

**MEETING NOTES**

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

**SCE&G Lake Murray Training Center  
January 26, 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      |
| John Frick, landowner                | George Duke, LMHOC                   |
| Roy Parker, LMA                      | Greg Carbone, USC                    |
| Amanda Hill, USFWS                   | Theresa Powers, Newberry County      |
| David Hancock, SCE&G                 | Van Hoffman, SCANA Services          |
| Dick Christie, SCDNR                 | Kim Westbury, Saluda County          |

---

**HOMEWORK:**

- Tommy Boozer – To coordinate with Orbis on meeting dates

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**      **February 7, 2007 at 9:30 a.m. Joint Meeting With  
Recreation 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.*

**Discussion on Proposed Fringeland Management Prescriptions:**

Alan opened the group and noted that the first item for discussion was a review of the Land Management Prescriptions drafted by Tommy Boozer. Tommy began to discuss these proposed prescriptions with the group and noted that they were drafted in reference to future development property. Tommy explained that he included examples of what would be categorized under each prescription. There were five initial categories that future development lands were proposed to be classified under:

- Development Property
- Limited Development Areas

- Protected Areas (subsequently re-named Natural Areas after discussion)
- Recreation Areas
- Prohibited Access Areas/Project Operation

The group began by discussing Development Property. Tommy explained that under the current license, the FERC allows SCE&G to sell property with restrictions. Tommy further pointed out that these restrictions include the dock guidelines.

The group discussed the guidelines for Limited Development Areas. Tommy noted that the only problem with this classification was that there was no incentives with limited development multi-slip docks. He pointed out that one option was that they could require the property owner to make the setback an equal 100 ft all the way around. In regards to this, Bill Argentieri asked the group what would keep future property owners maintaining 100 ft setback natural. Tommy replied that the owner would have to deed the additional land (the land that makes up the 100 ft) to SCE&G. Tommy noted that in the past they have worked out ways to issue a dock permit when the setback is less than 75 ft. However, Tommy noted that in the future, the property owners would have to give up some of their land to make the setback continuous in order to receive a dock permit.

Tommy began to describe to the group that there were many small areas along the shoreline that are an acre or less. He explained that they would want to protect those located in the backs of coves, however he noted that he did not believe it made sense to preserve small parcels that are located between two parcels that have already been sold down to the 360'. The group agreed.

The group discussed Protected Areas and decided that it would be more appropriately named Natural Areas. The group discussed whether Forest and Game lands would be included under this category. Ron Ahle noted that he believed Forest and Game management lands would only be appropriate under the Natural Areas category if the lands were left in their natural state and not harvested. Subsequently, the group decided that Forest and Game Management lands be best placed under Recreation Areas.

The group talked about the possibility of having a process that they will use to evaluate where lands should be placed or categorized. Dick Christie noted that he believed the TWC would be a good forum in which to evaluate lands that do not fit well under the Forest and Game management category.

The group then moved on to discuss Recreation Areas. Tony Bebbler noted that Commercial Marinas, which was originally listed under Recreation, should be moved to developed areas. The group agreed

As an aside, David Hancock pointed out that the value to the individuals involved primarily came down to whether the property was eligible for a dock. He noted that the rebalancing process may be expedited if the group simply chose how many docks should be put on Future Development fringelands and where they should be placed. He explained that the other Future Development areas could be placed under a conservation easement. The group noted that this may be something that is worth considering.

There was a bit more discussion on the Land Classifications and the group expressed that they were satisfied with the document and the changes that were made.

#### **Economics Scoring Criteria:**

The Economics group took some time separate from the group to greater develop their scoring criteria. The economics group then presented their more thoroughly developed criteria, however, the natural resources group remained concerned that there were too few scoring factors (the economics group had 5 scoring factors). Ron suggested that some of the categories be broken down into several separate scoring items. He noted that having more categories would heighten the scoring sensitivity. The TWC adjourned and the Economics group met again prior to the TWC meeting in order to separate out some of the categories. Attached is the amended criteria that the economics group developed. The benefits categories was separated out into the economic interest of the local governments, SCE&G, and the back property owners. Location was also separated out into several categories. Ultimately, the group concluded the meeting with 10 separate items from which to score lands from the economic perspective.

