

MEETING NOTES

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

**SCE&G Lake Murray Training Center
January 17, 2007**

final acg 2-21-07

ATTENDEES:

Alison Guth, Kleinschmidt Associates	Bill Argentieri, SCE&G
Ron Ahle, SCDNR	Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt Associates
Steve Bell, Lake Watch	Tommy Boozer, SCE&G
Tony Bebber, SCPRT	Carl Sundias, Southshore Marina
Randy Mahan, SCANA Services	John Frick, landowner
Joy Downs, LMA	Synthia Williams, Lexington County
Amanda Hill, USFWS	Wayne Beam, Beam & Associates
David Hancock, SCE&G	Van Hoffman, SCANA Services
Dick Christie, SCDNR	Kim Westbury, Saluda County
Regis Parsons, landowner	Linda Schneider, landowner
Ellis Harmon, landowner	Sherri Armstrong, Lexington County

HOMEWORK:

- Van Hoffman – Further develop definitions on scoring criteria for economics group
- Tommy Boozer – To coordinate with Orbis on meeting dates and to further develop proposed land classifications

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: **January 26, 2007 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 group and there were introductions of the new individuals. Bill Argentieri announced that SCE&G has just introduced the lower Saluda River page on the company's website. He gave a brief website demonstration to the group and illustrated that the website included many features and information related to Project operations. After the website demonstration, the TWC broke off into the two land rebalancing subcommittees (Natural Resource Values and Economic Values). During this period, the separate groups worked on finalizing their land rebalancing work plans.

After lunch, the groups then met together to discuss their respective workplans. The economics group began with a discussion by Kim Westbury from Saluda County. She described the economic value of lands surrounding Lake Murray to the county. She noted that she also had discussions with Capitol City Lake Murray Tourism, the county assessor, and the county auditor who noted that the land values are worth a substantial amount of money to the county. The tourism board alone was impacted by over 16 million dollars yearly. Kim also stressed that Saluda County was the only one of the four counties without an interstate, subsequently making Lake Murray a huge economic development tool for them.

Van Hoffman then discussed some monetary figures specific to Lake Murray and noted that a large percentage of the available future development fringelands will be reduced due to the expansion from a 75 ft setback to a 100 ft setback. Van also explained that the group has developed 5 values from which they will evaluate the land parcels during rebalancing. These items include:

- Benefits - can be described as benefits to the county, SCE&G, area economy, and property owners
- Location - includes proximity, amenities, infrastructure, view, water depth, and topography
- Fair Market Value - described as price per acre or per square ft
- Size/Width - described as the dimensions of the fringeland
- Dock Qualifications – policy based

Van explained that there was probably going to be the need for alternatives to be considered with regards to land rebalancing. He noted that these alternatives could include such items as trade-offs, or the setting aside of a percentage from the sale of fringelands to be applied toward non-development conservation easements along tributaries.

Van discussed how the land parcels will be scored according to the criteria. He noted that they will each receive a score of a 1, 3, or 5, 5 being excellent, 3 being moderate and 1 being poor. Several individuals noted that they would like to see the scoring method further defined with specific criteria behind the numbers. The economics group noted that they would work on this and present this information at an upcoming meeting.

The natural resource group then discussed the workplan that was developed for their evaluation of future development lands. There was brief discussion on the general process of evaluation. It was noted that some of the evaluation criteria was very qualitative and there may be disagreements for the scoring. It was further explained that if a significant disagreement occurs, the disagreement will be noted and placed in the parking lot and the decision of the majority will be chosen for the time being. Ron Ahle noted that the DNR has already met internally to mark areas of concern on maps of the Lake. Ron added that he would bring these maps to the evaluation.

Ron presented the natural resource values (attached to end of notes) to the group and noted at the current time the group feels that each criteria should have an equal weight. Ron further explained that some parcels may not rank high in the total score, but may have a specific feature that is very significant. He noted that these parcels would be flagged so that the group could know to still consider them.

