

SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT RELICENSING
FERC Project No. 516
Quarterly Public Meeting
July 31, 2008
9:00 o'clock A.M.

Produced by:
Capital Video
405 Timberpoint Court
Columbia, S.C. 29212
(803) 781-6747

and,

Transcribed from recorded cassette tape of Proceedings
by, Annette B. Gore, Court Reporter
Irmo, S.C. 29063

Public Meeting Opened by:
Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt and Associates

Presentations by:
Randy Mahan, South Carolina Electric and Gas Co.
Tommy Boozer, South Carolina Electric and Gas Co.
David Hancock, South Carolina Electric and Gas Co.

Comments and Questions from the Public

PUBLIC MEETING:

MR. ALAN STUART: Good morning, I want to welcome everybody to our Quarterly Meeting. We have got a pretty busy agenda this morning. Just wanted to get everybody up to speed with an agenda. Tommy Boozer, Randy Mahan, and David Hancock are going to give a presentation on the land rebalancing proposal that has been discussed within the Technical Working Committee. We will also have time for questions. I do ask that you write down your questions and hold them til the end; there is a lot of information here, and I am afraid if we don't hold the questions until the end we will never get through the proposal. So, there will be plenty of time at the end for questions. Also, there will be opportunity for other comments with respect to the relicensing. Just to give you an idea, the rebalancing proposal was a joint effort within the Lake and Land Management TWC. A little background on the TWC, it includes twenty members from State agencies, non-governmental organizations, and homeowner groups. We convened over forty meetings; generated in excess of 225 pages of meeting summaries; 1100 e-mails; and expended over 7000 man hours through this whole process. With that I am going to bring Randy up first to give a background on Lake and Land Management issues around the Lake.

MR. RANDY MAHAN: Good morning. I am sure glad to see the crowd today. I am Randy Mahan, I am Associate General Counsel at SCANA Corporation. I think the only reason they asked me to come up is because I am one of the folks that has been around here a long time. I participated, actually I was with the State Attorney General's Office back in the early 1970s when there was a proceeding going on in Washington at the then Federal Power Commission. It was Docket Number E-77-94. It had to do with Lake Murray. And Lake Murray for whatever reason was selected by the Federal Power Commission to be the poster child for dealing with a shoreline and water quality, and other issues other than generating electricity at hydro projects. Just happened to be at the right place at the right time. One of the outcomes from that proceeding, which by the way started I think in 1972, and we got an Order in 1979. So, seven years worth of proceedings. And a Final Order in 1980 was the requirement that SCE&G develop a shoreline management plan. Really the first time any Federal --- or, any of the Federal Power Commission license hydro electric projects had to put in place something that looked at more than just generating electricity in a very deliberate way. And since that time, by the way, SCE&G and Project 516 have held a special place in the hearts and minds of the folks of the FERC; we probably get more attention on these issues than almost any other project.

We are lucky to be able to try out the first of any new things

to be done. So, here we are years later. One of the issues that has come up since that first Order in 1979 and the Final Order in 1980 that required SCE&G to develop a land management plan is the idea that we need to have this deliberate approach. And then if you will look around at what has happened in shorelines, not just at Lake Murray, but other projects around the nation after the Federal Power Commission back in the '60s allowed the project owners to start selling any excess, quote, "excess properties" they had around these projects. We started hearing this thing called "Cumulative Impact and Rebalancing". Didn't know really what it meant, and I am not sure even today if you ask someone from the FERC to come sit down and define exactly they mean by rebalancing that they could give you a really clear idea. But, I think probably in our project because of the time we have spent in this relicensing, we probably have as good an idea as anybody else about what we are trying to achieve, what we can't do, and what we haven't been able to do, and probably aren't going to be able to do in essentially to go back and turn back the clock in regards to properties that have been sold, developments that have been put into place around the projects for years. What we can do and to rebalance, is rebalance our focus; re-focus on how we deal with the properties around the Lake and the shoreline management activities around the Lake on a going forward basis. Now, one of the reasons that SCE&G, when we started this rebalancing or relicensing project, and

rebalancing put a moratorium on certain activities such as selling land and so forth is because we understood that we can only do the things that are a forward looking. We need to make sure we kind of put a place holder so that we don't keep going down perhaps the wrong path, or the path we were going down before, before we put these new processes and these new ideas in place. And we have caught a little bit of heat about not selling property and not allowing additional marina applications, and things of this sort; but when we drew that line in the sand, it says, "Okay, those things that had already been in place and already had applications for, we are going to process. But going forward, let's wait and see what we come up with through this great effort that we have going on, that we were planning to have going on, and we have conducted in terms of rebalancing how we do things going forward." Now, most folks think almost entirely about land sales and land use when we think about rebalancing. But it also involves things like what standards are we going to use for permitting docks? What kind of activities are we going to have and limit around the Lake? Not just the sale of land, but rebalancing also means rebalancing again that focus in terms of how we do what we can as the owners of property to control what goes forward. So that is what we are really talking about today. A lot of it certainly has to do with

