But it will be here shortly.

MR. HARMON: And how will that be advertised?

MR. STUART: That's what I was going to say. Has everybody linked on time into our FERC --- Saluda Hydro Relicensing website? Has anybody not done it? Okay. The address is www.saludahydrorelicense.com. It concerns everything that goes on in these Resource Groups and Technical Working Committees. Detailed minutes of what was discussed. If you go to the Resource Group there, you will see all of the sub-groups that we discussed tonight. For instance, Lake and Land Management. These meetings that we have are in chronological order; the minutes are posted, we try to get them out in about two weeks after we have had the meetings, sometimes that slips. Generally if you have Acrobat Reader on your computer; if you don't, you can pretty much go to any government agency website, and you can download it for free. The reason we do that is, to be quite frank, is they can't be edited. You just click on the link and there's the meeting minutes from June 15th. And pretty much lays out what was discussed, the date of the next meeting, list of homework assignments, and typically what we are going to discuss at the next meeting. As far as advertising a meeting, see this little tool right here, it's called calendar. Click on that link, there's a list of all the meetings that we have upcoming. We

try to get those out about a month in advance, or as soon as we're scheduled. You know, some Resource Groups like Lake and Land Management Technical Working Committee, we meet quite frequently. And usually we meet about every other week it seems like. Sometimes it seems like about every day. But we get them up there as soon as we agree to the meeting date within the Technical Working Committee.

MR. BOOZER: And we will also identify what is to be discussed at that meeting on that date.

MR. STUART: Right.

MR. HARMON: As of last Thursday, I talked with the writer. He told me how to get to all this stuff. I have been doing a lot of --- spending a lot of time on the internet since last Thursday trying to catch up and see what's been going on.

MR. STUART: Well, we have been promoting this from the get-go. And we said this is going to be the primary tool to distribute information to the general public and people that are intricately involved in the relicensing process. So, there is a lot of information there, and you have got a catching up to do, is the best way I could say it. Like I said, we ---

MR. HARMON: Is the public invited to these meetings?

MR. STUART: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.

MR. HARMON: Are the public invited to these meetings?

MR. STUART: That question was asked, the meetings are open to the public. You can come as an observer. Typically at the end we do have some time if somebody wanted to make a comment publicly, would be more than welcome to. What you do need to do is, contact Alison Guth because we typically meet at the Lake Murray Training Center; and there is a security clearance gate you have to get through, and if you don't let her know in advance you will be stuck at the gate and he won't let you through.

MR. HARMON: Are the meetings in the evenings or usually during the day?

MR. STUART: The meetings are during the day.

MR. HARMON: Makes the people like me at a disadvantage.

MR. STUART: It does make it difficult. If you do have comments, there is a comment section on here; if there is something that you would like the Resource Group of the Technical Working Committee to address, certainly provide that comment through this avenue; and it pretty much goes to myself, Alison, Randy, Bill ---

UNIDENTIFIED: Is that the contact list?

MR. STUART: Yes, that's the contact list, right. Yeah, there is Bill's e-mail address. There is also one, I think, down at the bottom of the home page. It says, "Comments ---" Is that where it is? I'm trying to think. "Comments," right there. That's the one that has that global distribution,

and like I said it goes to Randy Mahan, Bill, myself, Alison. So, if you want to go to the meeting, that's probably the easiest way to let us know is through that "Comment". Again, we do ask in advance because we typically have lunch because we do it pretty much all day, so there are some logistical things we work out; but you are absolutely more than welcome to attend any meeting, just let us know in advance. We like to have seven days, but we do make exceptions.

UNIDENTIFIED: But if you don't have a computer, do they list it in the paper?

MR. STUART: No. If you don't have the computer, you can go to the library. But the other thing is we can give you a telephone number, you can contact us. And feel free to call. You can call Bill, or you can call myself if you have questions. The reason we try to use the computer is because it's like a VCR; everybody has got a computer, or most people do. Most people do.

MS. DONNA RICHARDSON: It's Donna Richardson, and I live on the property that's on that cove. And that's our concern because already there have been signs of fires, you know, where people have fires. And Styrofoam. Wires. But concern about it, the land being cleared for picnic areas, you know, for them to come off their boat onto the land. And all that being destroyed. And that's the reason they want to come is because all the people around the area have intentionally left it natural. And it won't stay that way.

MR. BOOZER: That will be addressed. And like I said, there is no plans to do any type of land based recreation in that particular area. Right now, it just applies to the water serving the community.

UNIDENTIFIED: So, when the boat is already coming in there, won't they eventually come back and say, "Hey, we need direct access. Put us a road in so we can put our boats in right there in that cove."

MR. BOOZER: That's not going to happen. We are not going to put a boat ramp ---

UNIDENTIFIED: How can you say that's not going to happen?

MR. BOOZER: Because we pick and choose where to put them. So, it's not going to happen. And we are not going to put a boat ramp at the Harmon property there. We have got other areas that we are going to be looking at. But, I mean, that will be evaluated. Now, one thing you have got to understand, that is fringe land there. That is SCE&G's fringe land. And that fringe land is project property; and, you know, somebody gets out and walks on it, they can do that. Believe me, now, if they start building fires, or they start building camp grounds, or they start disturbing the peace, then we can get the Sheriff's Department involved and take care of that. But as far as -- If an individual gets out and walks around the shore line, there's nothing we can do. It's the same principle if somebody owns to the 360 and you get out and walk below the 360. You know, that's open to the public.

UNIDENTIFIED: What if the things, all the trash they leave, the cans, and food containers, and everything else on the shore, it won't become a shore.

MR. BOOZER: Is there a history of that?

UNIDENTIFIED: Oh, yes, definitely.

MR. BOOZER: I knew about four years ago we had an issue with fires in that area. I think Bill stopped that, it was trapping. We had some issues there but, you know, that is also a litter issue, and if it's a problem we will get the proper law enforcement people there to monitor it.

UNIDENTIFIED: So y'all can do that on fringe land ---

MR. BOOZER: If somebody is littering, we are not going to allow that to happen. It's not trespassing, it's littering. So, we can't get them for trespassing.

MR. STUART: The project land (inaudible), or we put it for public usage without regard to discrimination and ---

MR. BOOZER: This goes back to what we were saying of what we were going to be discussing and try to manage that fringe land there. And so that is part of what the Committee is going to be. And you know, we have got areas on the Lake that we are looking at to set aside for recreation. The fringe land, you know, under the license, under the project license, it is open to the public. But just because it is open to the public doesn't mean it's going to be a public recreation area. There is a difference.

