

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP**

**LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER
July 20, 2006**

final dka 08-08-06

ATTENDEES:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Alan Stuart	Kleinschmidt Associates	Don Eng	TU
Kelly Miller	Kleinschmidt Associates	Dave Anderson	Kleinschmidt Associates
Bill Argentieri	SCE&G	Steve Bell	Lake Watch
Bret Hoffman	Kleinschmidt Associates	Charlene Coleman	American Whitewater
Karen Kustafik	Columbia Parks & Recreation	Kenneth Fox	LMA
Malcolm Leaphart	Trout Unlimited	Bill Mathias	LMA, LMPS
Gerrit Jobsis	American Rivers	Tom Eppink	SCANA Services
George Duke	LMHC	Norm Nicholson	Lex. Co. Sherrif's Dept.
Mike Waddell	TU	Joy Downs	LMA
Patrick Moore	SCCCL	David Price	LMPS
Am. Rivers		Alice Ammons	Palmetto Richland Hospital
Randy Mahan	SCANA Services	Tommy Boozer	SCE&G
Regis Parsons	Homeowner	Richard Mikel	Adventure Carolina
Mike Dawson	River Alliance	Randy Mahan	SCANA Services

HOMEWORK ITEMS:

- Dave Anderson – modify Safety RCG Work Plan and send to group for final approval

PARKING LOT ITEMS:

- None

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

**October 24, 2006 at 9:30 a.m.
Located at the Lake Murray Training Center**

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP**

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER

July 20, 2006

final dka 08-08-06

MEETING NOTES:

These notes serve to be a summary of the major points presented during the meeting and are not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting.

Dave Anderson opened the meeting and distributed meeting agendas to the group. He briefly went over the agenda and then turned the meeting over to Mike Dawson to give a presentation on the Three Rivers Greenway.

Mike began his presentation by detailing the construction of the riverwalk system. He showed a map that displayed the exact layout of the riverwalk, including the location of restrooms, parking lots, and boat access. Mike also explained how potential problems such as flooding and maximum flows were being considered. He showed a detailed drawing of the composting toilets that are being installed and explained they are designed to limit potential damage from flooding of the restrooms. He also addressed the issue of wetlands, mentioning that the pathway will circle the wetland areas in order to preserve them. Mike also specified the various smaller pathways that will lead to and from the riverwalk to allow for easy access. After Mike finished detailing the length of the riverwalk, he addressed the installation of emergency call boxes. He said these boxes would be installed along the riverwalk, providing immediate access to a 911 operator. Mike added that a light would turn on near the call box when activated. He also said that there would be a gate for firemen and other rescue workers to easily access the riverwalk. Mike concluded his presentation stating that the new portion of the Three Rivers Greenway was scheduled to be operational by early summer in 2007. Mike then added that the International Canoe Federation was considering the Saluda River as the site for its annual canoe race and that he would like to have the riverwalk functional for that event. Mike then opened the meeting for questions.

Malcolm Leaphart asked who had police jurisdiction in regards to the call boxes. Mike answered that police from the University of South Carolina and other city police have an agreement on who will take jurisdiction in the various areas. He said that the law enforcement wants to be proactive. Mike also added that there will be active patrolling around the river including security guards on golf carts.

Bret Hoffman asked if the walkway would be located above the high water mark during periods of high flows; Mike replied that they are not, but it should not matter as any flooding will not affect the walkway.

Steve Bell then asked if there was any idea of what to expect in the next thirty years in terms of recreational activity on the river. Mike answered that there was no accurate prediction of the amount of recreational activity that the Saluda River will see in thirty years. He said that a

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP**

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER

July 20, 2006

final dka 08-08-06

probability analysis could be done based on population, but the accuracy would not be very reliable. Mike predicted that as many as 450 people per hour would use the greenway after completion.

Charlene Coleman brought up the issue of an increased budget for training rescuers. She stated that by adding more access to the river, there would be a rise in river use, causing an increased need for additional trained rescuers. Mike agreed that more resources were needed and that the budget did need to expand to include this issue. Charlene then asked if there would be some type of public education informing people on the new access routes. Mike answered that the State newspaper has already begun running articles about the greenway.

Dave asked if there were plans to expand the riverwalk above Interstate 26, towards Saluda Shoals. Mike answered that Saluda Shoals has put in grant requests to do their own expansions. He added that this would be funded by the cities of Columbia and West Columbia, highway funds, and local school districts. Mike added that the Three Rivers Greenway project does not have the budget to expand towards Saluda Shoals.

After a break, Dave reconvened the meeting and then turned it over to Bret Hoffman to give the group an update on the installation of the new warning siren on the Saluda River. Bret began by stating that the pole was in place and the rest of the equipment would be installed within the next week. He added that noise testing would be done on Thursday to determine if the siren noise could be reduced, in consideration of nearby neighborhoods. The new siren would be operational following that noise test. Malcolm then asked Bret where this new siren was located. Bret answered that it was at the left of the Riverbanks Zoo parking lot, covering the rapids in that area and the downstream side of the zoo. Mike Waddell then asked how long the siren will sound after activation. Bill Argentieri answered that it will sound for three minutes after initial activation. He added that the siren will be activated after a three inch rise in water level, changed from a ¾ inch rise, and that the siren will be reactivated after each rise. Bill then said that a strobe will also be triggered and will flash for sixteen minutes. Bill also added that this system runs on a three minute time delay. Charlene said that she felt that people in the river needed that extra three minutes to move to safety. Bill replied that the system can be adjusted. Malcolm asked if the siren and strobe were activated by a drop in water level. It was stated that the warning siren system was only initiated by rising water levels.