rebalancing in the sense of what we are able to sell, what we are not going to sell, what we are going to set aside and

protect, what limitations are we going to put on things that can be done. And then, of course, there is going to be other things that relate to, again, the management of those properties that we retain and the management of properties that we allow to be sold. So, that is where we are. It has not been an easy task. I will say there have been many hours of very frank, open, occasionally angry, occasionally frustrated, occasionally laughter filled sessions, in which we talked about these issues. But I think everybody involved, to a man, to a woman, has been focused on the idea that what we are trying to do is look forward, balance how we approach what we have left up there in terms of land, what we have left up there in terms of our ability to control what happens at Lake Murray for us, and for our children, and grandchildren, and so on. Because, what we are looking for is a license period that will go from between 30 and 50 years. And while there will be opportunities during that time to step back and take a look, and make some mid-course changes, we really would like to try to get it right to start with. We think we have got a pretty good plan. Some folks say, "Well, it can make everybody mad, then you must have it just right."

We'd love not to make anybody mad, and we don't think we will, when sure there is going to be some who are going to be less happy than others. Some who will be a little more

disappointed than others. But I hope you get the flavor from what you will hear today that there has been a great effort to

try to take into account all of the issues, all the concerns, all the interests that have to be balanced when you try to do something as big as this, and you are trying to do it for so many years to come. You want me to go ahead? All right. I can read, too. Okay, one of the things we are doing is we are going to be proposing to protect from residential and commercial development to the extent we can protect it by not selling it. About 9,198 acres, in terms of the 600-plus miles, 650 miles, of shoreline around the Lake, we are talking about 185 miles of that that we are going to have in a protected classification where you are not going to see that development. Okay, I am going to turn it over now to David Hancock.

MR. DAVID HANCOCK: Good morning, everybody. I am David Hancock, I with SCE&G Lake Management Department. We are going to talk a little bit about project and non-project land. And Lake Murray to the FERC as most of you know is known as Project 516. And what we talk about project lands are those lands that are around Lake Murray, there is a PBL line, Project Boundary Line.

And we are talking about all of the lands from that project boundary line down to the Lake. And the most important part we are going to talk about are our current project land, which

is we have got different classifications for those lands. The main one we are going to be talking about is future

development land. That is the land that SCE&G still owns from the PBL down to the high water mark that has not been sold at this time. And those lands in that classification total about 90 miles of shoreline. And really that's about the only land that we are talking about that we can rebalance. And we are going to talk about the management plan for those remaining lands; we are going to talk about recreation properties, that's another classification that is part of the Project 516.

And we are going to talk about within the recreation, we are going to talk about project and non-project land. When we talk about non-project land, that's those lands above the project boundary line. We are going to talk about the Lower Saluda River lands that SCE&G still owns; and this is from the Dam down. We are also going to talk about non-project lands that South Carolina Electric and Gas owns that are large tracts and they are outside the PBL, and they are adjacent to --- in most instances they are adjacent to the PBL, and that is going to be mostly on the Upper Saluda around Lake Murray.

Re-balancing project lands, SCE&G future development. And, you know, Randy has already gone over, "Where did we start from?" Well, years ago before the license that Randy was talking about people bought that fringe land, that property from the PBL down to the high water mark. A lot of the original folks that were around the Lake called it buying their water rights. And they would buy the property down to the high water mark, which we had the authority to sell. And

then in 1984, with the 1984 relicense, we wound up with a 75 foot setback imposed on any future sale of land. So, the FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, imposed a 75 foot setback on all property that SCE&G sold from that day forward. And that setback was to be imposed on anyone who retained ownership of that property; and that basically, when somebody, a back property owner came up and wanted to develop their property, then we would sell them what fringe land would be available to sell; and then we would retain that 75 foot setback in front of their property. And most of the time they would come to us for a dock, or whatever, at that time. So that is kind of where we started with the project, and we got classification. There is one classification called Forest Management Property. And that property is in a classification that we manage the timber on that property, and sometimes it is just sitting there. And that property cannot be developed. So, we have some existing shoreline of that, also. I am going to show you what we call our current management prescriptions for all the land within the project boundary line around Lake Murray. And under our current management prescription, you see that top one, that is the 75 foot setback. So, since 1984 in the 75 foot setback, we have 253 acres, and approximately 30 miles of shoreline. So, we have basically since 1984 sold 30 miles of shoreline. And if you look down where it says

