

MEETING NOTES

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

**SCE&G Carolina Research Park
November 21, 2006**

Final acg 12-13-06

ATTENDEES:

Alison Guth, Kleinschmidt Associates
Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt Associates
Tommy Boozer, SCE&G
Dick Christie, SCDNR
Roy Parker, LMA
Steve Bell, Lake Watch
Van Hoffman, SCANA
Tony Bebber, SCPRT

Bill Argentieri, SCE&G
George Duke, LMHOC
Ron Ahle, SCDNR
Trisha Priester, Lexington Co.
David Hancock, SCE&G
John Frick, landowner
Joy Downs, LMA

HOMEWORK:

- Tommy, David – Contact Orbis to determine if fringeland dimensions and characteristics currently available (lengths, depths, acreage, ft. of ESA, PBL to 360', Min width, max width, mean width) as well as number the land parcels
- Van - Develop Economics Resource Group Strawman Workplan
- Ron A. – Develop Natural Resources Group Strawman Workplan
- John F. – Back property values strawman

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: **January 17, 2006 at 9:30 a.m.**
Located at Lake Murray Training Center

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.

Welcome and Review of Rebalancing Goal Statement and Criteria

Alan Stuart welcomed the group and noted that today the group would work on developing a mission statement for rebalancing. Ron Ahle noted that he had completed this strawman as a homework assignment from the last meeting. The group reviewed the strawman interactively and Ron explained the reasoning behind his mission statement. He pointed out that he had divided it into three parts: The Issue, The Task, and The Goal. He noted that he has initially removed the private values from the list of Evaluation Criteria because he believes that in the first sweep the group should look at the public values. He continued to explain that the group would re-visit the

MEETING NOTES

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

**SCE&G Carolina Research Park
November 21, 2006**

Final acg 12-13-06

private values during a second evaluation of the lands. There was some concern expressed that public and private values could not be separated. John Frick explained that there are instances where there is insufficient fringeland and suggested that it could be possible to work with the back property owners. Ron noted that items like this would be evaluated second. The group was generally agreeable to the Mission Statement that Ron had drafted (attached below).

Group Discussion of Scoring Criteria

Ron also discussed his concept of scoring the land parcels. He suggested that land parcels will be ranked based on quantitative or qualitative values developed by the group. Ron pointed out that under his method of scoring, the parcels of land would each receive a score (1-poor; 3 – good; 5 – excellent) for each one of the criteria. The sum of the points would subsequently be added up to achieve a final grade for that parcel. Ron explained that this method of scoring worked well because of the many variables that were being evaluated.

Tommy Boozer asked if the evaluation of lands could be accomplished through aerial photography rather than extensive field work. Ron replied that he believed that aerial photography would be an acceptable means of evaluation and the group agreed.

Evaluation Criteria Review

Ron began to review the revised list of evaluation criteria. He explained that a few items from the original list were combined, such as continuity and adjacency, and ESA's and Conservation Areas. Trisha Priester noted that it may still be necessary to keep zoning issues in the revised list. Tommy pointed out that the majority of the land that was being reviewed was below the 360', which is not affected by zoning. Ron agreed and noted that zoning may be something that the group looks at along with the private values. The group decided that a discussion on zoning issues would be a parking lot item to discuss at a later point.

Ron continued to explain why some items were not included in the first list. He also explained that his vision for this process would be to eventually see many more fringelands with similar protection to that of Forest and Game Management. The group began to discuss that there may be land swaps with current Forest and Game Lands. Van Hoffman suggested that the group take a conservation easement type of approach with trades of lands on the upper Saluda or lands outside the PBL. Alan noted that the FERC only has responsibility within the project boundary. Subsequently, there may be recommendations that this group makes for land swaps that the FERC cannot agree to in a settlement agreement. The group agreed that this would be discussed further when looking at options that they had in the "toolbox".

In a continuation of discussions on the evaluation criteria, Ron noted that each value will be defined so that one can score a parcel of land quickly and easily. For example, Ron noted general habitat

MEETING NOTES

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

**SCE&G Carolina Research Park
November 21, 2006**

Final acg 12-13-06

quality could be defined so that a score of 5 will be naturally forested, a pine monoculture would receive a 3 and if there was no vegetation it would receive a 1. There was also some discussion on how recreation values would be assessed. Tony Bebber noted that in many places public access is needed more than boat ramps and such. Tommy reminded the group that information on where future recreation areas are needed will come out of the Recreation Surveys.