MR. STUART: One of the things we are going to attempt to do is provide general guidelines of what should --- what activities should be done in the buffer zones, or fringe lands, and things like that. This is what Tommy said. As long as it's a lawful act, SCE&G can't tell somebody they can or cannot do it. But they can provide guidelines for what activities are --- I don't want to say permissible, but are promoted.

MR. BOOZER: It's very similar to the Forest Service. The Forest Service allows you to walk on it, but in some places they allow you to hunt, some they don't; some places they allow you to camp, in others they don't. So, that's what we will be determining in this.

MS. RICHARDSON: I have another question, too. There are deer down there. You talking about usage of the land and anybody can come up. What if it comes hunting season? Somebody is on the fringe land. We have homes up in there. We are outside.

MR. BOOZER: But that area is not designated as Forest and Land Management property. So it shouldn't be any --- it should be hunting --- if somebody is hunting on that property, then they are not supposed to be hunting on SCE&G's property.

UNIDENTIFIED: The history of duck flying is found on the shoreline.

MR. STUART: Right.

MS. RICHARDSON: But I think somebody needs to come out there and take a look at that because, you know, there are several things going on.

MR. STUART: Each County has some Federal or some State laws that prohibit discharging a firearm within so many residences. That may be an unlawful act.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): There's some at my place down there.

MS. RICHARDSON: He's closer than I am to the water, but I still hear it.

MR. STUART: I mean, a lot of this is like anything you see. You can see somebody robbing a bank, you are not going to call the bank, you are going to call the police. I mean, that is who is going to be ---

MS. RICHARDSON: But by the time I get down there they're gone. But you hear it.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): I would just like to thank you all for printing these big ads in the paper. I couldn't find these, and I just wonder if there is --- could you possibly, you have had several of these meetings in the last few months. Give us kind of an overview of what the bigger issues have been. What --- I mean ---

MR. STUART: We touched on ---

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED)D: I couldn't come to all your meetings. I'd love to know, is it all on the website, the issues that have been raised?

MR. STUART: Yes. To date there are --- there is one meeting we had where we listed all the primary, most all of the issues. I can't --- do you remember what meeting it was?

MS. ALISON GUTH: We had one for Lake and Land Management where we listed all the issues. But many of the issues are in the comment section on the website when people submitted their comments to the ICD.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): Are they accessible?

MS. GUTH: Yes.

MR. STUART: Okay. I guess to kind of give you a big picture, Lake Level Fluctuation, Downstream where it releases into the Saluda River, Management of the properties around the Lake, Recreational Access, those I think are the --- Buffer Zone Management, or Lake Land Management. Those are the primary drivers, I would say.

UNIDENTIFIED: Are any concerns raised about septic systems, you know, a non-point source, inputs to the Lake?

MR. STUART: That has been addressed in the Water Quality meeting. A lot of it is concern over agricultural runoff, it is submitted ---

UNIDENTIFIED: Right.

MR. STUART: With respect to this Two Bird Cove, if you go to this --- here is another fancy website you can visit. This is the FERC website. This is where a lot of these Public Notices and postings for the Saluda, it's probably five sixteen, P-516. If you are interested, go up to this link

or --- link right here, it says "E Library". You click on that. You can do a general search. What this does, it gives you a date range, it goes back --- I can't remember, they converted the E Library somewhere around --- it goes back to about 1980--- to the '80s. All submittals by SCE&G, or other Government Agencies, or general public, and all issuances by the Commission, the FERC, are listed on there. Basically, what you do is, you can set your date range to whatever you want it, but be --- I am going ahead and warn you, I would set it in manageable chunks. If you set it for fifteen years, you will sit here for fifteen years. I am just going to go ahead and tell you. Because if one person files a comment, fifty people file a comment on top of that comment. And it's just a --- it's a snow ball effect. So, for your Two Bird Cove, it was I would say somewhere in the 2001 to --- well, unfortunately, before 2006.

But at least it narrows it down to five years, and then you can --- the submittal, like I said, is something that SCE&G or John Q. Public, or an agency submitted; and issuance is what the FERC issued in response to that. To help migrate through this, you click on the hydro link, right here where it says "Docket Number". For this project you type in "P-516", submit. This lists all the activity regarding Saluda Hydro for that date range, or whatever. Here we go, for instance. Here is an Order modifying improving non-project lands. This is an issuance, an Order by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. There is a lot of introduction. This specific issue deals with authorization to issue a permit to Lake Port for the use of project lands to construct three private docks, joint use of waterfront lake. And it goes through and indicates who filed the permit, SCE&G's response if it was directed to them, or usually SCE&G files for the request, and then FERC comes back and issues a notice that this activity is going to take place. And it goes through and lists their understanding of what the issue is, or what the request is for, and their action that they take, whether it be grant or deny the permit to SCE&G. If FERC grants their request, the permit is issued to --- what was it Lake --- Lake Port. If they deny the permit, it would say, "SCE&G, you can't issue that permit." That's unfortunate, but you must move forward. At the very end where it says, "The Direct Orders ---" that's what he orders, and that is what SCE&G must do. There is an appeal process, I think, but --- final action. As you can see, they authorized the permit for construction, and authorized 6,000 cubic yards of material to be ---

MR. BOOZER: It's denied.

MR. STUART: It's denied, I'm sorry. Sorry. And then, again, that last item says unless a request for are-hearing be --- unless they receive a request for a re-hearing within thirty days, it is final action.

MR. HARMON: We have got thirty days for Two Bird Cove?

MR. STUART: No. That thirty days is gone.

MR. BOOZER: That was in June 2004, they issued that Order.

MR. STUART: But this is --- you are asking how is this --- unfortunately this is how they do it a lot of times, pretty much all of the time. There is a lot of things that go on, and like Brian said, if you are not one of those legal hounds that just keep an eye out for stuff like this in the Federal Register and legal notices, you will never catch it.

MR. ANDERSON: If you have e-mail, you can actually sign up to receive notices on this certain project and there will be a --- the FERC notices in their e-mail in box as they are generated.

MR. STUART: Yes, good point. Be careful what you request.

MS. RICHARDSON: I have a question. What is the difference, was talking about fringe lands and a buffer area. What difference is there?