"easement with 75 foot setback", about halfway down, that is what we actually sold since 1984, 299 acres. There are some

causeways, there is four acres in causeways, 1.23 miles; commercial recreation, there is 114 acres, 6 miles; natural areas, this is something relatively new, it's kind of evolving as we talk, at one time it was called a conservation area; the DBA areas in coves where typically there were EFAs are, environmentally sensitive areas, and currently we have 42 acres in that, and 1.57 miles; easement property, easement property is property with SCE&G either never owned or we sold down to the 350, and that total is 7944 acres, and 386 miles of shoreline. I have already explained what the easement with 75 foot setback is. There's no shoreline miles associated with that because that's at the 75, the very top. But that's the acres that we actually sold above the 75 foot setback. So, pretty much long time, 24 years, we have only sold 300 acres roughly. As far as management land, we have 3570 acres in that, and 100 miles of shoreline; and that's the property I was talking about that would not be developed. Now, we can't control in most cases if there is a back property owner behind that forest management land, what they do with their property, that's outside the project.

The future development lands is what we are going to be discussing a lot today. Currently we have 1800 acres and 90 miles of shoreline. Project operations, we have 1057 acres and 1.63 miles, and that's typically the Dam. Public

recreation, we are going to talk a lot about public recreation today. We have got 755 acres and 37 miles of shoreline.

That's where we are currently with all of our management prescriptions. What I am going to be talking about right now, the rebalancing of basically four classifications. And those four classifications are natural areas, forest management, recreation and future development. Natural areas, we are talking about putting an additional 464 acres in the natural areas, 21 miles of shoreline. Forest management, we are talking about another 206 acres, and 9 miles of shoreline. Recreation, we are talking about putting in 189, almost 190 acres, and 9.26 miles of shoreline in recreation. And that's a sub-total of 859 acres in additional acres in some type of protection, and 39.73 miles of shoreline. Our future development property will go from 1818 acres down to 958 acres, and 51 miles of shoreline from 90 miles of shoreline. And again, that's property that we own from the project boundary line down to the 350 in front of somebody else's property.

And this is how the management prescription was changed. The ones that are highlighted are the ones that are basically going to be changing; and I am kind of emphasize on that.

The only one that is not highlighted is future development, and that's white. But anyway, the natural areas are going from 42 acres to 550; forest management is going from 3570 to 3776 acres; and public recreation is going from 755 to 955;

and our future development acreage is going from 1818 down to 958. Remembering that if we sell any future development land,

that 958 acres includes the 75 for setback. So, we really would not be able to sell 958 acres, it would be less than that.

And, putting them in perspective with miles of shoreline, the same ones changing, conservation areas or natural areas, are going from 1.57 to 22.58. Forest management from 100 miles to 109 miles. Public recreation 37 to 47. And future development 90 to 51. Our total miles of 655 miles along the shoreline. And Tommy is going to get up, and we are going to talk, but he is going to talk about Lake Murray recreation and the Lower Saluda River.

MR. TOMMY BOOZER: Good morning. I'm Tommy Boozer with SCE&G Lake Management. And we are going to be talking a little bit about the recreation facilities that exist on Lake Murray, and also some of the recreation that we are going to be proposing to put in around the shoreline of Lake Murray, and some other projects that we are going to be trying to implement. Okay, recreation we are going to talk about is existing recreation. This can get kind of confusing because we are talking about existing and then proposed, and want to try to make it as clear as possible for everyone. But right now we are going to talk about existing public parks, and these are parks that already exist and are in operation, and people use them on the Lake every day. We have got existing future park sites. These are sites that we have set

aside for future development, that have already been set aside in our Exhibit R with FERC, that's our recreation plan, that are just sitting there waiting to be developed when the time arrives. Also, we are going to talk about our islands in Lake Murray and their benefits. We are going to talk about existing Lower Saluda parks that there are some parks on the Saluda River right now that exist. And then we are going to talk about the new future recreation sites. These are the sites that we are proposing to put in recreation during their rebalancing. We are going to talk about Lake Murray parks inside and outside the project. The Lower Saluda River, and then we are going to talk about some non-project tracts that are outside the project boundary line. Currently the existing parks we have got, we have got 14 parks; and these are all operational on the Lake, and they are located in different areas around the shoreline of Lake Murray. They have different facilities at them; boat launching areas, picnic tables, rest rooms. And all of these are being used right now on Lake Murray. We have got 412 miles, almost 413 miles, of acres and 14.8 miles of shoreline as they exist right now. The existing future sites are sites that are just set aside for recreation. We have got 252 acres, and we have got 9.12 miles in this category. And this is property that is out there for recreation now. We have got 62 islands on Lake Murray with 100 acres, and 13.81 miles. The 100 acres in the islands, we had some discussion about that. What we classify