Dave then distributed copies of the Safety RCG Work Plan (attached) for discussion and the issue of having a safety plan versus a program was introduced. Bill Mathias said that a safety plan would be integrated into the FERC license, but the creation of a safety program would not, which would allow for easier modifications. Malcolm asked what assurance there is if a safety program is created. He wanted to know how it could be included into the license. Overall, the group expressed concern over the fact that a program could eventually be absolved, but a plan could not, since it

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP**

**LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER
July 20, 2006**

final dka 08-08-06

would be included in the license. Patrick M. pointed out that regardless of the plan vs. program decision, the final settlement terms will be enforceable in a court of competent jurisdiction by any signatory. Bill Mathias said that the safety program would be a partial liability absolver, and there would be no reason to terminate the program. Charlene added that the plan could include specifics about stakeholders involved and meeting times for the program. This would ensure that mention of the program was included as part of the license. Joy Downs said that some of the issues were like apples and oranges, and that some of the larger issues could be discussed in the FERC plan and the other issues could be dealt with in the program. Tom Eppink said that there were some issues that had to be included in the license, as required by FERC, but others could be dealt with in the program. Tom also reiterated that there will be unannounced releases in order for Saluda to meet reserve generation requirements and the group should move forward based on this. Patrick replied that this statement is erroneous and that no evidence has been presented to stakeholders that demonstrates operations are capable of compliance with state numeric water quality standards, state narrative standards, the Clean Water Act, Federal Power Act, Endangered Species Act, and other applicable law. Several other stakeholders also spoke up in disagreement with Tom's statement and restated their expectations the RCG would be an open forum where all issues and alternatives could be discussed. The group then agreed that we can amicably, yet seriously, disagree on this issue.

Dave Anderson then directed the discussion back to the specifics of the work plan. The group decided that the identified issues would be better separated into lower Saluda River issues and Lake Murray issues.

Before the group broke for lunch, Don Eng recounted his experience during a recent release on the Saluda River. Don explained that he was fishing when he saw a large amount of water rushing towards him, washing him downstream for approximately one block. He said that he clung to branches to stay above the water, and was eventually rescued by some kayakers. He added that during this struggle, he watched a family get washed downstream and out of his sight. Don wanted to state that real people are affected by the water releases on the river. After Don's recount, there was discussion regarding the need for in-stream recreators to use appropriate safety equipment and the lack thereof in this particular case.

After lunch, discussion on the work plan continued. During the discussion, the issue of how to attain accident information was raised. The Budget Control Board and SCDNR accident data were mentioned as possible sources for this information. Because of privacy issues and unreported accidents, accurate accident information is hard to acquire. The group agreed to continue thinking about this issue.

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP**

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER

July 20, 2006

final dka 08-08-06

The RCG Responsibilities section of the Work Plan initiated a discussion on whether the Safety RCG takes hierarchy over the other RCGs. The group then decided that safety should be compatible with all of the RCGs, allowing for compromise between the groups.

The group agreed on the changes made to the Safety RCG Work Plan (The updated work plan is attached).

Dave then directed the discussion to focus on the Safety Program Outline (attached). Again, the issue of having a program versus a plan was raised. Dave stated that a safety program is acceptable to deal with issues that will continue beyond the FERC relicensing. Mike Waddell asked if the program would be submitted to FERC. Alan Stuart answered that it would be referenced through the safety plan. Dave agreed, stating that the safety program can be referenced to FERC, allowing FERC to be aware of the program. The group agreed that a safety program would be beneficial. Randy Mahan stated that this would be something good for the community. He added that including FERC in some cases would complicate the process and use extra time when making simple changes.

Malcolm asked Dave to develop 'deliverables' for each of the tasks in the Safety RCG Work Plan (Work Scope and Product Section) as those are reflective of the important issues raised to date and are the basis for the recommendations to be made to FERC. Dave indicated that he would do that. Malcolm pointed out that developing a safety program would take away from the limited time and resources of the Safety RCG in dealing with the issues and should be considered after relicensing, and definitely not as a replacement goal or deliverable of the Safety RCG as defined in the Mission Statement. Tentative revisions to the Mission Statement made earlier in the meeting to reflect a change in scope and product (deliverable) to a safety program to be administered outside of the FERC process and after license approval were removed. The language of the original mission to develop recommendations for the identified issues was reinserted to reflect that the group would continue to develop an "RCG Safety Plan" for submission to FERC for consideration to incorporate into the FERC Public Safety Plan. Tommy Boozer acknowledged that the safety program was an idea brought to SCE&G to simplify and allow for ongoing public discussions concerning safety issues on the lake. Tommy further stated that he understands, as Malcolm explained, the stakeholders want to develop recommendations for incorporation into the FERC license and not defer actions on issues until after the license is approved. Randy reiterated that FERC will want to look at alternatives in determining whether to grant a new license and explained this might include the potential to modify Saluda to get the most economic benefit possible from a minimum flow rather than just to keep spinning a unit or two with no generation and the potential to replace the runners to increase the units' maximum capacity.

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP**

**LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER
July 20, 2006**

final dka 08-08-06

Joy reiterated that the larger safety issues, such as flows, water levels, and shoal makers, should be included in the plan to FERC, and other issues should be included in the program. Tommy Boozer added that it is important to show that an effort is being made for safety in the future. The group ended the discussion by agreeing in favor of the safety program. The group agreed that developing a safety plan, addressing identified issues, and determining what recommendations need to be made back to Operations RCG should take priority, but that Bill Mathias can continue to work on the safety program. Malcolm suggested that developing a safety program after submitting the new license application might be more appropriate.