MR. BOOZER: The difference is --- Tommy Boozer with SCE&G. The difference is that is that it starts out as fringe land. And then when the back property owner comes to SCE&G and requests to buy some fringe land, well, we can only sell to the 75 foot setback. So, say if it is 100 foot of fringe land in the area, and that property owner will be eligible to buy that 25 feet in the remaining 75 feet to the water's edge, would then become a buffer zone. Doesn't become a buffer zone until the back property is sold. But it's going to be a lot of --- it's not going to be sold so the buffer zone will be extended back to the PBL.

MR. HARMON: Now, the buffer zone, does it go from 360 inland? It goes outward?

MR. BOOZER: It goes from --- the 75 foot buffer zone starts at the 360 and goes 75 feet inland.

MR. HARMON: In from the Lake?

MR. BOOZER: Right, from the Lake.

MS. HARMON: It comes 75 feet back on to the property.

MR. BOOZER: Right.

MS. RICHARDSON: Is that like the blue lines --- is that just the highway?

MR. BOOZER: The blue line on that particular piece of property is the PBL. Because nothing has been sold in there. So that is the PBL.

MR. MCMANUS: And depending on whether the property was sold to this back property owner, above this fringe land buffer zone area varies because of the conditions changed over a period of time. So, some people will write that up as a 360. No buffer zone, no fringe. As the vintage changes so does the restrictions on the property ---

MR. HARMON: How can you find out what ---

UNIDENTIFIED: That's not a fun time either.

MR. HARMON: How do you find out what the present restrictions are on your property?

MR. BOOZER: Well, we also did your property. You know what PBL is?

MR. HARMON: No.

MR. BOOZER: Well, it's painted, it's on there. The blue line

MR. HARMON: What is PDL? What is that?

MR. BOOZER: That's Project Boundary Line, excuse me.

MR. HARMON: I don't know where the blue line is on his property, that blue line is on my property.

MR. BOOZER: Right. Well, it should be on there so --- this blue mark should be on there so you can --- it should be marked out in blue. Should have concrete markers on it.

MR. HARMON: That's above the 360, right?

MR. BOOZER: Beg your pardon.

MR. HARMON: That's above the 360?

MR. BOOZER: That's above the 360, that's right.

MR. HARMON: And that says I can't do anything in that blue mark down ---

MR. BOOZER: From the blue mark down, that's fair.

MR. HARMON: What set that up? Is that something you are talking about --- anybody that doesn't have the link doesn't have that, right? What you said.

MR. BOOZER: At one time everybody had it. And that gets back to what Brian said, you know, until --- we stop talking about land sales. The Company started selling land sales in mid--- the late '50s. And the license allowed us to sell project property --- at that time we were able to sell from the PBL, Project Boundary Line, all the way down to the 360. And that's why if you ride around the Lake to see where people, if they are only down to the 360, their property goes to the 360. Then we were issued a new license in 1984. And the new license required us to have --- part of the condition of us continuing to sell fringe land was that we have a 75 foot buffer zone. So, in 1984 we could no longer sell down to the 360, and that's when the 75 foot buffer zone was implemented.

MR. STUART: If I could get everybody to pause for just one minute, George needs to replace his tape. We have only got about five minutes left, and I know we have got a couple of other questions, and I don't want to let him miss any questions. So, I hate to interrupt, but otherwise we need to move on.

MR. BOOZER: And if you have really got some questions, if the whole community is interested, I will be glad to stay and answer any questions anybody has got.

(Off the record - break)

MR. STUART: Okay, I think George has got his tape all set. Did you have another question, comment?

MR. PHIL HAMBY: My name is Phil Hamby, and I am a resident at Lake Murray, close to the Two Bird Cove designation. And just based on a few comments that I have heard tonight, one of the things I wanted to quickly mention before I went into some of the comments that I actually have prepared. You know, we talk about all this information being available, and you almost get the impression that you are kind of ignorant if you haven't accessed all this information. But, I hope we all do understand that this is a mammoth amount of information on this relicensing; it's not like we can say, "There is a public notice on just Two Bird Cove," but that is just not happening. It's all part of this massive document. It's hard to find, in my personal opinion. And that makes it difficult for different landowners who actually live close to the area because we don't know what to look for. Secondly, as far as the Two Bird Cove designation, or the Two Bird Cove name, I mean, and I am sorry, this may sound ignorant to some other folks as well, but I don't own a sail boat, I don't travel the waters, and I have never heard of our Cove ever being referred to as Two Bird Cove in my life until about a week and a half ago. So, even if I knew what to look for, I would never have known to look for --- or, I would not have known what Two Bird Cove meant. So that's just one comment just to consider.

As far as the actual designation, one of the biggest concerns that I have had, members of my family have had, is that we just feel like we honestly have not been kept in the loop, I mean, as far as this particular designation. The only way we found out about it was through the media contacting us and contacting our family and saying, "By the way, here is this designation." And again, I know y'all can point back to it's been in documents buried down in some huge Federal legal-ese. But we just haven't seen it, we haven't been notified. Now, SCE&G easily can notify us and get access to us whenever they need us when it comes to, you know, the architectural study, or the archeological dig study, and that sort of thing; but when it comes to a smaller cove that only affects a certain number of people, you know, apparently they can't notify us in that situation. So, that's just one comment there. That's a really big concern that I have is that we would have loved to have the opportunity to express some of the concerns and questions that we have. So, that's that comment. Going into the designation, if this designation stands, which at this meeting it sounds like it is just a done deal. I would hope that there is still definitely room for re-consideration of this designation, because the concerns that come to mind for me directly and for my family, and for folks that potentially will eventually build in this area, number one, it's the obvious thing we have already talked about, the noise and the overcrowding. There is no stipulations that we are aware of if any kind of designation of how many boats is a maximum limit on the boats. We don't know that. And just common sense, I think, tells you that one boat, maybe that's different, but you have ten, fifteen boats, twenty boats, that's going to make noise like the article refers to as "Hurricane Hole". Now, I know we still keep on being told, "Well, Two Bird Cove, that's a smaller, shallower cove, so you are the peaceful quiet cove, and Hurricane Hole is this massive, you know, tailgating party," or whatever the comment was. You know, maybe it's quiet and peaceful today, but once we designate it we are encouraging folks to come visit, come stay at this place. And what is not to say that we have --- there is no ability for us to restrict, it becoming a miniature Hurricane Hole? And that's a huge concern, because I don't personally like the idea of having parties going on till two or three o'clock in the morning. That may be fine for the sailors, they may enjoy it, you know. I just feel like there may be appropriate places that still could be available but not in a residential cove. And I apologize --- or, I don't really want to apologize for not already building more homes, and my family, to show you for