as an island is it has to be above the 350 contour. There's a lot of islands that are below the 350, but people can also use and recreate. All of the islands that SCE&G owns on Lake Murray are in our recreation program and are open to the public for public use. The Lower Saluda River, we have got hope there, which is Meetze Landing off of Corley Mill Road. We have got the Saluda River to new sites, which is off of Gardendale. And we also have Saluda Shoals Park with 160 acres. Saluda Shoals Park is a lot larger than 160 acres, but SCE&G leases the Irmo Chapin Recreation Commission 160 acres of SCE&G property to create the Park. So, we have got a total of 165.7 acres, and 1.36 miles. This is what exists today in the SCE&G recreation plan. These are the sites that we will be proposing for recreation. There is 14 sites, and 7 of these sites are new sites, and 6 of these sites will be an expansion of an existing site. And you can kind of look at the acreage on it, and one of the things to look at on this is we have got acres outside the PBL and acres inside the PBL. The acres inside the PBL is the future development properties David was talking about. That's one of the 348 parcels, and we are placing that property inside of the PBL and putting it into recreation. In addition, in some of these sites, 6 of these sites, we are looking at adding property outside the PBL. So that property that we will be adding to these recreation facilities as far as the relicensing will be brought inside the PBL whenever we file with FERC. So, this gives you and

idea. We are proposing for 658 acres outside the PBL into recreation. We are going to also rebalance the future development property and put in recreation of another 250 acres, and 9.3 miles, almost 10 miles of shoreline. And this is what we are proposing to do in recreation. Now, one of the things I want to mention, we will have this presentation on the website, the relicensing website; and this is kind of a condensed version because I have got slides for all these, everyone of these, on the presentation. But to kind of conserve a little time we are going to just pick a couple of them to give you some examples of what we are proposing to do.

This one right here is Sunset, it's in Saluda County. The original park, and I hope you can see the original park was right here; it was 2.3 acres, had 640 feet of shoreline.

We are proposing to put 7.88 acres of property inside the PBL; and also, we are going to put 22 acres proposed outside the PBL. And you can see this is inside the PBL, and all of this is outside the PBL. So, we will end up with this park of a total of 31, almost 32 acres at this park. Newberry County, excuse me --- no, that's Saluda County. Trying to mess me up here. That's Saluda County. And it is going to have almost 3000 feet of shoreline, which is pretty significant coming all the way over through here. So, really the significant thing about this park is right now that exists and we are proposing

for the whole --- for all of this. So, another one that has been, I think a lot of people have talked about it in the

past, a lot of discussion during the relicensing was maybe to have some type of State park on the Lexington side of the project. Well, the Saluda County and Lexington line comes about right through here. This is Rocky Creek. And what we are proposing to do is put 102 acres inside the PBL, and also then put another 546 acres outside the PBL, all you see in red would be included into this project. So, this park would be 648 acres, with over 5 miles of shoreline on the Lake. And so, this is the recommendation that we are making to the Committee and also to the Recreation Committee to do this. Okay, in summary, when we go back and kind of recap what we talked about, existing recreation was 412, existing future recreation 252, islands 100, recreation Lower Saluda River is 165.

So, we have got a total right now of 930, almost 931, acres, and almost 39 miles. And what we are proposing to do to add this additional recreation in --- of the 853 acres, and then 55 acres on the Saluda River. So, we will have a total of 1839 acres in recreation, and almost 49 miles of shoreline on Lake Murray would be put in recreation. And the rebalancing part, of course, would be this right in here, facing the future development property and reclassifying it from future development to recreation. One of the things I wanted to mention, which I think is pretty significant on Lake Murray,

is that right now we have got Villager Island State Park which is 348 acres, and we have got 12 miles of shoreline, one of

the nicest State parks in the state of South Carolina that SCE&G leases to the South Carolina Parks and Recreation Tourism Group. Also, we have got Saluda Shoals Regional Park that SCE&G leased 160 acres to create this park, 1.3 miles on the River. We are proposing the Rocky Creek State Park, which is 648 acres, and 5 miles. And then we have got Bundrick Island, which is 88 acres, and we have got about 2.23 miles of shoreline. So, those are pretty large tracts when you put them altogether. You have got 1324 acres, and about 20 miles of shoreline on the Lake. So, all of this would be in either a State park or Regional Park.

