

MEETING NOTES

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

**SCE&G Training Center
August 24, 2006**

Final acg 9-20-06

ATTENDEES:

Alison Guth, Kleinschmidt Associates	Bill Argentieri, SCE&G
Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt Associates	Randy Mahan, SCANA Services, Inc.
Tommy Boozer, SCE&G	Ron Ahle, SCDNR
David Hancock, SCE&G	Rhett Bickley, Lexington County
Joy Downs, LMA	Roy Parker, LMA
Steve Bell, Lake Watch	John Frick, landowner
Tony Bebbber, SCPRT	

HOMEWORK:

- Tommy/David to develop recommendations for increasing the size /slips of common access areas accommodating larger shoreline properties

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING: September 5, 2006 at 9:30 a.m.
Located at the 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.

Alan opened the meeting and noted that the first item on the agenda would be for Tommy to give a presentation on SCE&G's existing multi-use dock policy.

While discussing the presentation with the group, Tommy explained that the definition of a multi-use dock was a dock that would accommodate four or more watercraft simultaneously. Tommy added that under the residential dock policy they could accommodate at most four people at a common dock. However, Tommy reminded the group that they had recommended to change that number to two people at most per common dock. Tommy also noted that the terms multi-use and multi-slip could be used interchangeably.

During the presentation Tommy also discussed the general requirements of multi-use marinas. Tommy explained that when a marina greater than 10 slips went into an area, no other marinas were allowed within a half-mile radius of the facility, except on a peninsula which there is a required 3

MEETING NOTES

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

**SCE&G Training Center
August 24, 2006**

Final acg 9-20-06

mile shoreline distance between marinas. Ron Ahle asked why they chose the 3 mile distance on a peninsula rather than the ½ mile radius. Randy Mahan replied that a 3 mile distance would be far enough that keep boat traffic at a distance where the marinas would not be impacting one another.

Tommy went on to discuss common access areas. He noted that if there is a common access area in a community then they will not permit individual boat ramps in that community. After the presentation the group looked at the Lake Murray Multi-slip Radius Map. While the group looked over the map, David Hancock noted that many of the facilities on the map were in place before the criteria came out. Ron noted that when criteria is developed he believed that there needed to be something in the criteria that allows for an objection by the agencies if there is significant spawning habitat. There was some discussion on private marinas vs. public marinas. The group noted the need for public multi-slip facilities and questioned if there was a need to make special concessions for those facilities. The group discussed how this could be incorporated while still developing fair criteria. Ron Ahle suggested having a less restrictive rule that the public facility only has to be a ¼ mile from another facility rather than ½ mile.

John Frick noted that if a developer buys 3000 ft of shoreline that it may have less of an environmental impact for him to put in a multi-slip dock rather than individual docks. Tommy noted that he and David had discussed that issue and noted they have also considered asking the developer to put in a buffer in order to receive a certain amount of extra slips.

The group discussed whether or not there was a need for more recreation facilities on the Lake. Alan noted that they will be able to better understand this question with the data from the recreation studies. Randy noted that the group needed to make sure that they documented the rationale behind the decisions they made because many of the decisions would be affecting the expectations that people would have for their property. He also noted that they would be presenting the changes to the public.

As a homework item review from the last meeting the group discussed the statistical analysis of the total number of docks that could exist on Lake Murray for each 100' of shoreline. Group noted that this would be good information to keep on file while making considerations. The group then looked at the newly updated ESA data. Ron noted that he would be interested in knowing how many deeper fringeland tracts are around the lake. He noted that this would be important to know during discussions on rebalancing. David noted that in order to do that there would need to be survey work done because there is inconsistencies with the GIS information. He noted that the PBL is correct on the ground and the plats but it is not consistent with the GIS. Tommy noted that they would look into this issue further.

MEETING NOTES

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

*SCE&G Training Center
August 24, 2006*

Final acg 9-20-06

The group noted that the first set of criteria they would discuss was the criteria on common access areas. The group briefly discussed what the definition of a narrow cove should be. Ron noted that at another project they had termed a narrow cove anything “that was behind a constriction point of 300 ft or less”. There was discussion on whether or not to permit common access in coves with narrow openings. There was some agreement among individuals that this may not be an issue because there were not many areas like this around the Lake that needed to be dealt with.

The group continued to review through the criteria (criteria with group accepted changes attached below). As the group went through each one of the items they spent some time discussing how much shoreline should be required in a development for the common access area. The group also discussed how many feet of shoreline should be required for developments greater than 75 units, and if they were to include the lake front lots in that number. The group decided that the lake front lots would be included. The group also concluded that they would like to implement a minimum of 100 feet of shoreline with common areas serving more than 75 property/residential units having an additional 1.5 feet of linear shoreline per each property/residential unit served. The group noted that this would be good to have in place if there was a condominium or apartment complex built.

The group also noted that common access areas serving 10 or fewer property/residential units will meet the established existing guidelines for private docks, generally permitting up to 750 square feet in size and 75 feet in length. Common access areas serving more than 10 property/residential units may be eligible for a slip dock. This would allow a place where people could park their boat for short periods of time

When the group had finished discussing the criteria, they noted that the next TWC meeting would be scheduled for September 5th at 9:30 and they will be discussing commercial marinas.