Economics Group Scoring Criteria for Future Development Lands:

1. Economic Interest (Local Government) – Property Tax Revenue, Recreation, Economic Growth

5 High  
3 Medium  
1 Low

2. Economic Interest (SCE&G) – Land Sale (value), Recreation, Environmental (ESA)

5 High  
3 Medium  
1 Low

3. Economic Interest (Back Property Owners) – Lake Access, Dock Permit, Developmental Potential

5 High  
3 Medium  
1 Low

4. Proximity to Utilities (water/sewer/etc.)

5 Existing  
3 Planned  
1 Not suitable

5. Proximity to Road Access

5 Existing and adequate  
3 Minor improvements needed  
1 Major improvements needed

6. Proximity to Amenities (Fire Protection/school district/groceries/medical care etc.)

5 1-5 miles  
3 6-10 miles  
1 >10 miles

7. Direct water useability and topography for boating

- 5 year round (12 months)
- 3 6-12 months
- 1 <6 months

8. Market Value (Value Assessed per County)

- 5 High Range 100-75%
- 3 Medium Range 50-75 %
- 1 Low Range < 50%

9. Size/width

- 5  $\geq$ 125 ft Depth  
>1 acre
- 3 75-125 ft Depth  
0.5 – 1 acre size
- 1 <75 ft depth  
<0.5 acre

10. Dock Qualifications

- 5 Unrestricted
- 3 Limited (Deck, multi-use)
- 1 Does not qualify

# STRAW MAN

## SCE&G

### FRINGELAND MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS

#### Development Property

Fringeland under the development category is generally available for purchase by the adjoining back property owner subject to the FERC License regulations.

#### Guidelines

Property identified for development will allow individual, shared, multi-slip docks and community access areas. Development areas will maintain a non-disturbance vegetated Buffer Zone 75 feet and/or 100 feet from the 360-foot contour elevation inland. A 10 foot wide meandering path will provide access to docking facilities. The Shoreline Management Plan dock restrictions and requirements will apply. Project property would only be sold down to the 100 foot Buffer Zone to qualified back property owners. [Note - SCE&G will consider exchange of land to make a continuous 100-foot non-disturbance vegetated Buffer Zone where fringeland is less than 75 and/or 100 feet wide.]

#### Limited Development Areas

Fringeland under the limited development category is generally available for purchase by the adjoining back property owner subject to the FERC License regulation with additional restrictions applied based on environmental impact, aesthetics, accessibility, shoreline density, and fish and wildlife habitat.

#### Guidelines

Property identified as limited development areas will allow individual, shared, multi-slip docks and community access areas but with additional restrictions.

- Individual dock would require a minimum of 200 feet along the Project Boundary Line to qualify for a dock permit.
- Shared dock would require a minimum of 150 feet per lot to qualify for a shared dock permit for a total of 300 feet for one shared dock. Maximum participation in a shared dock permit will be two (2) property owners.
- 
- 75 and/or 100-foot Setbacks passive recreation
  - Multi-slip dock requires 100 feet of shoreline for a maximum of ten (10) slips per 1000 feet. (no incentives)
  - Multi-slip dock must be a minimum of 150 feet from adjoining property.
  - A minimum distance of 500 feet across a cove, measured 360 to 360.
  - One (1) 10 foot wide access path will be allowed through the Buffer Zone to access the multi-slip dock
  - Multi-slip dock must be a minimum of 50 feet from an Environmentally Sensitive Area.
  - No individual docks will be permitted within a multi-slip dock development.

- Community Access, Boat Ramps, and Courtesy Dock minimum of 300 feet on Project Boundary Line. Setback restriction as established for Community Access Areas by Land and Lake WTC will apply.

#### Natural Areas:

Fringeland under the protected category preserves the environmental, cultural, historical, fish and wildlife habitat and natural resource values of the Project.

- ESA Areas continuous and intermittent
- Forest Management Areas – leave here or place under Recreation Area??? [look into re-defining Forest Management criteria if we leave this classification here.]
- Conservation Areas
- Unique Habitat Areas (such as Bomb Island – Purple Martin significance)

#### Recreation Areas:

Designated Recreation Areas that provide the general public access to the waters of Lake Murray. SCE&G public access areas, existing and future, identified on FERC Recreation Plan for Lake Murray, Exhibit R. .

- Existing and Future Recreation Sites
- SCE&G owned Islands
- Impromptu Areas
- Forest Management Areas – move here or keep in Natural Area???
- 

#### Prohibited Access Areas/Project Operation

Unavailable to the Public

- Powerhouse Intakes
- Dams
- Spillway
- Tailrace