Okay, the Saluda River property. On the Saluda River, SCE&G has got some tracts on the Saluda River that we are proposing to change from just property that we own --- (Off the record) But, we have got 14 tracts on the Saluda River. These are inside the project, and they total 275 acres, plus 45 acres already in the scenic river that SCE&G put in the scenic river program about ten to twelve years ago. To bring the total of these tracts to 320 acres. Now, the map that just fell, we will put back up, and I will have one on here, too. And you can kind of take your time to look at it. These are just tracts that SCE&G has owned over the years, and we made the decision to put all these tracts, and they all are adjacent to the River, to put them in a recreation classification. There

are no plans to develop into recreation, but recreation is a good protective classification to put these properties in. And, you know, they will be there if the need ever arises to do any type of recreation development there. This is just a list of the tracts and their acreage. And right now there is the existing scenic river easement is 45 acres. And that is part of these tracts right now. And that is something that SCE&G did with DNR a good many years ago. But the total of what we are looking at, the total protection on the Saluda River will be 540 acres, and 5.8 miles of shoreline that SCE&G would be protecting on the Saluda River.

This might be a little hard to see; but this is Saluda Shoals where we are right now. And we have got some small tracts located along --- this right here is landing on the other side, Number 1 there. Then we just go down the River, and you can kind of see the tracts and what is going to be protected in the recreation. And like I said, we have a hard copy that you can probably see a little better. The other thing that we are doing is that SCE&G also has 24 timber tracts, totaling 2754 acres. These tracts are scattered around all in the upper end of the region of the Lake. And they are different sizes. Some of them are pretty significant in size. And so what we are proposing to do is to lease these tracts to the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources for the life of a license. And that could either be 30, 40, 50 years. With the lease to DNR, if DNR chooses they could put them in their

Wildlife Management Program where they are open to the public for hunting, or for hiking, or whatever they want to do. But they would be open to the public, but they would be leased for the full term of the license. And this is just a list of the tracts. Now, one of the things to remember, the property on the Saluda River that we talked about putting in the recreation is inside the project. But these tracts we are talking about, the 24 tracts we are talking about, are outside the project. Most of them, all except one or two, adjoin the Lake or adjoin the fringe land.

So, they are associated with the project, but they are outside the project boundary line. And this is just kind of going through kind of showing you some of the locations of where most of them in the upper end, this is the Little Saluda; then we go on up, and the other ones are in the Big Saluda area. We have got some air photographs if some of you would like to see them. We have got them on this table over here, if you want to roll them out and take a look at them. But those 24 tracts would be leased for the term of the license. All right, Sunset is in Newberry County, unless they have moved the County line recently. The rebalancing summary: future development land, and this is kind of --- we are going to kind of bring all of this together. And of those future development lands, again we are talking about the natural area, the forest management, recreation, and future development. And you can see what it was before, and you can see which each one of them

are going to be laid out after the proposal takes effect. And then the miles and the miles after. And remember, we started out with future development lands of 1818, and they are dropping down to 958. Non-project land, the recreation land, the four rebalancing were zero outside the project. We are going to bring inside the project 658 acres. We are going to lease to DNR 2754 acres. The will remain outside the project.

That's 3412 acres total on that. On the Lower Saluda River, recreation, we currently have 195, it is going to be 470. The scenic river acreage, which has been there, is not changing. And that brings a sub-total of 265 and 540, and the miles will not change on the Lower Saluda River. And the rebalancing summary on the acreage, here is what we call protected acreage basically on Lake Murray, with natural areas we are going to have 506 forest management 3776, recreation 955. And you see the non-project land, the ones that are going into recreation leasing to DNR, and the Lower Saluda River 540. And you can see what the sub-totals are. And all four of those added up for some level of protection is 9190 acres, almost 9191 acres.

And converting that to miles, we are looking at 185 miles of shoreline, basically looking at 180 miles of shoreline on Lake Murray that will be in some level of protection; and 5.8 miles on the Lower Saluda River. And what have we heard for 2 1/2 years?