The group agreed to have the next RCG meeting in October, around the time of the next Quarterly Public Meeting. Dave suggested that the group have two separate meetings to discuss lake issues and river issues after the joint RCG meeting in September (after the operations model is finalized). No dates were set for any of these meetings. It was agreed that the group will continue to communicate by e-mail.

Comments received after this meeting are attached after the agenda.

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP**

**LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER
July 20, 2006**

final dka 08-08-06

**Saluda Hydro Relicensing
Safety Resource Conservation Group**

Meeting Agenda

July 20, 2006

9:30 AM

Lake Murray Training Center

- **9:30 to 10:30** Presentation on the Three Rivers Greenway (Mike Dawson)
- **10:30 to 10:45** BREAK
- **10:45 to 11:00** Update on Installation of Warning Siren (Bret Hoffman)
- **11:00 to 12:00** Discussion of Safety RCG Work Plan (Dave Anderson)
- **12:00 to 1:00** LUNCH
- **1:00 to 2:00** Discussion of Safety RCG Work Plan (Dave Anderson)
- **2:00 to 2:15** BREAK
- **2:15 to 3:00** Discussion of Safety Program Outline (Dave Anderson)
- **3:00 to 3:10** Develop an Agenda for Next Meeting and Set Next Meeting Date

Adjourn



MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP**

**LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER
July 20, 2006**

final dka 08-08-06

Comments from Steve Bell: The Saluda Generation TWC is reviewing generation data and most likely will request additional information on specific releases. It seems a bit premature to suggest that we should agree to disagree before reviewing all the data. Also, it may be worth mentioning that all issues including SCE&G's are being tracked via spreadsheet which will result in a written record of the step by step process used to resolve the issue. I believe this will complement the meeting summaries as the official record. Finally, there appears to be no consensus, at this time, on SCE&G's issue of "maximum flexibility". We owe it to our members to review all the facts before considering an outcome.

Comments from Malcolm Leaphart: I have no further comments for either the Safety or Recreation summaries of the most recent meetings; but still have concerns about issues not addressed to date. For example, additional recreational sites as I raised to you earlier in the process, including extension of the Greenways Trail to the dam now that we have learned of the River Alliance's plans to build it up to I26, providing the needed 'safety' exit above Mill Race. You deferred those to SCE&G, but recreation sites should be discussed in the Recreation RCG and TWCs for it. Also, how will the rest of the river users out of hearing range of the 3 sirens be warned of rising water levels - and whether the sirens are a nuisance to homeowners that should not be used at all for warnings (as opposed to something less obtrusive and possibly more effective like warning lights)? Also, I am having to question Charlene about the warning system because it is not clearly documented. Recent questions have included the location of the sensors for the water level increases, whether the sirens can be triggered before water is actually released, the amount of time that a person on the river would have to exit it once a siren goes off at each location, and whether that amount of warning time is dependent on the amount or rate of water released??? That is, should there be a table created of warning times at varying flow releases? Bottom line - the current warning system and any intended changes should be clearly documented and updated as questions are raised and answered during the remainder of the relicensing process.

There will certainly be many other questions and issues once the warning system is documented thoroughly, such as the suitability of sirens in a largely residential area, how the entire tailrace down into the confluence will be alerted, etc. For example, with the 3 sirens in place now, I know of hundreds who still must 'watch the rocks' for rising water, and are extremely fearful now of the quick releases of large volumes like the over 13,000 cfs that washed Don Eng downstream in May without any chance of escaping it... see the Saluda River Trout Unlimited website for the article on river safety in the lower Saluda in the ATTENTION box - www.saludatu.org.

And of course, there is the issue of evolving to an operational mode that uses the hydro in the heavily populated Columbia metropolitan area only for base power needs, like the TVA does with announced schedules of moderate releases more in tune with the natural hydrology. The ultimate warning for this river at this point in time is of course not lights and sirens, but an announced

MEETING NOTES

*SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP*

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER

July 20, 2006

final dka 08-08-06

warning a day or more in advance as that mode of operation would allow. If I was a lawyer for the utility company, I would surely want that to be the case if I had to defend the company in a suit about a river drowning during a generation. Regardless of whatever decision is made, not even considering a change to a safer mode for the community during relicensing would certainly flaw the process.

I'm sure SCE&G would like to be considered a good corporate neighbor in the midlands, but their decisions about public safety, not words in ads, are the real factors in whether the public agrees with that description or not. And an open process with a clean slate approach will go a long way towards fostering a positive attitude for the company. Times have changed for the rivers, just as they have for Lake Murray, and continuing the past operating modes of peak power or reserve power usage should be closely examined given the heavy use of the river by the citizens, and the incorporation of the midlands rivers into the very fabric of the community as the greenways and parks are doing. In other words, it is time for a major re-thinking of the best usage of the Lake Murray hydro - for both SCE&G and the citizens who have placed their trust in them in managing public waters in an efficient and safe way.

Steve Bell has told me that there is a spreadsheet being kept by either SCE&G or Kleinschmidt of issues to make sure all issues are addressed. It would be good to have that clarified for all the stakeholders as I have only heard that from Steve, not from you or another committee leader. Would you confirm with a quick reply that a spreadsheet of issues is being kept, and follow up soon with information to all the stakeholders about it, including how it can be accessed, when it will be used in the process, etc.

Please share my comments with any others that you deem appropriate beyond my limited distribution and/or post as comments to the last Safety RCG meeting summary. However, please do not post as comments and fail to include them as topics for discussion at future meetings.