Statistical Analysis of the Total Number of Docks That Could Exist on Lake Murray for Each 100' of Shoreline

Total Docks per each 100' lot						
Classification	Miles	ESA Miles	Feet	Docks		
Essement	385.16	39.66	2,033,803.29	20,338.03		
Future Development	101.33	40.65	535,022.40	5,350.22		
Forest Management	99.29	56.98	518,654.40	5,186.54		
75-Foot Setback	27.3	7.59	144,144.00	1,441.44		
Conservation Areas	0.71	0.71	3,748.80	37.49		
Public Recreation	32.14	0	0.00	0.00		
Commercial Recreation	5.81	0	0.00	0.00		
Project Operations	1.63	0	0.00	0.00		
	652.34	145.89	3,235,372.80	32,353.73		
Total Docks per 100' lots excluding Public Rec, Commercial Rec and Project Ops						
				32,354		
Total Docks per each 100' lot Excluding Protected Shoreline						
Classification	Miles	ESA Miles	Continuous Button Bush Miles	Shoreline Miles w/o Button Bush	Feet	Docks
Essement	385.19	39.66	-21.65	393.54	1,519,491.20	19,794.51
Future Development	101.33	40.95	-30.29	71.04	375,091.20	3,750.91
75-Foot Setback	27.3	7.59	-3.66	23.64	124,019.20	1,240.19
	513.82	88.2	-55.60	458.22	2,419,401.60	24,194.02
Total Docks per 100' lots Excluding Forest Management and Continuous ESA's						
						24,194
Current Number of Docks Existing on Lake Murray	9,500					

1994-2005 ESA DATA				
Classification	Miles	ESA Miles	Total ESA Mileage per County	
Easement	385.19	39.66	Lexington	39.49
Future Development	101.33	40.95	Newberry	51.36
Forest Management	98.23	56.98	Richland	2.92
75-Foot Setback	27.3	7.59	Saluda	52.11
Conservation Areas	0.71	0.71		145.89
Public Recreation	32.14	0		
Commercial Recreation	5.81	0		
Project Operations	1.93	0		
	652.34	145.89		
ESA Breakdown by County			Total Mileage per ESA	
Classification	County	ESA Miles		
Easement	Lexington	21.48	Wet Flats	18.09
	Newberry	9.94	Shallow Shoals	0.30
	Richland	2.03	Shallow Coves	25.75
	Saluda	6.21	Mature Upland Hardwood	0.86
		39.66	Exposed Bars	0.13
Future Development			Button Bush & Willow Flats	14.89
	Lexington	15.95	Bottomland Hardwood	17.89
	Newberry	14.04	Rocky Shores	0.10
	Richland	0.39	Water Tupelo	0.10
	Saluda	10.57	Continuous Button Bush	51.94
		40.95	Intermittent Button Bush	12.29
Forest Management and 75-Foot Setback			Bottomland Hardwood	5.55
	Lexington	1.98		145.89
	Newberry	26.88		
	Richland	0.50		
		64.57		
Conservation Areas	Lexington	0.09		
	Newberry	0.50		
	Richland	0.00		
	Saluda	0.12		
		0.71		

Updated August 23, 2006



SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
LAKE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMON ACCESS AREA GUIDELINES
BOAT RAMPS AND COURTESY DOCKS

1. Initial consultation and site inspection by SCE&G Lake Management representative.
2. County Zoning Requirements: SCE&G requires a letter from the County Zoning Administration stating that the proposed site location meets existing County regulations to construct a Boat Ramp or Courtesy Dock.
3. ~~No common access area, dock or ramp will be permitted to be located in a cove less than 200' wide measured from the 360' to 360' contour across the cove.~~ **3.**
Existing slope and water depth must accommodate ramp and dock at a minimum lake level elevation of 352'. Ramps will be constructed of reinforced concrete and may not exceed 12 feet wide.
4. No destruction or removal of **critical** shoreline vegetation growing below the 360' contour will be permitted for the installation of a boat ramp or dock. Critical vegetation includes but is not limited to species such as button bush, willows and significant hardwood species.
5. From the end of the proposed courtesy dock, there must be a minimum of 150' across the cove to the 360' contour on the opposite shore. Clearance between structures on opposing banks must be a minimum of 75 feet.
6. Common areas must be located within the confines of the proposed development with a minimum of 100' to the nearest adjoining property, or a buildable lot designated on both sides of the common area with a minimum linear shoreline footage of 100 feet.
7. All common areas must have a minimum of 100' of linear shoreline. Common areas serving more than 75 property/residential units must have an additional 1.5 feet of linear shoreline per each property/residential unit served.

Deleted: ¶
¶

Deleted: No common area dock or ramp will be permitted to be located at the end of a narrow cove area.

Deleted: Adequate

Deleted: water access required.

Formatted: Highlight

Comment: Check for consistency with verbiage in the SMP/ESA criteria.

Deleted: .

Deleted: existing

Deleted: owner

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25",
Hanging: 0.75"

Deleted: .

Deleted: All common areas must have minimum of 100' of linear shoreline.

8.

~~_____~~

Deleted: Common areas must provide adequate roads and parking area to accommodate the use of the facility by the Homeowners Association.

9.

~~_____~~

Deleted: Ramps will be constructed of reinforced concrete and generally up to 12 feet wide. Required length to be functional.

**Common Access Area Guidelines
Boat Ramps and Courtesy Docks
Page 2**

10.

Common access areas serving 10 or fewer property/residential units will meet the established existing guidelines for private docks, generally permitting up to 750 square feet in size and 75 feet in length. Common access areas serving more than 10 property/residential units may be eligible for a slip dock. waterway.

Deleted: Docks will follow the
Deleted:

Comment: Tommy/David to develop recommendations for increasing the size /slips of common access areas accomodating larger shoreline properties.

11.

All common access docks are approved for short term day use only.

Deleted: or not to extend one third the distance across the affected

Deleted: No slips or overnight docking of boats will be allowed at the Courtesy Dock.