This next section that we are going to be talking about is, you have heard about how we are planning on

rebalancing the property and changing different classifications, and putting it in the natural and the recreation. And this portion of the presentation is going to be talking about how we are going to manage that property in the future. What is left? That's 51 miles of property out of the 90 miles that's left in future development, how is it that you are proposing to manage that property as we go into the future? Some of the recommendations, during this relicensing process we have talked about a lot of things. And we have heard a lot of things. And, you know, we discussed a lot of things, and a lot of times people think we don't really put the emphasis on maybe something that is important to someone in particular. But, there are so many things that we have discussed, and everything; but we wanted to make sure. We heard what people are saying, and we took as much into consideration as we could and applied it to this plan, and also applied to the presentation that David and I have made so far. One of the big issues that a lot of people are concerned about is the increase of the size of the lots on Lake Murray. Also, multi-docks and individual docks. And you will hear a little bit more about this as we go on. Non-disturbance buffer zone. That's the buffer zone that was established in 1984. It was managed a certain way. Any future property that we fill, the buffer zone will be managed a little bit differently. Establish a full 75 foot buffer zone. And what we are talking about there is, if you remember how we were explaining earlier, you have got the project boundary line which

is the PBL, and you have got the high water mark, which is the 360. In between that area right there, that is the fringe land.

When we sell any back property, we retain that 75 feet. In some places the PBL might not be but 50 feet. And so, in those instances where people are looking to try get a dock, they would have to consider if it's worth it to them to deed SCE&G that 25 feet to make this a whole 75 foot.

And so, that is what we are trying to do is to establish a consistent 75 foot. Because, in some places the PBL could be 125, in some places it could be 25 or 50. So, what we are looking at is to try to get a consistent 75 foot setback all the way around the future development property. Establish natural areas, if you remember what David was talking about, we have established natural areas, and we are putting a good bit of property in this classification. With development, we have been to PBL. We will talk a little bit more about that. Protect additional forest management, recreation land, I feel like we have done a pretty good job in rebalancing and putting the future development into recreation and forest management. Management and related future development property under restrictive and protective plan. That policy is for forest management lands. We had a lot of discussion about this, and it is one of the classifications that you saw on the first slide

was forest management. Well, we have got right now over 100 miles of shoreline in forest management. And some of those

larger tracts, we are looking to coming up with some type of plan that may allow one dock to the individual who owns property behind SCE&G's forest management classification. And so that is something that we worked pretty hard on. Hunting, by participating with DNR in the WMA Program, hope to be the larger tracts that we are proposing to put in the upper end of the Lake. We will provide some hunting and recreation opportunities for the project in those areas.

Also, there is shoreline in the areas around Lake Murray where a lot of people do hunt water fowl. State Park, on the Lexington side of Lake Murray, you know, we feel like the 600-and so acres for the Rocky Creek, should set aside that need. Project property on the Lower Saluda River, the tracts that we are setting aside and putting new recreation provide additional recreation properties on Lake Murray and the Lower Saluda. We talked about that. And updating and improving existing parks. And this will be part of our license requirement, and we are looking right now and doing some evaluations of existing parks to see what we need to do to bring them to maybe update the standard, and improve rest room facilities, and do some paving. So, once we receive our license, it will be like a five or ten year plan that we will start updating these parks. The plan that we are talking about, the plan that we are proposing, there again I would recommend that you go on the website and look at this in a little bit more detail because we have kind of shortened it a little bit to try to make sure that everybody

kind of understands, because it's a pretty lengthy plan. But, this is for SCE&G's land sales and dock permitting on future development property. That is the approximately 51 miles that is left in the future development classification. This plan does not apply to any other property. It does apply to the easement property. If you remember looking on there, it was about 380 acres of easement property where people own down to the 350. It does not apply to that property. It does not apply to the property that people bought in 1984 with the setback. This plan would only be applied to any future land sales that SCE&G would do. And I guarantee you somebody will ask me does that impact my property? The phone calls have been coming. There is your plan, applies to the remaining SCE&G on fringe land property on Lake Murray; allows SCE&G to continue with fringe land sale, reflects the agency and committee interest, promotes protection of the environmental scenic values of the property. We will go through this, and I am sure some folks are going to have some questions when we get through, and we have got plenty of time to answer them. So, I will just kind of go through each one of these things. The plan would keep the current 75 foot setback requirement; allow sales of fringe land greater than 75 feet to the back property, and with deed restrictions; maintain environmental protective deed restrictions for all purchased fringe lands; non-developed and vegetation management restrictions included included in each deed; purchaser must acknowledge that they understand the deed

restrictions before generating any permits, or granting any permits for the shoreline amenities such as a dock or a path. We want to make sure everybody understands what they can do and what they can't do. Permits and shoreline amenities will continue to depend on other conditions, you know, for exact permits. There are certain areas that we can permit the VSAs, and vegetation, that wouldn't allow docks to go in. So, they have got to meet basically the current criteria. Also, uniform 75 non-disturbance buffer. That's what I explained a little while ago when we were talking about trying to get a consistency, as I can remember, around the shoreline on this property. Back properties who own, the owners, who have less than 75 feet in depth to the 350 contour would be required to deed SCE&G so much of their property to create a uniform 75 foot deep buffer. Now, of that I got ten or fifteen calls from people saying, "Do I have to put 75 feet of my property in a buffer zone in order to get a dock?" No, it only applies to any future sales, not the easement property on the Lake. What are the conditions that SCE&G will consider to looking at the property, and if they meet all the other terms of the dimensions and requirements, we would issue a dock permit to those individuals. What we are looking at now, we are going to talk about three classifications here. We are going to talk about multi-slip docks; we are going to talk about common docks; and then we are going to talk about individual docks, and also a community access dock. And this is the plan.