Comments from Charlene Coleman: I feel it is critical to include a **plan** to FERC on issues that do pertain to the safety of the public in regards to operation of the facility. I also agree with Steve Bell that with out the proper information to make sound decisions or agree to disagree on level ground is the only way for everyone to "feel" confident they did due process in the public's best interest, be that power or just surviving a family outing.

The program is an excellent idea and should be pursued, but not at the expense of guidelines that can not be change at whim. Therefore I do feel strongly a plan is to be offered with the program as part of the plan.

So much for semantics.

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
SAFETY RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP**

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER

July 20, 2006

final dka 08-08-06

Comments from Mike Waddell: The word plan has to stay in the mission statement period. If it does not then I can assure you there will no consensus.

Safety Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

Facilitator:			
Dave Anderson	Kleinschmidt Associates	dave.anderson@kleinschmidtusa.com	(205) 981-4547
Members:			
Name	Organization	E-mail	Work Phone
Aaron Small	US Coast Guard Auxiliary	arsbhs@bellsouth.net	
Alan Axson	Columbia Fire Department	cfidwaxson@columbiasc.net	
Alan Stuart	KA	alan.stuart@kleinschmidtusa.com	
Alison Guth	KA	alison.guth@kleinschmidtusa.com	
Amanda Hill	USFWS	amanda_hill@fws.gov	
Bill Argentieri	SCE&G	bargentieri@scana.com	
Bill Marshall	Lower Saluda Scenic River Advisory Council, DNR	marshallb@dnr.sc.gov	
Bill Mathias	LMA/LMPS	bill25@sc.rr.com	
Charlene Coleman	American Whitewater	cheetahtrk@yahoo.com	
Dave Anderson	Kleinschmidt Associates	dave.anderson@kleinschmidtusa.com	
David C. Price	Lake Murray Power Squadron	pricedc@dhec.sc.gov	
Dick Christie	SCDNR	dchristie@infoave.net	
Edward D. Schnepel	LMA	eschnepel@sc.rr.com	
George Duke	LMHC	kayakduke@bellsouth.net	
Gerrit Jobsis	Coastal Conservation League & American Rivers	gerritj@sccl.org; gjobsis@americanrivers.org	
Jennifer O'Rourke	South Carolina Wildlife Federation	jenno@scwf.org	
Jerry Wise	Lake Murray Power Squadron	meddynamic@aol.com	
Jim Devereaux	SCE&G	jdevereaux@scana.com	
John and Rob Altenberg	Sea Tow	seatowlakemurray@seatow.com	
Joy Downs	LMA	elymay2@aol.com	
Karen Kustafik	City of Columbia Parks and Recreation	kakustafik@columbiasc.net	
Ken Uschelbec	US Coast Guard Auxiliary	colkenu@aol.com	
Kenneth G. Fox	LMA	skfox@sc.rr.com	
Larry Turner	SCDHEC	turnerle@dhec.sc.gov	
Lee Barber	LMA	lbarber@sc.rr.com	
Malcolm Leaphart	Trout Unlimited	malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu	
Mark Leao	USFWS	mark_leao@fws.gov	
Michael Waddell	TU - Saluda River Chapter	mwaddell@esri.sc.edu	
Mike Gillis	EMS		
Miriam S. Atria	Capitol City Lake Murray Country	miriam@lakemurraycountry.com	
Norm Nicholson	Lexington Resident Deputy	larana@mindspring.com	
Norm Ferris	Trout Unlimited	norm@sc.rr.com	
Patrick Moore	SCCCL AR	patrickm@sccl.org	
Ralph Crafton	LMA	crafton@usit.net	
Randy Mahan	SCANA	rmahan@scana.com	
Roger Hovis	Richland County Emergency Services	rogerhovis@richlandonline.com	
Steve Bell	Lake Murray Watch	bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net	
Suzanne Rhodes	SC Wildlife Federation	suzrhodes@juno.com	
Tom Eppink	SCANA Services, Inc.	teppink@scana.com	
Tommy Boozer	SCE&G	tboozer@scana.com	

Safety Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

Mission Statement

The Mission of the Safety Resource Conservation Group (SRCG) is, through good faith cooperation, 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 Recreational Safety Plan proposal for inclusion in the FERC license application. This will be accomplished by gathering or developing data relevant to Saluda Hydroelectric Project safety-related interests/issues, seek to understand those interests/issues and that data, and consider all such interests/issues and data relevant to and significantly affecting safety on Lake Murray and the lower Saluda River.

Identified Issues

- creation of a public information system and improvement of communications concerning changes in river flows in the lower Saluda River
- creation of a public warning/notification system for river users during unannounced changes in river flows in the lower Saluda River
- fluctuating lake levels and their effect on safety
- boat traffic/congestion in cove areas related to nearby shoreline development
- fluctuating lake and river levels and their effect on recreational user safety
- placement and maintenance of shoal markers
- systematic collection of accident data on the lake and on the river
- ingress/egress to potentially hazardous areas (e.g., Mill Race)
- Lack of an advanced public information system of releases from the Lake Murray hydro plant that provides release information at least 12 hours in advance
- 'Rates of flow' from the Lake Murray hydro need a unit of measure established, and a determination of unacceptable rate levels for the safety of recreationists in the lower Saluda River
- consider alternate methods of operations besides the present "maximum flexibility" mode of operation
- Poor understanding the hazardous conditions in the river caused by hydro flows, how hazards vary from place to place, and who is affected
- Interest in managing river flows, particularly rates of increase in flow, to improve safety for river users
- fluctuating river levels and its effect on rescue resources
- flow rate recommendations for public safety concerns

Comment: Malcolm Leaphart suggests deleting this one in lieu of the item "Lack of an advanced..."