Ron briefly described each of the values to the group beginning with Fish Spawning and Nursery Habitat. He noted that they will look at the amount of this type of habitat in front of the fringelands, and that it was commonly associated with the elevation 354' and higher. For Length of Shoreline Ron noted that typically the longer the shoreline, the higher the value to natural resources. Ron

explained for Mean Width of Fringeland they will consider the average width and they would also give consideration to the habitat from the 358' to the 360'.

Ron continued to go through the definitions and noted that they combined the originally separate Unique Habitat and Threatened and Endangered Species categories into one. He explained that this was a sensitive criteria that will help to separate the excellent sites from the good sites. He also noted that a factor entitled Terrestrial Habitat that considered land for wildlife species had been added and was measured by acreage.

The group also reviewed the scoring factors for each of the natural resource criteria. Ron explained that some of the criteria is based on quantitative measurements, and other things such as waterfowl hunting will be more of a qualitative measurements.

The group generally agreed with the Natural Resource Values workplan and began to discuss how scoring would take place. It was noted that each group would begin by evaluating the parcels on the north side of the lake and work their way around. The natural resource group will evaluate the lands first, and the economics group will use the same excel sheet and numbering as the natural resource group uses. It was explained that this method would allow for land parcel number consistency between the two groups. The natural resource group would also combine small lands where they felt necessary and indicate on the excel sheet what lands were combined for use by the economics group. Ron also noted that the excel sheet containing their scoring criteria would contain a column specifying which lands are not worthy for ranking.

The group concluded the discussions on land rebalancing and Tommy Boozer briefly informed the group on proposed new land classifications for consideration. He noted that these few classifications would simplify the many classifications that currently exist. These proposed new classifications include: Development, limited development, protected/sensitive area habitat, and recreation.

- Development – would include the dock policies
- Limited Development – may have large minimum shoreline length requirements for a dock
- Protected/Sensitive Habitat - would include areas such as ESA's
- Recreation - would include commercial and public recreation sites

The group agreed that they liked the ideas that Tommy presented and Tommy noted that he would work up a more complete set of definitions for discussion at the next meeting. Steve Bell noted that it would be important to point out that the protected areas would still be available for passive recreational activities.

There was some discussion on Two Bird Cove. Some individuals felt it important that the Lake and Land RCG collectively request that the FERC remove the Special Recreation Area classification from Two Bird Cove and Hurricane Hole Cove, but specify that this would not entail any restriction of current recreational uses. It was decided that an RCG meeting would be arranged in the next few months where all of the parties involved (SCE&G, land owners and yacht club) be invited to discuss this issue.

The next meeting date was scheduled for January 26th at the Lake Murray Training Center. At this meeting there would be discussion on the Economics Scoring Criteria, proposed new land use

definitions, and the uses of the fringeland. Tommy will coordinate with Clarence from Orbis in order to schedule dates for land rebalancing. The preferred dates for land rebalancing were February 26th and 27th.

Group Adjourned

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
Division of Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries
Environmental Programs Office

MEMORANDUM

To: ISF TWC
From: Ron Ahle
Date: 12-22-06
Subject: Criteria for evaluating natural resource significance for fringeland.

Resource Value Factors

Fish spawning and nursery habitat

This factor evaluates the amount of near shore lake bottom associated with fringeland that provides substrate and water depth needed for fish spawning and nursery habitat. The relative abundance of this type habitat will be used to evaluate this criterion.

- commonly associated with elev. 354' and higher

Length of shoreline

The logic for this criterion is the longer the shoreline the higher the natural resource value.

Mean width of fringeland

The logic for this criterion is the wider the fringeland the higher the natural resource value.

Waterfowl hunting opportunity

This factor evaluates the amount and quality of near shore waterfowl habitat and the shooting restrictions pertinent to each County. If little or no waterfowl hunting opportunities exist, a poor ranking is given. If only some opportunities exist because of marginal habitat or proximity to a residence, a moderate ranking is given. If most or all of the fringeland shoreline is available for hunting and suitable habitat exists, a best ranking is given.

Regional importance

This factor evaluates the fringeland resource value based on regional land uses. For example, a small tract surrounded by development would have a low rating while a small track connecting two conservation areas would have a high rating. Another example would be a medium size track in a largely developed area could have a high rating because of a lack of natural habitat in the region. A moderate ranking can occur when a medium sized tract occurs in an area that has some development and some forest management.