And if you go back on the website, you will see we have got some distance and restrictions; but this is just a baseline for us and what we are proposing. And we are talking a little bit more about this and some of the regulations in the Working Technical Committee. But, what we are looking for on this thing, you know, most slip docks will be required in lieu of individual docks. And what we have heard a lot of times from a lot of folks, and from DNR, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and a lot of the different groups, instead of impacting 1000 or 2000 feet of shoreline with docks every so much footage, why not go ahead and make the impact in one area, and put a multi-slip dock in there? And then the rest of the shoreline would be left natural. That is one of the things this plan will promote. And what we are proposing, 1 1/2 slip would be approved for each 200 feet of property along the PBL. And I will give you an example of this in a second. And then one 10 foot wide meandering path would be allowed through the buffer zone to access the multi-slip dock. This is a good example I kind of sliced it from the Lake and we will work our way back up. This is the 350 contour right in here. Okay, this is the 75 foot setback, this is a non-disturbant setback. The only clearing in this setback will be a 10 foot wide meandering path. This right here is approximately 75 foot back to the PBL. This is the property right in here that SCE&G would sell to the back property owner. This property right here would have deed restrictions. There will be no development, no structures, no permanant structure would be

allowed to be built in this area. They would be allowed to do limited brushing. Right now it is kind of removed something like 3 inches in diameter in the vines and different things like that. But there would not be any clearing, major clearing; there wouldn't be any houses encroaching in here. This plan is proposing that there will be no structures or no houses inside the existing PBL on this property. The example here, if it's 800 feet they would be allowed based on you would have four lots in here, and each one of those lots would qualify for 1 1/2 slips. And so that would come up to 6 slips that they would have. These blocks right in here would have access to this multi-slip dock right here. But there again, this would be a non-disturbance, with only the path. They would purchase this property right here, but they would have to build - and we are talking about the homes, we are talking about out buildings, we are talking about drain lines, anything would have to be above the PBL. You are still keeping common docks in; and in order to qualify for a common dock, each one of the lots must have a minimum of 150 feet on the project boundary line. This gives you an example, this is a property owner, and this is another one, and they both have got 150 feet, we could put a common dock in right here between them. Everything else stays the same; deed restrictions, limited brushing stays the same, non-disturbance stays the same right here. So, on this right here what the goal is is to try to get as much separation between the docks, in this case we ought to give at least a minimum of 300 feet

between the docks. Individual docks, and this is one of the things that you really kind of have to understand the fringe land because we can't just say blanket everybody has got to be in a multi-slip dock because we have got some criteria here about multi-slip docks. So, there's a lot of small fragment in here of future development properties where they might not have but 200, 300, or 400 feet. So, we need some type of regulation to work with those individuals. Not all of the tracts are 500, 1000, or 2000 feet. We have got some larger tracts like that. Those tracts will be required to go into the multi-slip. But on these smaller tracts, we have come up with the individual docks, and they have to have 200 feet measured on the project boundary line. Fringe lands that have less than 400 feet measured on the PBL may qualify for an individual dock. They still have to meet certain criteria and certain standards. Also, the fringe lands that exceeds the 400 feet would be required to participate in multi-slip docks. But, you know, there is always exceptions, and this is just a base rule, base guidelines, we are looking at. You know, if somebody comes and he may own it, and he may want to buy 1000 feet and put one house on it. So, I mean, we have got to have some leaway to work with the folks, and their different situations. With this way, we keep this in, we would rather see the multi-slip where possible; but in the areas that have less than 400 feet we will work with the individuals on individual docks. This is just an example of individual docks. The house structure will be back here, and deed restrictions,