Deleted: about

Deleted: unannounced

Deleted: conditions o

Inserted: unannounced

Deleted: due

Inserted: due to

Comment: Charlene Coleman:
Redundant to #3

Deleted: current project operations

Inserted: current project operations

Deleted: unannounced river flows

Safety Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

RCG Responsibilities

- Identifying specific areas where lake level fluctuations may be adversely affecting safety at the lake, including the nature and timing of the effect (e.g., shoal areas).
- Working with the Operations Resource Conservation Group to identify “reasonable” (based on hydrologic, structural, and other limitations identified) changes and alternatives for modifying project operations, including operations that affect safety on the lake and lower Saluda River.
- Identifying any studies, if applicable, that should be performed to identify and/or evaluate possible changes to Project operations (e.g., flow studies on the river).
- Presenting a range of reasonable alternatives or recommendations to the Saluda Hydro Relicensing Group (SHRG) regarding possible modifications to current Project operations.
- Reviewing results from the Recreation Resource Conservation Group to make sure they are consistent with the mission statement of the Safety Resource Conservation Group.
- Developing a recreational safety plan for Lake Murray and the lower Saluda River that addresses all of the “Identified Issues”
- Developing a public information/warning system during unannounced changes in river flows in the lower Saluda River (including a phone call to Rescue One—Columbia Fire Department).
- Identify needed information products/systems/facilities to increase public awareness of potential hazards and necessary precautions

Deleted: need to

Deleted: for

Deleted: ing

Deleted: ing

Deleted: Downstream Flows Technical Working Committee

Comment: Malcolm Leaphart suggests deleting.

Work Scope and Product

- **Task 1** – Review the operational constraints and current operations of the Saluda Project (see Initial Consultation Document).
- **Task 2** – Determine how Project operations affect safety and alternatives to present operations to enhance safety on the lower Saluda River.
- **Task 3** – Review applicable laws governing boating use.
- **Task 4** – Identify safety-related organizations concerned with Lake Murray and/or the lower Saluda River.
- **Task 5** – Invite those safety-related organizations identified in Task 4 to participate in the Safety Resource Conservation Group.
- **Task 6** – Review stakeholder requests for particular studies and/or enhancement measures to ensure that these are incorporated into study planning, if applicable (flow studies related to safety on the lower Saluda River).
- **Task 7** – Develop and recommend operations scenarios to the Operations RCG for analysis (both lake and selected points (determine by the stakeholders) on the lower Saluda River). These scenarios should reflect initial thinking on potential solutions and be designed to narrow the focus of Task 12 below. Analysis by the Operations RCG will focus on an assessment of potential safety impacts associated with any suggested changes to operations.
- **Task 8** – Discuss results of the Operations RCG analyses.

**Safety Resource Conservation Group Work Plan
Saluda River Project**

- **Task 9** – Develop study designs/methods/plans and review agreed upon studies, literature reviews, etc. [if necessary](#).
- **Task 10** – Identify high use areas of the river for inclusion in the rising water warning system.
- **Task 11** – Identify safety concerns that can possibly be resolved outside of the relicensing process.
- **Task 12** – Provide [safety-related](#) recommendations for Project operations and recreation access, facilities, and use to be considered in conjunction with all ecological and recreational issues.
- **Task 13** – Develop a consensus based Recreational Safety Plan for the Saluda Project that addresses all of the issues and tasks identified above.

Schedule

Late 2005/Early 2006—Finalize Mission Statement and Work Plan

Mid-2006—Complete identification of studies, literature reviews, etc. that need to be completed to address issues and tasks identified in the Work Plan

Late 2006—Begin compilation of existing information, review preliminary study results, and draft an outline of the Recreational Safety Plan

2007—Complete any studies identified in Task 9 and review results; draft recommendations to SHRG, complete draft Recreational Safety Plan

2008—Finalize Recreational Safety Plan and provide comments on Draft License Application