sure this is a residential cove. But in fifteen to twenty years from now, I can tell you we have got family members who will build. You might now be able to easily see them because we do have fringe land, we have a beautiful buffer of trees that give us a natural surrounding from the water; but we can definitely hear these folks. I mean, we all know in this room, water --- noise carries differently over water than it carries through land. So, we can hear every word, every comment; and although I want you to definitely still understand, I understand reasonable noise. You know, we have boaters, we have jet skis, and that sort of thing, that's fine. But, there does come a point where I think everyone could agree, there are reasonable limits where it does get noisy, it gets obnoxious, especially when you are talking late hours at night. So, that is a huge concern I have with that.

The safety and the privacy; I mean, our home we have built this home, this is family property, this is where we tend to live till the day we die. And this is important for me to know what can I expect for the next ten, fifteen, twenty years, whatever God gives me to live left on this earth? And if I have people that might see this as a quiet cove, and the more people come in there, I think it would be naive for me to consider that my safety will always remain the same, my wife's safety will remain the same, with an increase of traffic. And I know Tommy has mentioned that SCE&G doesn't have any current plans to do any additional things with, you know, public facilities on the fringe land; but, you know, what we say what we don't have planned today surely doesn't mean what won't happen. And we have no assurances that that will not happen. And, the more we encourage traffic on this fringe land, which we definitely understand, please do not misunderstand that we --- we do understand that the Lake is not ours. We understand the fringe land is what SCE&G owns. We understand that very clearly. But, we also know that proximity to our land, we have people who will wander up. We have had trouble already with trespassing on our property, not just the fringe land; we have had trouble with littering, obviously; we have trouble with vandalism, with theft. We have had many troubles. So, all of a sudden you invite this new massive number of folks to come in, you have really increased the potential for more of these traffic problems to have and more of these safety concerns. Thirdly, the effluent from the boats. I mean, I look at boats like --- you know, they are like motor homes, they are just motor homes on water. They have sewer systems internally in the boats, and I know by law they are not supposed to dump that refuse in the water; but again, I have no assurances, I have no way of knowing for sure when that happens. But, I would assume, human nature would tell me, if I owned a big sail boat and I had it anchored at my house but I have the opportunity to go off to a public access place, basically what I have seen with how people treat public access places, whether it is at the beach or the Lake, or wherever, people don't exactly treat public places like they treat their home places. So, I have a fear of fifteen, twenty boats being in a cove, and maybe they decide, "Well, shoot, I am going to go ahead and dump my sewer." I might have a leaky gasoline tank, I might have leaky oil. And all that extra volume in that cove invites trouble, again, for a residential cove. It may not appear residential as much as some of the other coves do currently, but I can tell you it will in the future.

The protection of the peace, I have already kind of mentioned that, any increase in just the traffic, again, increasing the volume of people potentially coming up on the property, doing more trespassing, doing more theft, vandalism, and that sort of thing, and you know, I have a small house but I have a lot of windows. And at night time when it is dark outside but your lights are turned on inside, you can see through there like it's a crystal ball. And I don't like the idea of maybe my wife deciding to be very comfortable, watching the TV, and then we have people that

can easily see inside the house because they are allowed to get right up to our fringe land and our lawn area. So that's a concern.

And then finally, I would say as far as the concerns, once we set up this designation it again invites the possibility for what's going to be the next step? You know, we are talking about the potential --- or, the boaters are saying --- apparently for years have said, "We really would love this cove. It's natural, it's beautiful, it's quiet, peaceful, let's get this cove." Well, it has taken a number of years, but finally apparently they have done what it takes to get this designation to occur. So, how do I know in two more years they are not going to say, "Well, shoot, we have now been frequenting this cove because it is protected, let's go ahead and get these public facilities on the shoreline. Let's get these moorings. And, let's get these other restrictions." And I also understand, apparently, we do have adverse affection already, because even if we did buy the fringe land, if we were allowed to do so, apparently now our dock length will be restricted now. Because now it would interfere with potential sailors and boaters, and that sort of thing. So, we already are taking a hit at the rights that we already have available to us. And so there is another concern. And I apologize for being long winded, but I feel like it's important for you to understand that I am speaking for myself, I am speaking for my family, and other members, that we have talked about in a very quick, short period of time because we have learned about this in a very short period of time, you know, how this might be an impact for us. Because, we don't look at just how it affects us today, but how it will affect us fifteen, twenty, thirty years from now.

And that brings me to the next point of as far as the public resources. Again, I don't want to have anybody misunderstand that I am very much for public access, I want people to have the boating access, I want people to have park access. I would just try to offer what I think is a reasonable question of, when is enough enough for public access on the Lake? And the quick background check that I did on here's the summary of what it seems like our current SCE&G assets for public --- or, basically just public access. 64 islands, easily. Apparently denying the presentation I saw a number of like 149 that are even out there. But apparently, 64 are available for public access. To me that is a huge number of public access already available on the Lake. We have got 18 ramping areas, probably more because, again, my numbers seem to be maybe a little small. SCE&G has the large public park on the West side of the Dam. It offers swimming, it offers the large and small shelters for picnicking. The boats can come, lay anchor close to shoreline. They already have an area there.

