

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
Cultural Resources RCG**

**S&ME Offices
March 2, 2007**

Final acg 3-29-07

ATTENDEES:

Alison Guth	Kleinschmidt Associates
Bill Argentieri	SCE&G
Bill Green	S&ME
Wenonah Haire	Catawba Indian Nation
Sandra Reinhardt	Catawba Indian Nation
Randy Mahan	SCANA Services
Ken Styer	S&ME
Rebekah Dobrasko	SHPO
Heather Jones	S&ME
Kristen Seibert	S&ME

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.

Bill Green opened the meeting and the group proceeded with introductions. He then presented the group with a PowerPoint he had prepared on the Stage 2 progress of the Cultural Resource Surveys.

Green explained that during their Stage 2 surveys they surveyed 125 of the 129 islands on Lake Murray and approximately 85 miles of shoreline along Lake Murray and the lower Saluda River. Green explained that only 2 of the 7 islands on the lower Saluda were investigated. He noted that some areas were not investigated because of either inundation; the areas were outside the Area of Potential Effects on the lower Saluda, or the inability to obtain landowner consent. Green pointed out that a geomorphologist determined that there was no Project effect erosion on the lower Saluda below Mett's Landing.

The group reviewed the initial findings of the Stage 2 investigations. Green explained that:

- 156 archaeological sites and 42 isolated finds investigated.
- 136 sites and 42 isolated finds recommended ineligible for the National Register.

- Three sites recommended eligible for the NRHP. 17 sites recommended potentially eligible for the National Register.
- Lake Murray Dam and Complex already eligible for the National Register.

Green also focused on the types of sites investigated and explained that they had found 96 Pre-contact sites, 44 Historic sites, and 16 sites with both Pre-contact and Historic components. The group discussed the areas in which the sites were located and it was noted that many of the sites are clustered around the upper end of the reservoir. Ken Styer pointed out that this may be because it is closer to the original river channel.

The group then began to discuss each of the significant sites individually. The group viewed the site 38LX526, and Green noted that it was occasionally inundated, however there appeared to be no noticeable erosion to the site. The group discussed the significance of this site and it was noted that it contained a 19th century family cemetery. Bill continued to review the significant sites and pointed out that site 38LX531, located on the lower Saluda River, was the most remarkable site found. He explained that this site contained artifacts ranging from Late Paleoindian through Mississippian Periods (ca. 11,500 – 800 B.P.). It was noted that only part of the site is owned by SCE&G, as it is almost 12 acres in size. The remainder of the property is owned by 3 other private individuals. Only one of the private owners has allowed more intensive sampling on their property. Green explained that artifact retrieval from this site would be tricky because it had artifacts close to the surface, as well as deeply buried. Green noted that there was erosion occurring at this site so future data recovery or stabilization would be needed.

Green continued to explain the other sites that were found along the LSR and Lake Murray. Many of the culturally significant areas contained relics dating from the Late 18th through the early 20th centuries. Several, however, contained pre-contact, Early Archaic, Middle Archaic and possibly Mississippian artifact scatters. A few of these sites were recommended for stabilization or Phase II testing. The Amick family cemetery was briefly discussed. Heather Jones explained that there are 5 marked burial sites and 6 unmarked burials located on this property. It was pointed out that this site was not located far from the original site of the Amicks Ferry. In reference to the sites that were experiencing some erosion, Randy Mahan asked if this was due to natural occurrences or as the result of Project operations. Ken S. responded that the only sites discussed were those that were being impacted by the Lake.

After the group completed their discussions regarding the sites, they began to discuss the next steps the group needed to take. Green explained that they would first submit a draft report on their findings to SCE&G and then to the other consulting parties. This step as well as those following it are listed below:

- Submit draft report to SCE&G for review (anticipated mid-March 2007).
- Submit draft report to SHPO, THPO, and consulting parties for review (late March or early April 2007). Submit final report once review is completed.
- Prepare Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP).
- FERC prepares Programmatic Agreement (PA).
- Implement terms and conditions of the HPMP and PA, including resolving adverse effects.

- Prepare public information component for the project.

Bill Argentieri asked if the RCG members would be commenting on the HPMP. Green noted that they would be commenting on it informally through the RCG. Green went on to explain the Action Items, which are listed as follows:

- Develop a plan for resolving adverse effects occurring at the site 38LX531.
- Create a list of categorical exclusions in conjunction with the Operations and Lake and Land Management RCGs.
- Develop general recommendations for inclusion in the HPMP.
- Schedule Next Meeting

Rebekah Dobrasko asked when SCE&G anticipated sending the license application to the FERC. Argentieri responded that they would be sending the draft in no later than August of 2008. Argentieri then asked if the HPMP had to be part of the license application. Green noted that it was not required to be a part of the application, however the process ran smoother if it was included.

Mahan noted that he would like to further address the issue of the non-participating property owners at site 38LX531. Randy continued to explain that if an individual plans on developing their property, they may run into some issues if they don't address the cultural aspect of it. Green noted that he would provide Randy with the names of the individual's attorneys so that Randy may contact them for further discussions on this issue.

The group then began to discuss the need to develop a plan for site 38LX531. Green noted that SCE&G could choose to either begin data recovery or stabilization of that area. Green then began to explain what would be involved with data recovery. He noted that they would test a sample of the site, recover the artifacts from the sample, and prepare a data recovery report. Green continued to note that once agreement had been reached on data recovery methods, they would commence the data recovery process. He then explained that it was not required that this be done until after relicensing, however it would be better for the resource if it was done before. Argentieri noted that they would need to have some discussions with their engineers for estimates on stabilization. Argentieri further noted that he was leaning toward the data recovery option. Green replied that SCE&G would fulfill their obligations under relicensing by performing data recovery and then subsequently placing a conservation easement on portions of the property if one did not already exist. Green also suggested that because this was such a large data recovery, it could possibly be used for mitigation for other less significant sites. Green noted that he could submit a data recovery plan and proposal to SCE&G to approve and then to the group for formal review. Argentieri noted that he would also check internally to discuss whether or not a conservation easement already exists on the property and with Bill Marshall to see where the Scenic River Easements are located.

Discussions then turned to developing a list of categorical exclusions for the HPMP. Green explained that this was a list of tasks that SCE&G can perform without having to contact the SHPO. Argentieri noted that he would get together with Green to review categorical exclusions developed for other projects in order to develop a list for Saluda. A draft list of exclusions will be issued to the group for review. Dobrasko noted that the most recent project that they had developed a list for was Catawba Wateree. Wenonah Haire added that ground disturbance was what they were to be

notified about at the Duke projects. Green pointed out that in the HPMP they would include an instruction manual for dealing with the culturally significant sites. Green added that he would recommend inspecting the sites every two years.

The group briefly discussed safety issues and signage at the Project. Argentieri noted that they have sirens on the lower Saluda River and a website that provides generation information. Haire asked about bilingual signage at the park sites. Mahan noted that some of the signs were bilingual, while other were not. Haire noted that this was mainly important at the larger sites.

The group concluded their discussions and Green noted that at the next meeting they would begin to discuss in more detail what to include in the HPMP. The group decided that the next meeting would occur on Thursday, July 12 at 9:30 in the S&ME offices. Green concluded by noting that he would have a proposal regarding data recovery at site 38LX531 prepared in the next month or so.

Group adjourned.