Safety Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

Facilitator:			
Dave Anderson	Kleinschmidt Associates	dave.anderson@kleinschmidtusa.com	(205) 981-4547
Members:			
Name	Organization	E-mail	Work Phone
Aaron Small	US Coast Guard Auxiliary	arsbhs@bellsouth.net	
Alan Axson	Columbia Fire Department	cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net	
Alan Stuart	KA	alan.stuart@kleinschmidtusa.com	
Alison Guth	KA	alison.guth@kleinschmidtusa.com	
Amanda Hill	USFWS	amanda_hill@fws.gov	
Bill Argentieri	SCE&G	bargentieri@scana.com	
Bill Marshall	Lower Saluda Scenic River Advisory Council, DNR	marshallb@dnr.sc.gov	
Bill Mathias	LMA/LMPS	bill25@sc.rr.com	
Charlene Coleman	American Whitewater	cheetahtrk@yahoo.com	
Dave Anderson	Kleinschmidt Associates	dave.anderson@kleinschmidtusa.com	
David C. Price	Lake Murray Power Squadron	pricedc@dhec.sc.gov	
Dick Christie	SCDNR	dchristie@infoave.net	
Edward D. Schnepel	LMA	eschnepel@sc.rr.com	
George Duke	LMHC	kayakduke@bellsouth.net	
Gerrit Jobsis	Coastal Conservation League & American Rivers	gerritj@sccl.org; gjobsis@americanrivers.org	
Jennifer O'Rourke	South Carolina Wildlife Federation	jenno@scwf.org	
Jerry Wise	Lake Murray Power Squadron	meddynamic@aol.com	
Jim Devereaux	SCE&G	jdevereaux@scana.com	
John and Rob Altenberg	Sea Tow	seatowlakemurray@seatow.com	
Joy Downs	LMA	elymay2@aol.com	
Karen Kustafik	City of Columbia Parks and Recreation	kakustafik@columbiasc.net	
Ken Uschelbec	US Coast Guard Auxiliary	colkenu@aol.com	
Kenneth G. Fox	LMA	skfox@sc.rr.com	
Larry Turner	SCDHEC	turnerle@dhec.sc.gov	
Lee Barber	LMA	lbarber@sc.rr.com	
Malcolm Leaphart	Trout Unlimited	malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu	
Mark Leao	USFWS	mark_leao@fws.gov	
Michael Waddell	TU - Saluda River Chapter	mwaddell@esri.sc.edu	
Mike Gillis	EMS		
Miriam S. Atria	Capitol City Lake Murray Country	miriam@lakemurraycountry.com	
Norm Nicholson	Lexington Resident Deputy	larana@mindspring.com	
Norm Ferris	Trout Unlimited	norm@sc.rr.com	
Patrick Moore	SCCCL AR	patrickm@sccl.org	
Ralph Crafton	LMA	crafton@usit.net	
Randy Mahan	SCANA	rmahan@scana.com	
Roger Hovis	Richland County Emergency Services	rogerhovis@richlandonline.com	
Steve Bell	Lake Murray Watch	bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net	
Suzanne Rhodes	SC Wildlife Federation	suzrhodes@juno.com	
Tom Eppink	SCANA Services, Inc.	teppink@scana.com	
Tommy Boozer	SCE&G	tboozer@scana.com	

Safety Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

Mission Statement

The Mission of the Safety Resource Conservation Group (SRCG) is, through good faith cooperation, to make Lake Murray and the lower Saluda River as safe as reasonably possible for the public. The objective is to develop consensus-based [recommendations to the license application](#). This will be accomplished by gathering or developing data relevant to Saluda Hydroelectric Project safety-related interests/issues, seek to understand those interests/issues and that data, and consider all such interests/issues and data relevant to and significantly affecting safety on Lake Murray and the lower Saluda River.

Identified Issues

Lower Saluda River:

- [level fluctuations and their effect on safety:](#)
 - [Lack of advance public information system and improvement of communications concerning changes in river flows in the lower Saluda River](#)
 - [enhancement of a public warning/notification system \(warning devices\) for river users during unannounced changes in river flows in the lower Saluda River](#)
 - [ingress/egress to potentially hazardous areas and its effect on rescue resources \(e.g., Mill Race\)](#)
 - [rate of change on the lower Saluda River for recreational safety](#)
- [systematic collection of accident data on the river](#)

Lake Murray:

- [levels and their effect on safety](#)
- [level fluctuations and their effect on safety](#)
- [boat traffic/congestion in cove areas related to nearby shoreline development](#)
- [placement and maintenance of shoal markers](#)
- [Power lines impeding sail boat navigation](#)
- [Water quality and its effect on safety being addressed by WQ RCG](#)
- [Amphibious aircraft using Lake Murray](#)
- [systematic collection of accident data on the lake](#)

RCG Responsibilities

- Identifying specific areas where lake levels [and](#) fluctuations may be adversely affecting safety at the lake, including the nature and timing of the effect (e.g., shoal areas).
- Working with the Operations Resource Conservation Group to identify “reasonable” (based on hydrologic, structural, and other limitations identified) changes and alternatives for modifying project operations, including operations that affect safety [on the lake and lower Saluda River](#).

Deleted: a ...Recreational Safet	...	[1]
Comment: Determine if this sho	...	[2]
Formatted	...	[3]
Formatted: Bullets and Numb	...	[4]
Deleted: creation		
Formatted: Bullets and Numb	...	[5]
Comment: Malcolm Leaphart s	...	[6]
Deleted: about		
Deleted: unannounced		
Inserted: unannounced		
Deleted: conditions o		
Deleted: creation		
Inserted: creation		
Formatted: Bullets and Numb	...	[7]
Comment: Charlene Coleman:	...	[8]
Deleted: <#>fluctuating lake lev	...	[9]
Formatted: Bullets and Num	...	[10]
Inserted: <#>traffic/congestio	...	[11]
Inserted: <#>related		
Deleted: <#>due		
Inserted: <#>due to		
Deleted: <#>to nearby shorelin	...	[12]
Inserted: <#>nearby shoreline		
Inserted: <#>development		
Deleted: <#>current project operations		
Inserted: <#>current project operations		
Deleted: <#>fluctuating lake a	...	[13]
Inserted: <#>fluctuating lake	...	[14]
Inserted: <#>and their effect on		
Inserted: <#>recreational user		
Inserted: <#>¶	...	[15]
Inserted: <#>safety		
Inserted: <#> on the lake and	...	[16]
Inserted: <#>¶	...	[17]
Deleted: unannounced river flows		
Deleted: <#>Lack of an advan	...	[18]
Inserted: <#>Lack of an adva	...	[19]
Formatted: Bullets and Num	...	[20]
Inserted: 'Rates of flow' from	...	[21]
Deleted: levels for the safety o	...	[22]
Inserted: levels for the safety	...	[23]
Formatted	...	[24]
Formatted: Bullets and Num	...	[25]
Deleted: <#>consider alternat	...	[26]
Inserted: <#>consider alternat	...	[27]
Inserted: <#>Poor understand	...	[28]
Inserted: <#>fluctuating river	...	[29]
Inserted: <#>¶		
Formatted	...	[30]
Formatted: Bullets and Num	...	[31]
Deleted: ¶		
Deleted: ¶	...	[32]