SCE&G has the other public park on the East side of the Dam. It has three boat ramp accesses. It offers fishermen a place to fish. They even have a handicap fishing pier. Picnic areas, as well. They have got lots of resources. And if that is not enough, PRT has a huge mammoth park at Dreher Island State Recreation area. 348 acres are on that park, you know, and I understand, I am from a country background, and I have country folks that I have grown up from. But 348 acres, that's a lot of land to have for public access. 12 miles of shoreline at that park, 3 islands, 3 boat ramps, 112 camp sites, lake side camping, primitive camping, RV camping, lake side villas, fishing, nature trails. We have access for pets, playground equipment, picnic areas. I mean, you are not just catering to one niche, you are catering to many, many different types of socio-economical places. And then, it doesn't stop there. I mean, if that is not enough currently, then there is more parks on the way through the public arena. SCE&G, from my understanding, and I don't want to put words into Tommy's mouth or anybody else's mouth, but from what I have read and studied it sounds like SCE&G has pledged two tracts for public use on the Southside park, in

addition to the Northside that is already there for Dreher Island State recreation area. And that being the 89 acres of Bundrick Island Peninsula, and 518 acres on the Rocky Creek Cove. And again, note this size is even much larger than the Dreher Island State recreation area. So, if you have all that mammoth amount of public recreation areas in Dreher Island State park, what in the world can you fit on 518 acres, which is even more? So, I think we are doing pretty darn good of allowing many modes of public access currently, and definitely in the hopper for ten to fifteen years down the road. So, when it comes back full circle to what we are talking about tonight with the Two Bird Cove, what I would think would be a reasonable suggestion would be for a cove that you are hearing from families that almost every family is represented that is affected by this Two Bird Cove, is either here or you have spoken to them, or you will hear from them soon, we have done about all that we can do to say how we feel about how it affects our cove and our concerns. And that's about all we can do. It's hard for us as the David going up against the Goliath of all these big, you know, agencies, special interest groups, the lobbying people who have the time to study through all these documents, who have all the resources to spend daytime hours to attend these meetings that we don't as homeowners. And it's really tough for us to just accept people saying, "Well, you weren't there first, you didn't build a house, so we like your little peaceful cove, so it's too bad you just didn't move quick enough." We just haven't done it yet.

And that's where I would just hope that there will be some consideration from SCE&G, from FERC, to reconsider the designation because there are just so many impacts I think we are addressing tonight that we haven't had any major answers for, and surely we haven't had any kind of direct comments --- or, any kind of direct communications, say, "By the way, this is going to affect all of your families out here in this cove. What are your comments?" None of that. Nothing. I mean, sure there is a website floating off in internet lands somewhere, and it's huge once you find it. It's got lots of legalese, all these different things are represented, all these agencies represented, but I am not seeing anything for the small homeowners that might not be a part of this Homeowner's Association that represents 23 homeowner's associations, 4,500 people or so. You know, if they are so for the Two Bird Cove, out of those 23 communities maybe they can find a place that they feel comfortable with it; but we just don't feel as comfortable with it. That's it. And I apologize for being long winded, but I appreciate y'all taking the time just to listen to that. And it's just a very valid concern and I hope there is some type of communication we can get back as to how can we more directly become involved? I know we can kind of view what is happening and what is being done; but we would like to definitely have input as a two way communication, just to have that opportunity. I appreciate it, thank you.

MR. STUART: To follow up on that, you know, I sympathize with you. You know, I don't live on the Lake so I am not as close to it as you are. It's probably no consolation, but we have been advertising the meetings, this process has been going on for almost two years. And we have advertised fisheries workshops, we have these quarterly public meetings just to try to get it to the people who can't be there during the day to get you guys to come out. And if there are concerns or issues you have, SCE&G wants to know about them. The Two Bird Cove thing, again, that was --- it's a FERC process, and it's like any Government process, they're flawed. I mean, there is no perfect answer. I think SCE&G understands, gets the message that you are trying to send. You know, I know it could be potentially discussed and see --- you know, I can't speak for the FERC, I don't work for them. But it is certainly something that can be addressed as part of the relicensing. You know, I don't know if we --- if there was enough interest, you know, one person --- to my knowledge, one person got this thing designated. I would imagine if a handful came out

there might be a way to do it. I can't provide you that information, but it is certainly something that --- you know, SCE&G I don't think has a position on it either way. I think initially they were against it, now, to be perfectly honest; but they, again, were ordered to, so ---

MR. HAMBY: We had no way to know --- come for a meeting. And, see, that's what scared me. --- sources that, nobody knows exactly where it is. So, how in the world, am I supposed to know? How are my family members supposed to know?

UNIDENTIFIED: I think that was mainly what the sailors came up with.

MR. TOMMY BOOZER: But one thing I do want to address, your comments about the recreation. Tommy Boozer. Your comments about the recreation. We feel like we have got pretty accurate recreation around the Lake, also. But, PRT thinks differently. And so, PRT is the Agency driving the train here on requiring us to put in additional recreation facilities both existing and also enough recreation that could sustain this project all the way for the next fifty years. Hopefully, we are going to get a fifty year license. And so, that's the big interest right there, making sure there is enough land set aside for this project for fifty years.

MR. STUART: One thing just to follow up, just because SCE&G is requesting a fifty year license, they have to every seven years do the FERC Form 80, which addresses recreational needs. So, if they get a fifty year license, it is not going to be fifty years/no recreation. I mean, it goes through a process every seven years where they review it to determine the need and adequacy at that point. So, just so you know, it's not a fifty year and that's the end of the story for fifty years.

MS. RICHARDSON: What about if (inaudible) the fringe land, you were talking about for about for that seven years, in seven years you're going to re-address and issue if the recreation part goes through?

MR. BOOZER: Hopefully, doing this relicensing process we will reclassify the land, that's where we balance and reclassify the land. And that should take care of a lot of the --- when I say reclassify, we'll look at land, what land we are going to put in recreation, what land will stay in the forest and game management, what land will stay in the future development, those type of issues. That should be resolved. And once it's classified, it's kind of hard to change that classification. Hopefully, we will get that halfway established during this relicensing process. That's not to say that every --- right now, we have a five year review on our SMP, our Shoreline Management Plan. We are proposing a ten year review on it. For every ten years we get a fifty year license, and every ten years the whole SMP and the Land Management issues will be reviewed. It will be a living document; it will have opportunity to be reviewed.

MR. STUART: I am going to offer this suggestion to you. If you have specific recommendations for managing the fringe land, or sale of fringe land, provide those to us in the comments, and ask that we address, or consider those, or take a look at those when we address that issue. And again, you are free to come to the meeting when we have that; but that way we at least have it in writing and we can take it to the RCG Group members and say, "Okay, here is what some of the concerned citizens who aren't being represented --- or, adequately represented on this RCG."

MR. BOOZER: The sudden concern y'all are addressing tonight, other people who have property behind the set back, have expressed that to us too. They are concerned about what type of activity will be allowed to take place in that buffer zone. These are folks who have homes, and they bought the fringe land, and they have got the buffer zone in front of their property. So, y'all are not the only ones who have concerns about it, and that's why it is going to be addressed during this Committee and during this process.