After lunch the group came to some conclusions on how the criteria should be dealt with. Alan proposed that the group be divided into two subcommittees, the Natural Resource Values Sub-Committee, and the Economic Value Subcommittee. Alan continued to explain that the groups would function independently of one another during the scoring process and come back together at the end to compare their scorings of the parcels of land

Alan noted that initially the groups would meet separately to develop their workplans and swap the plans with the other group for comment. Alan continued to explain that recreation would be evaluated separately under each committee. He explained that the Natural Resource committee would evaluate land parcels based on passive recreation, while the Economic committee would evaluate active recreation. Ron further explained that passive recreation can be viewed as recreation that does not change the character of the land (e.g. hiking trails), while active recreation changes the character of the land (e.g. boat ramps). Alan asked Tony if he was agreeable to the way in which the recreation was separated. Tony noted that it appeared acceptable to him. Dick noted that ESAs may be evaluated differently on each committee. He noted that an ESA may charge negatively against the overall score of the land on the Economic committee, while positively toward the Natural Resource Committee.

Group Assignments:

The group members were assigned to the following positions and everyone agreed that they were content with their standings on the committees.

Natural Resource Value Sub-Committee

SCE&G (David Hancock)
SCDNR (Ron Ahle)
USFWS
Steve Bell
Joy Downs
Tony Bebber

Economic Value Sub-committee

SCE&G (Tommy Boozer)
SCANA (Van Hoffman)
Roy Parker
John Frick
George Duke
Counties (Newberry, Saluda, Lexington,
Richland)

After some discussion the TWC came up with the following Actions List for the groups.

MEETING NOTES

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

**SCE&G Carolina Research Park
November 21, 2006**

Final acg 12-13-06

-
1. Each group will separately develop Workplan/Criteria Descriptions/Scoring Mechanisms through email and conference calls and/or meetings.
 2. Both groups will meet back at the Training Center on January 17th.
 - They will meet separately in the morning to finalize their workplans
 - Both groups will come back together in the afternoon to compare and comment on workplans
 3. Groups will then view aerial maps to develop initial scoring for land parcels.
 4. Orbis will then come in separately for each group to go over land parcels and the groups will subsequently score each parcel (possibly 2 days for each group).
 5. TWC will meet back together as a whole to compare scorings on land parcels

Additional Tools and Homework Assignments:

The TWC noted that a homework item for Orbis would be to assign numbers to each of the parcels, as well as identify the characteristics of the parcels (lengths, depths, acreage, ft. of ESA, PBL to 360', Min width, max width, mean width). Ron noted that he would begin drafting the strawman workplan for the Natural Resource Group, while Van Hoffman noted that he would begin developing the strawman for the Economics Group.

In a discussion on what tools were needed for the upcoming meetings, Joy noted that it may be beneficial to have the radius maps for the marinas. David Hancock also suggested having a few maps depicting land parcels that the group could run through as a scoring exercise. Also, for scoring consistency, the TWC noted that each of the groups will score land based on a 1 to 5 scale. The group will also begin by looking at future development lands. John Frick noted that he would work on developing a way to incorporate the value of land to the back property owners with and without designated fringeland in front of their property.

Group adjourned

MEETING NOTES

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

**SCE&G Carolina Research Park
November 21, 2006**

Final acg 12-13-06

Mission Statement

Issue: Thirty percent of the project fringelands are currently being managed for wildlife and silvaculture. Approximately half of that (15%) is currently classified as future development lands. The remaining 70% of project lands have been sold and/or converted to other uses. The question is how much of the project fringelands need to be set aside for public uses?

Task: In order to understand the public values of the remaining future development lands, it is the task of the TWC to assess these values considering the following factors:

Future Development Land Guidelines

Natural Resource Value Sub-Committee

SCE&G (David Hancock)
SCDNR (Ron Ahle)
USFWS

Steve Bell
Joy Downs
Tony Bebber

Economic Value Sub-committee

SCE&G (Tommy Boozer)
SCANA (Van Hoffman)
Counties (Newberry, Saluda, Lexington,
Richland)
Roy Parker
John Frick
George Duke

General habitat quality
Tract Size
Fish spawning & nursery habitat
Length of undeveloped shoreline
Depth of Fringeland
Waterfowl hunting
Habitat in surrounding region
Aesthetics
Passive Recreation
Adjacency
ESA's & Cons areas
Endangered Species
Topography (slope)

Length of Fringeland
Depth of Fringeland
Active Recreation
Property Value
Development Potential
Economic
ESA
Conservation Areas

Information to be provided by Orbis for each Fringeland tract:

Identify each tract by a designation number or letter

MEETING NOTES

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

**SCE&G Carolina Research Park
November 21, 2006**

Final acg 12-13-06

Length of shoreline
Acreage
Feet of ESA
PBL to 360 contour line
Minimum/Maximum/Mean Width of tract

Once public resource values have been identified, it is the task of the TWC to find ways to protect these values while considering the needs of SCE&G and the back property owners.

- Back property owners
- Continuity
- Development pressure
- Zoning (Density)
- Economics

Goal: The goal is to protect public resources values of project lands in accordance with the Federal Power Act through rebalancing and other shoreline classification modifications and restrictions.