Safety Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

- Identifying any studies, that should be performed to identify, and/or evaluate possible changes to Project operations (e.g., flow studies on the river).
 - Presenting a range of reasonable alternatives or recommendations to the Saluda Hydro Relicensing Group (SHRG) regarding possible modifications to current Project operations. (flow rate recommendations for public safety concerns)
- Reviewing recommendations from the Resource Conservation Groups for compatibility with the Safety Program/Plan.
- Developing a safety program/plan for Lake Murray and the lower Saluda River that addresses all of the “Identified Issues”
- Developing a public information/warning system (warning devices) for unannounced changes in river flows in the lower Saluda River (including a phone call to Rescue One—Columbia Fire Department).
- Identifying needed information products/systems/facilities to increase public awareness of potential hazards and necessary precautions

Work Scope and Product

- **Task 1** – Review the operational constraints and current operations of the Saluda Project (see Initial Consultation Document).
- **Task 2** – Determine how current Project operations affect safety.
- **Task 3** – Review applicable laws governing boating use.
- **Task 4** – Identify and invite safety-related organizations concerned with Lake Murray and/or the lower Saluda River to participate in the Safety Resource Conservation Group.
- **Task 5** –
- **Task 6** – Review stakeholder requests for particular studies and/or enhancement measures to ensure that these are incorporated into study planning, if applicable (flow studies related to safety on the lower Saluda River).
- **Task 7** – Develop and recommend operations scenarios to the Operations RCG for analysis. These scenarios should reflect initial thinking on potential solutions and be designed to narrow the focus of Task 12 below. Analysis by the Operations RCG will focus on an assessment of potential safety impacts associated with any suggested changes to operations.
- **Task 8** – Discuss results of the Operations RCG analyses.
- **Task 9** – Develop study designs/methods/plans and review agreed upon studies, literature reviews, etc. if necessary.
- **Task 10** – Identify high use areas of the river for inclusion in the rising water warning system.
- **Task 11** – Identify safety concerns that can possibly be resolved outside of the relicensing process.
- **Task 12** – Provide safety-related recommendations for Project operations and recreation access, facilities, and use to be considered in conjunction with all ecological and recreational issues.

- Deleted:** if applicable,
- Deleted:** need to
- Deleted:** for
- Deleted:** ing
- Deleted:** ing
- Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering
- Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering
- Deleted:** results
- Deleted:** Downstream Flows Technical Working Committee
- Deleted:** Recreation
- Inserted:** Recreation Resource Conservation Group
- Deleted:** to make sure they are consistent with the mission statement of the Safety Resource Conservation Group.
- Deleted:** recreational
- Deleted:** during
- Comment:** Malcolm Leaphart suggests deleting.

- Deleted:** and alternatives to present operations to enhance safety on the lower Saluda River

- Inserted:** and alternatives to present operations to enhance safety on the lower Saluda River

- Deleted:** Invite those safety-related organizations identified in Task 4 to participate in the Safety Resource Conservation Group.

- Deleted:** (both lake and selected points (determine by the stakeholders) on the lower Saluda River)

- Inserted:** (both lake and selected points (determine by the stakeholders) on the lower Saluda River)

**Safety Resource Conservation Group Work Plan
Saluda River Project**

- **Task 13** – Develop a consensus based Safety Program/Plan for the Saluda Project that addresses all of the issues and tasks identified above.

Deleted: Recreational

Schedule

Late 2005/Early 2006—Finalize Mission Statement and Work Plan

Mid-2006—Complete identification of studies, literature reviews, etc. that need to be completed to address issues and tasks identified in the Work Plan

Late 2006—Begin compilation of existing information, review preliminary study results, and draft an outline of the Recreational Safety Plan

2007—Complete any studies identified in Task 9 and review results; draft recommendations to SHRG, complete draft Recreational Safety Plan

2008—Finalize Recreational Safety Plan and provide comments on Draft License Application

DRAFT

Page 2: [1] Deleted	SCANA	7/20/2006 11:19 AM
a		
Page 2: [1] Deleted	SCANA	7/20/2006 11:22 AM
Recreational Safety Plan proposal for inclusion in the FERC license application		
Page 2: [2] Comment	SCANA	7/20/2006 11:13 AM
Determine if this should change to Safety Program.		
Page 2: [3] Formatted	SCANA	7/20/2006 1:20 PM
Indent: Left: 0", Tabs: 0.25", List tab + Not at 0.5"		
Page 2: [4] Change	SCANA	7/20/2006 1:20 PM
Formatted Bullets and Numbering		
Page 2: [5] Change	Alan Stuart	4/18/2006 9:16 AM
Formatted Bullets and Numbering		
Page 2: [6] Comment	Malcolm Leaphart	7/10/2006 4:36 PM
Malcolm Leaphart suggests deleting this one in lieu of the item "Lack of an advanced..."		
Page 2: [7] Change	Bill Argentieri	5/30/2006 11:40 AM
Formatted Bullets and Numbering		
Page 2: [8] Comment	Charlene Coleman	7/11/2006 9:22 AM
Charlene Coleman: Redundant to #3		
Page 2: [9] Deleted	SCANA	7/20/2006 11:43 AM
fluctuating lake levels and their effect on safety boat traffic/congestion in cove areas related		
Page 2: [10] Change	Dave Anderson	5/10/2006 10:50 AM
Formatted Bullets and Numbering		
Page 2: [11] Inserted	Alan Stuart	4/18/2006 9:16 AM
traffic/congestion in cove areas		
Page 2: [12] Deleted	SCANA	7/20/2006 11:44 AM
to nearby shoreline development		
Page 2: [13] Deleted	SCANA	7/20/2006 11:47 AM
fluctuating lake and river levels and their effect on recreational user safety placement and maintenance of shoal markers systematic collection of accident data on the lake and on the river		
Page 2: [14] Inserted	Randy Mahan	5/30/2006 11:31 AM
fluctuating lake and river levels		
Page 2: [15] Inserted	Alan Stuart	4/18/2006 9:19 AM
placement and maintenance of shoal markers systematic collection of accident data		
Page 2: [16] Inserted	Charlene Coleman	7/11/2006 9:24 AM
on the lake and on the river		
Page 2: [17] Inserted	Alan Stuart	4/18/2006 9:20 AM
ingress/egress to potentially hazardous areas		
Page 2: [18] Deleted	SCANA	7/20/2006 11:49 AM