MR. HAMBY: And just to clarify all of this, what is exactly the name of this particular Committee that might have the designation of Two Bird Cove, and the fringe land? What is the name ---

MR. STUART: It is going to be the Land and Lake Management Technical Working Committee. If you go to that resource groups, Lake, just click on Lake and Land Management, and that will - --

MR. HAMBY: Is the membership open, or is it closed at this point?

MR. BOOZER: Well, the membership on the Technical Working Committee is closed, but you can just come as an observer; and like Alan said, at the end of the --- or, somewhere during the process, these things start to go all day, and so there will be an opportunity to voice your interest and other things

MR. STUART: But again, if you do have, you know, your specific comments, please get them to us sooner than later so we don't miss anything. Or, you can make them right here so that we know.

MR. HAMBY: I pretty said what I have to say.

MR. BOOZER: Or, they can provide us comments through an e-mail, or ---

MR. STUART: Yeah, that's what I meant through the comments thing on --- whatever avenue is easiest. But, we just --- like I said, we have done this as an open process, and we want to get your comments. For everyone of you that is sitting there, there is other people that say that the fringe land should be open for all kinds of public activities. So, bear in mind ---

MR. HAMBY: I thought I said it before. But again, I am not trying to debate the fact there should be public access in a number of areas. But I do think there is a logical reasonable limit of what is enough. I mean, what is the cut off of saying, "We have plenty of recreation, not just currently but what's down the road on not just the North, not just the South, but on the East?" I mean, every place you turn around. And obviously, I think the experience of showing us that you give an inch, people expect more and more and more. And I think there has got to be a reasonable compromise of --- I mean, I think SCE&G has done a pretty darn good job of providing lots of public access already. And then working on the larger one on the South side, I mean that just opens it up to just --- I don't know how many lakes would have that type of public access. It's just amazing to me.

MR. STUART: Well, one of the things that Dave talked about was the recreational study that is going on, is actually designed to evaluate that in a scientific manner. So, that information will be available, the report when it is finalized. So, it should provide a lot of valuable information.

UNIDENTIFIED: At your next meeting, when you have a meeting, if you take into consideration of things that was brought up tonight?

MR. STUART: Not at the next meeting, no, because we have already set the Agenda. However, we can put it in what we call a "parking lot item", that will be addressed ---

UNIDENTIFIED: In other words, if not everyone can come to your meeting, but would somebody in your ---

MR. BOOZER: We will address that.

MR. STUART: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: Will address what our concerns are, so everybody, whoever is a member and voting in every way you do, would know our concerns. That's just the case, we couldn't get there, and no, we didn't get the message, and like I am, I don't have a computer, so I can't --- I don't know another way to get to you, see.

MR. STUART: Yes. And that's why we post the Minutes, it gives --- I understand your limitations without a computer. But that is why we post them, we want people to read them; if there is something you feel that is a direct conflict, or a potential issue, that's why that "Comment" section is on that website. Shoot us an e-mail saying, "I think we need --- this needs to be addressed." Something like that. Now, issues that we have already covered, you are going to have a real hard time because -- you can provide comment, I don't know how much it would change. I am not referring specifically to Two Bird Cove. But, management of buffer zones, for instance. If it's some minor change, you know, it may be do-able; but as to go back and recreate the will, I don't think you are going to meet a whole lot of support with that. It's the best way I can say it, I don't know what other way.

MS. VICKI HAMBY: I am Vicky Hamby, I also live on property adjacent to Two Bird Cove. And I know I am not going to say anything that you probably haven't already heard. But, because I am a citizen in my own right, I mean I want to have my thoughts heard. I think my husband and several other people in the room have made a really valid point that we are not saying that you haven't tried to get the information out there in some capacity; but again, we didn't know it was called Two Bird Cove. I could reach your site every day for a million years, and I would not know that that was the Cove that you were talking about. The web is great, I am incredibly web savvy; but I recognize that there are a lot of people in this room who are not. We work full time jobs, we have families, we have things that we are involved in our communities because we try to make a difference in our communities, and it is very difficult to find time to read through the kind --- and, I understand it. But I feel like when SCE&G is aware that decisions may be made that affect property owners adjacent to their fringe land, they need to go the extra mile to notify those families. It's incredibly unrealistic to expect that we are reading all this stuff. If I were in a position to make a decision about a piece of property adjacent to your home, and I said, "Well, I put a public notice in the paper," I can imagine how you would feel. Because, I am guessing that

you are not reading those public notices, just like the average American is not taking the time to read those public notices. I work with a colleague, she walked up to me last week and she said, "I read the article in the paper about Two Bird Cove. I am so sorry." And I said, "What do you mean?" She said, "Well, I used to live in Hurricane Cover, it's awful. It is so bad and there is nothing that you can do about it." And that's my frustration.

I understand fringe land is public property, I am concerned about the noise on the water. What do I do at 2:00 A.M. in the morning when my husband is out of town, and people are partying in the Cove? Answer this question for me: Who do I call?

MR. STUART: Lexington County Sheriff's Department.

MS. HAMBY: And they have jurisdiction over the waters?

MR. STUART: Yes. SCE&G has no jurisdiction over the water. The Department of Natural Resources and each County Sheriff's Department has that authority.

MS. HAMBY: Okay. And I am going to hope that they can get out there in a reasonable amount of time and that they can get up ---

MR. BOOZER: They are on the Lake, they have total authority.

MS. HAMBY: --- that they can sneak up on these people in a way that the people aren't going to say, "Oh, here come the cops," and then suddenly everything is fine. And I am going to hope that that works that way. You know, noise carries very differently on the water than it does on the land. It just does. And I hear things I don't need to hear all day long. I'm OK with people being out on the Lake during daytime hours, that's expected. But to designate an area for night time recreation, if somebody designated an area for night time recreation, a ball park, a tail gating party, whatever, on property across the street from your home, it would be just, you know, public disturbance of the peace. You don't have night time activities, and we can say, "Oh, these people just want to dock their boats and sleep, they just want to fish." No, they don't. They are going to drink, they are going to cuss, they are going to party, they are going to be loud, they are going to swim over, they are going to come up on the property, they are going to walk around, they are going to get in our yard. I am going to hope that they don't, but my best prediction is that that is how that is going to go. And I am frustrated that I know I can call the police, but I also know the reality of the situation. And, you know, we will hope for the best.