*the width is measured perpendicular to shore line
additional consideration will be given for the lands
below the 360'
358-360' calculated by dividing
area by length*

~~Aesthetics~~ → LAND USE

Aesthetics, from a natural resource perspective, is reflected in the amount of "natural habitat" present on a given fringeland tract. The scoring criterion for this factor is based on the more natural cover the better. Natural cover will generally consist of mixed pine/hardwood, hardwood and bottomland hard forest.

Natural forest is best

Recreational values

This factor looks at fringeland from a public recreation perspective with an emphasis on low impact recreation such as hiking, birding, fishing and picnicking. Considerations in evaluating this factor include land-based accessibility; shore fishing opportunities, proximity to other recreational areas, trail linkage and length, and wildlife viewing potential. If a tract has little or no opportunity for recreation, the fringeland is considered restricted and receives a low ranking. If the tract is unrestricted from a recreational perspective, it receives a high ranking.

Adjacency

This factor looks at adjacent land use with the idea that building upon adjacent natural areas is more desirable and establishing natural areas adjacent to other lands uses is less desirable. For example, a fringeland tract that is surrounded by residential development on one side and commercial development on the other would be considered isolated and would receive a low ranking. A tract that is surrounded by forest and game management would receive a high ranking.

Environmentally sensitive areas including conservation areas

This factor evaluates the amount of environmentally sensitive areas and conservation areas associated with future development fringeland. The relative abundance of this type habitat will be used to evaluate this criterion.

Threatened and Endangered Species

This factor evaluates the amount of habitat for threatened and endangered species and recognizes known occurrences. If a fringeland tract has unsuitable habitat with no occurrences, the tract is considered to have low value for endangered species. If the tract has suitable habitat with known occurrences, it is given the highest ranking.

Unique habitats

Unique habitats have a fairly low occurrence along the shoreline of Lake Murray. Some unique habitats that may be encountered include Piedmont seepage wetlands, gum swamps, old growth hardwoods and beaver ponds. The relative abundance of these types

↑
combined
↓

of habitat will be used to evaluate this criterion. Because of the rarity, the relative abundance scoring criteria are lower than for the other habitat criteria listed above.

Scoring Criteria

Fish spawning & nursery habitat

- < 10% ----- poor (1)
- 10% to 30% ----- good (3)
- > 30% ----- best (5)

Length of shoreline

- < 300 feet ----- moderate (1)
- 300' to 1000' ----- good (3)
- >1000 feet ----- best (5)

Mean width of fringeland

- < 100 feet ----- moderate (1)
- 100' to 250' ----- good (3)
- >250 feet ----- best (5)

Waterfowl hunting opportunity

- Little or None ----- poor (1)
- Partial ----- moderate (3)
- Good ----- best (5)

Regional importance

- Low ----- (1)
- Moderate ----- (3)
- High ----- (5)

Aesthetics

- < 25% natural ----- moderate (1)
- 25% to 75% natural ----- good (3)
- 100% natural ----- best (5)

Recreational values

- Restricted ^{Limited} ----- moderate (1)
- Partially restricted ----- good (3)
- Unrestricted ----- best (5)

Adjacency

- Isolated ----- (1)
- Connected on one side ----- (3)
- Connected on both sides ----- (5)

Environmentally sensitive areas including conservation areas

- < 10% ----- poor (1)
- 10% to 30% ----- good (3)
- > 30% ----- best (5)

Threatened and Endangered Species

- Poor habitat w/ No records ----- low (1)
- Suitable habitat w/ no records ----- good (3)
- Suitable habitat w/ known occurrences -- best (5)

combined



Unique habitats

- < 5% ----- moderate (1)
- 5% to 20% ----- good (3)
- > 20% ----- best (5)

Terrestrial Resources
measured by
acreage

REMBERT C. DENNIS BUILDING * P.O. BOX 167 * COLUMBIA, SC 29202
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-2728 * FACSIMILE: (803) 734-6020