Lack of an advanced public information system of releases from the Lake Murray hydro plant that provides release information at least 12 hours in advance
 'Rates of flow' from the Lake Murray hydro need a unit of measure established, and a determination of unacceptable

Page 2: [19] Inserted	Malcolm Leaphart	7/10/2006 4:34 PM
Lack of an advanced public information system of releases from the Lake Murray hydro plant that provides release information at least 12 hours in advance		
Page 2: [20] Change	Malcolm Leaphart	7/10/2006 4:34 PM
Formatted Bullets and Numbering		
Page 2: [21] Inserted	Malcolm Leaphart	7/10/2006 4:34 PM
'Rates of flow' from the Lake Murray hydro need a unit of measure established, and a determination of unacceptable rate		
Page 2: [22] Deleted	SCANA	7/20/2006 12:07 PM
levels for the safety of recreationists in		
Page 2: [23] Inserted	Malcolm Leaphart	7/10/2006 4:34 PM
levels for the safety of recreationists in the lower Saluda River		
Page 2: [24] Formatted	SCANA	7/20/2006 1:36 PM
Indent: Left: 0", Tabs: 0.25", List tab + Not at 0.5"		
Page 2: [25] Change	SCANA	7/20/2006 1:36 PM
Formatted Bullets and Numbering		
Page 2: [26] Deleted	SCANA	7/20/2006 12:16 PM
consider alternate methods of operations besides the present "maximum flexibility" mode of operation Poor understanding the hazardous conditions in the river caused by hydro flows, how hazards vary from place to place, and who is affected Interest in managing river flows, particularly rates of increase in flow, to improve safety for river users fluctuating river levels and its effect on rescue resources flow rate recommendations for public safety concerns		
Page 2: [27] Inserted	Mike Waddell	7/10/2006 4:40 PM
consider alternate methods of operations besides the present "maximum flexibility" mode of operation		
Page 2: [28] Inserted	Bill Marshall	7/10/2006 4:52 PM
Poor understanding the hazardous conditions in the river caused by hydro flows, how hazards vary from place to place, and who is affected		
Page 2: [28] Inserted	Bill Marshall	7/10/2006 4:52 PM
Interest in managing river flows, particularly rates of increase in flow, to improve safety for river users		
Page 2: [29] Inserted	Charlene Coleman	7/11/2006 9:24 AM
fluctuating river levels and its effect on rescue resources		
Page 2: [29] Inserted	Charlene Coleman	7/11/2006 9:25 AM
flow rate recommendations for public safety concerns		
Page 2: [30] Formatted	SCANA	7/20/2006 1:21 PM

Indent: Left: 0", Tabs: 0.25", List tab + Not at 0.5"

Page 2: [31] Change	SCANA	7/20/2006 1:21 PM
----------------------------	--------------	--------------------------

Formatted Bullets and Numbering

Page 2: [32] Deleted	SCANA	7/20/2006 1:35 PM
-----------------------------	--------------	--------------------------

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

SAFETY PROGRAM OUTLINE

DRAFT

SALUDA PROJECT
(FERC NO. 516)

JULY 10, 2006

Prepared by:

Kleinschmidt
Energy & Water Resource Consultants

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

SAFETY PROGRAM OUTLINE

DRAFT

SALUDA PROJECT
(FERC NO. 516)

JULY 10, 2006

Prepared by:

Kleinschmidt
Energy & Water Resource Consultants

SAFETY PROGRAM OUTLINE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	SCOPE
2.0	REVIEW AND AMENDMENT PROCESS
3.0	INTRODUCTION
4.0	ACTIVITIES AND USAGE.....
4.1	Lake Murray.....
4.1.1	Activities.....
4.1.2	Times of Greatest Use.....
4.1.3	Characteristics of Individual Users.....
4.2	Lower Saluda River
4.2.1	Activities.....
4.2.2	Times of Greatest Use.....
4.2.3	Characteristics of Individual Users.....
5.0	LAWS AND REGULATIONS.....
5.1	Sources of Laws Affecting Lake/River Usage.....
6.0	REGULATORY AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS, RESPONSIBLE PARTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....
7.0	SERVICE PROVIDERS FOR LAKE MURRAY AND THE LOWER SALUDA RIVER
8.0	SAFETY ON THE LAKE AND RIVER.....
8.1	Responsibility for Safety in the Saluda Hydro Project Boundaries.....
8.2	Law Enforcement.....
8.3	Law Enforcement Equipment
8.4	Fires.....
8.5	Medical Transport.....
8.6	Obtaining Assistance
9.0	SAFETY PLANS.....
10.0	EDUCATION PROGRAMS
11.0	USEFUL RESOURCES
12.0	ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY WITH WEB LINKS