My other fear with the fringe property is when I hear statements like, "Well, there are no plans to do anything on that land. There is nothing in the works right now to do anything with that fringe land." Maybe not right now. But, again, you take --- you know, you give an inch, people take a mile. You give them an inch, "Oh, well, that's died down now, what can we push next? Now that's died down, you know, what are going to ask for next?" Once people have this Cove designated as a public recreation area, that is going to be the next thing they ask for. "Well, we are not supposed to dump our waste in the wake, what have we got to do? We have got to go to the bathroom, we need facilities." And that's going to be the next thing that comes. So, you know, I know I am not saying anything that hasn't been said already, but again, as another individual citizen, it is a concern.

One of the things that was mentioned when you said, "Why was Two Bird Cove selected?" Well, it was selected because it is not really a developed cove right now. Which just goes to show, "Well, you obviously recognize that there is an impact on residents or you would put it in some other cove that's fully developed." I feel like you're penalizing a particular group of people who own property because they haven't chosen to build their homes yet. These are private property owners, and it will become a residential area. And when you say that, "Well, there is a lot of historic reasons for why this cove was chosen," let's look at history. The people who own this land owned it before the Lake. So, if you really want to look at the historical reach of the situation, you know, I think you need to take that into consideration. My bottom line is, when you are making --- what I would ask, and I will put this in writing, and I will send it to the "Comments". My request would be that when you consider where you are going to put recreational areas on the Lake, you need to look at not just whether it's currently developed or not, but who owns it. And is that intended to be eventually a residential area? And I was thinking about this when this first came about, and the first thing that came to my mind was, "You know, this would be kind of like ---" and I understand the public is --- the Lake is public, it's public. But what if you lived in a neighborhood and you happen to be a house that opened into a cul-de-sac that, for whatever reason, that cul-de-sac just never developed, nobody built houses all around that cul-de-sac. And a group of citizens got together and said, "Well, you know, there's just not any convenient camp ground close by, and we just want to park our trucks and tail gate. We just want to throw our blow up mattress in the back of the pickup truck and hang out all night. You know, we need a place to do that. There is not a convenient place. And, you know, the road is public. So, designate that cove ---" You know, you guys get my point. I really do hope that you will take the comments into consideration.

MR. ALEX HARMON: I know you said public notice had been made. Alex Harmon, I am a resident at the Lake on the property that is in question. I still don't see why SCE&G couldn't send a notification to --- especially as small a cove as this is with a limited number of residents as is involved in this cove, a notification through the mail and say, "Hey, this is what's going on, this is being considered, would you like some input?"

They got everybody's address, you have got power from them, they got your address, they know where you live. They know who lives where in the vicinity of the Cove. I mean, what's it, you know, 27 or 30 cents now, drop a letter in the mail? They send you your power bill. That's it.

MS. DONNA RICHARDSON: The way I learned about it was in the newspaper, someone called my house is how I found out about anything even going on. And they were able to track me, and I am not even the landowner, I live there. Donna Richardson.

MR. STUART: Well, I think this Two Bird Cove thing has been very well recognized. And again, get your comments to us. If there's things that can be done, it will certainly be considered. That's all I can tell you.

MR. HAMBY: We do not --- do we need to actually do it by e-mailing, or since this is on the record, supposedly this is official in record as much as we need, are you saying we actually need to double it with the e-mail, is that ---

MR. STUART: No, I am not saying that at all. What I am saying is, if you want to elaborate, or you know, do something, this is fine. It's easier if you do it with e-mail, but this will be sufficient.

MR. HAMBY: Then in that case you would not ---

MR. STUART: If you have specific recommendations.

MR. BOOZER: It will be published.

MR. STUART: These Minutes will be posted on the website, and it will be included as part of the official record. Yes, ma'am?

MS. BARBARA LEDBETTER: My name is Barbara Ledbetter, and I own property right at Two Bird Cove. My Dad owned the property before me, and when he died it was left to me. This property is undeveloped, it's beautiful property; and if you have been there, if you know where it is, it's beautiful. My Dad had an idea that this property would remain that way. One day is --- I would like to build there, my children would like to be there, it's a beautiful piece of property to have a home. My Dad's Dad did farm under the Lake where Two Bird Cove is. It's not like this is just property that we moved from somewhere out of state and bought it, it's a very valuable property to us. And we have heard it before, but please take this to your next meeting. Please reiterate the fact, when I heard about this coming to Two Bird Cove, I had no idea where this was. And to think this is where I spent my 4th of July in this quiet, quiet cove. And this is one of two places on the entire Lake that has been chosen for something like this. One comment that was made by Mr. Anderson from Recreation RCG update, and I appreciated this so much: one of the things that they look at is they don't want to put someone else out of business. And, you know, when I think of homes and people living there, and this is their home, that's putting someone out of business when this land is developed like it could very, very possibly be in the not so distant future; and I would ask you to please don't put us out of business there and our property. Another thing, I want to thank Mr. Tommy Boozer. When he made the comment, and I quote, "We will address your concerns." Please address these. I really do appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): This Public Meeting you have, will this come back up at that time again?

UNIDENTIFIED: Only if you bring it up.

MR. ARGENTIERI: Bill Argentieri, SCE&G. The issue was submitted to FERC because we had an Order. And we can talk about it in the relicensing, but it's not going to change that Order; it's not going to change what we submitted until the new license comes out. So, you are talking years down the road. If you are really serious about trying to get this change now, my suggestion is to write a letter to the FERC and question their reason for having that designation. They ordered us to designate it; the designation doesn't change the fact that whether the designation is there or not, those people would still be out on the water. The designation does not give the --- am I saying something wrong? That designation is something that the FERC wanted --- ordered us to do. Whether that designation is there or not, the water on the Lake is public property, and they could be out there whether we designated it or not. My suggestion, take it if you want --- I

mean, you can write us, e-mails that's fine, send a letter to the FERC questioning why that they ordered us to do that. And that might get some action now. We will look at it during the relicensing, but anything that comes out of relicensing isn't going to take effect until after we get our new license, which the earliest that would be would be 2010. Keep that in mind. You can bring it up next Public Meeting, and the next one, and it's not going to change because we were ordered to do it, and it's not going to change until --- if it is even going to change, it would not change until after 2010. Does that make sense?

UNIDENTIFIED: The FERC Order specifically designated that Cove?

MR. ARGENTIERI: Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED: It didn't say -----, it said that particular cove ---

MR. ARGENTIERI: No. It's specific --- that one and Hurricane Cove.

MR. BOOZER: Bill, what you need to mention, too, is that decision was based on consultation with the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife. They also commented on the designation of that location. So that would be another --- that would be two other Agencies that would have to be contacted.

UNIDENTIFIED: Who was that, again?

MR. BOOZER: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ---

UNIDENTIFIED: Fish and Wildlife, and --

MR. BOOZER: --- and South Carolina Department of Natural Resources.

UNIDENTIFIED: Natural Resources, okay.

MR. HAMBY: And see, that is the outlying thing that we have, it's nothing against you, or these folks. I mean, it's just --- the ironic thing is that all the Agencies and all the big boys got at the table and they had a seat at the table to say, "This what we want." But then the people who physically live at the property, who again --- we understand, we don't own it, blah, blah, we understand that, but we are definitely affected because of the proximity. But they surely didn't contact us to be at that same table. And that is what we are talking about we're so frustrated about is that the big people who have daytime hours to do all this kind of stuff, and read through all those attorney documents and everything, they've got all the time in the world to do it. But we are the people who are directly affected, and we are not the ones at the table, as well.

MS. HAMBY: I just wanted to respond to a comment about whether the designation is there or not. You are absolutely right, people very well may come to that cove anyway. But when there is discussions in the newspaper about moorings being put in that Cove, then you know --- there's some of the discussion about some things that are going to invite people to that Cove. I recognize that this is a FERC decision; I guess what I would say is that you all are an Agency that has influence with FERC; you talk with these people all the time, let's hope that you do. But, so here is my question: Who do I call at FERC and what is their phone number? If you can get me that,

I'll be happy. Get me a contact; don't tell me to contact FERC because I can go to FERC's website and, you know, twenty days trying to find it. But if you will help me figure who I need to get in touch with, that would be greatly appreciated.

(Off the record - inaudible discussions)

MR. STUART: You will need to contact the Compliance Division, to begin with, at the risk of losing (inaudible). You can address the secretary, secretary Salas is her name. And she will certainly pass it down the line to the appropriate individual.

UNIDENTIFIED: Now with the mike is not working. Who was the individual that contacted FERC? Oh, wait a minute.

MR. STUART: I wasn't in that ---

UNIDENTIFIED: It was one person?

MR. STUART: As far as I know it was one comment that was received.

MR. ANDERSON: If you go to FERC's website you could get that.

MR. STUART: It should be on there.

MR. ANDERSON: If you put in P-516, there is also a text search at the bottom, so I am sure if you go in and put it in Two Bird Cove, it will search every single document in their library for the phrase, Two Bird Cove.

UNIDENTIFIED: It seems to me it's in the frame work, that ---

MR. STUART: Make sure you put the P-516 on it, or it will search every hydro power project in the country.

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible), Windward Yacht Club --- next?

MR. STUART: Honestly, Bill --- I know we are trying to wrap up here. Honestly, Bill is correct. If it is something that is not going on per se in this relicensing, your quickest and best avenue is to contact them directly. Remember, this relicensing --- this Two Bird Cove thing happened outside of when we started this relicensing, so just bear that in mind. The sooner you do it, the better off you will be.

MR. BOOZER: You are right, because this right here, the Two Bird Cove, that's in the existing license. And what we are talking about is the new license process.

MR. STUART: And, like I said, I am not advocating either way, I am supposed to be neutral, but ---

MS. RICHARDSON: The land that we were talking about like the fringe land, if that is something y'all would address in the meeting?

MR. BOOZER: That is correct.

MS. RICHARDSON: So, with all these issues that's been brought up tonight, you would take a look at all of that when you are looking at the Two Bird Cove?

MR. STUART: Yes, ma'am. And we are also revising the Shoreline Management Plan, which is originally how this whole Two Bird Cove thing originated in the previous revision. So, there may be an avenue to go back; if you meet the resistance that way you may be able to voice your opinion here and get that designation revoked, or --- whatever the proper phrase.

MR. MAHAN: Reconsidered.

MR. STUART: Reconsidered. Thank you, Randy.

MR. HARMON: Did you say you had a phone number that you could call? Do you know the number to call?

MR. STUART: The FERC number?

MR. ARGENTIERI: I would write a letter.

MR. STUART: Yeah, I would write a letter.

(Everyone speaking simultaneously and laughing - not transcribeable)

MR. STUART: There is a general FERC number ---

MR. BOOZER: That's not helpful. Give them the address, is more important.

(Inaudible - everyone talking and laughing simultaneously)

MR. BOOZER: A letter puts it on record.

MR. ARGENTIERI: There it is. There's the address you want. Ma'am, there's the address you want.

MR. STUART: FERC. Make sure you put "Saluda Project P-516", that will get it there faster. If you don't put it on there they will have to research. Once you are actually talking to them, they know where it is.

MS. HAMBY: Would you say that again? Saluda Project ---

MR. STUART: P-516, that's the FERC Project Number we are talking about. It's 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

MR. ARGENTIERI: And I would address it to "Secretary" ---

MR. STUART: Secretary Magalie Salas.

MR. ARGENTIERI: M-a-g-a-l-i-e, S-a-l-a-s, Secretary. She's the Secretary of that, did you get that? Magalie Salas.

MR. STUART: The other thing, you may want to reference, you will have to do a little research because I don't know the actual Order Number; but I would reference the Order Number where they require SCE&G to designate that as Two Bird Cove. That will help expedite your ---

MS. JENNIFER RICHARDSON: Jennifer Richardson, homeowner. My comment is if anything comes up dealing with this fringe land, will you please let the homeowners know? Send a notice so we don't have to find it out in the state paper with the rest of the public?

(Off the record - changed tapes)

MR. MCMANUS: Dated an Order of June 23, 2004.

MR. STUART: Are there any other questions or comments that don't pertain to Two Bird Cove? We will be dismissed. I've got another meeting at 9:00 o'clock in the morning. I am not going to make light of it, but your information will be taken back to those, and thank you. If there is nothing more, the next Public Meeting I think have tentatively scheduled for October 26th. Please come out and we will see you in person at that time, that's everyone from Two Bird Cove.

MEETING ADJOURNED