limited brushing, all of this would be enforced in here. And this would be enforced by South Carolina Electric and Gas Company as part of the deed restrictions when we sell that property to that property owner. Then, of course, the non-disturbance. And one of the reasons we went with the non-disturbance is since '84, and you have got to kind of understand what happened. In 1984 basically that 75 foot was a setback. And over the years that 75 foot has grown into a vegetative setback, and in a more protected setback. And we were having trouble kind of monitoring what everyone was doing. You know, you have got a good portion of shoreline here, and somebody takes a tree here this year, and a tree here next year, and then after ten years, you know, it's not many trees there. So, what we are proposing, go ahead and just put a non-disturbance where it will be easy to recognize if there is any problems, and the folks' access will be the meandering path coming down here to the Lake. We also looked at a community boat ramp, a common access area. They have to have 300 feet measure on the project boundary line. Qualification for a community boat ramp will be heavily influenced on what kind of impact it is going to have to that buffer zone. Because we are talking about putting a ramp to the buffer zone, and we are also talking about putting a walking path. So, if it's good, wide open, with big timber, you won't have a problem; but if they have to go in there and take a lot of trees out, that might not be the best location, so we will work with the individuals on that.

But we will be following the coming process. This just kind of gives you an example. We will allow the area right here to croach inside the purchase property. But the only thing down through here would be some type of hard surface ramp and the meandering path. And it would only be one meandering path. And the reason we left this like this, because somebody could come in here and have different kinds of property development beyond the PBL. So, we realize that we are not just going to be dealing with individual residential lots. A couple of other things we talked about is the buffer zone. It will be a non-disturbance buffer zone except for the clearing for the path. No clearing of trees, or shrubs, or vegetation will be allowed. We will allow the single 10 foot wide path meandering access to permitted docks. And we are talking right now about what kind of surfaces we will allow to put in these paths. Path must not encourage erosion, and must protect the aesthetics of the shoreline. Trees larger than 8 inches in their size will not be removed; and the Lake Management Representatives will work with the property owners to lay out these access paths. So that is kind of where we are, that's what we are proposing, and how we are proposing to manage the remaining SCE&G plan. Ground rules for questions.

MR. STUART: Just to let everybody know, we do have a videographer here who actually tapes and records the meetings we have. So, in the interest of trying to maintain some order in here, please follow all the rules, unruly behavior. In other words, we don't even need to touch on that I don't think. No personal cracks, be respectful. Wait til we recognize you to ask your question. If you will, Alison will be walking around with a microphone. It is a dead mike, you won't hear it project like you do with this one. It is actually for the videographer. So, please speak clearly and project your voice so we can hear up here. State your name and the organization you are with. If you are an individual homeowner, simply say that. We are going to limit one question per person, per being recognized. That is not to say you can't ask another question later on, but just to keep the thing moving and make sure everybody at least gets an opportunity to get something in, we are going to do that. So, we are here as long as you want to this morning, so fire it away.

MR. BOOZER: I just want to make sure everybody knows we will be here, we'll be glad to answer any questions they have.

MR. STUART: Not literally fire away, but ask any questions you have.

MR. BOOZER: We must have done a pretty good job.

MR. STUART: Yes, sir.

MR. HORACE COLBY: I want to know where Sunset is.

MR. MAHAN: It's a road called Sunset Road.

MR. BOOZER: I do want to make one --- I don't think it's a clarification, to make sure everybody understands this is what is being proposed right now by South Carolina Electric and Gas Company as a result of all of our interactions with the groups and so forth. This does not mean that our friends in Washington might not have a different idea, and they may end up doing something different, requiring something different from what we have proposed. Okay? So, just wanted you to understand. If everybody says, "This is wonderful," we send it in and it comes back looking like a camel, which was a horse put together by a committee, you will understand that it is not necessarily because we asked it to be changed. Okay? And it also makes it important for you if you have got issues, and you don't think we are dealing with them properly, please, feel free to submit your comments to the FERC when they put the matter out on notice to give you that opportunity to do it.

MR. JOHN FRICK: I am John Frick. I am a back property owner. I have got a comment and a question. The comment is the proposal as it is presented will cost Newberry County \$300,000,000 over the next thirty years in lost tax revenue. And it will cost Saluda County \$330,000,000 over the

next thirty years. That's my comment. Now, for the question.

Explain to me how with the restrictions we have on properties in future development, how the Forest and Game Management properties that are supposed to be better protected, those properties won't have a 75 foot buffer. They can be developed right down to the shoreline, high density of whatever. Explain to me how the properties that were designated Forest and Game Management without the knowledge or approval of back property owners, how those properties are better protected in future development.

MR. BOOZER: We are not going to sell Forest and Game Management property.

MR. FRICK: I know that. But the property behind that can be developed high density. There is no incentive not to do that. So, those properties are supposed to be protected but yet they will have less of a buffer, and they won't have any of the deed restrictions, or anything that you have for future development. I think the law of unintended consequences will come into play because the program the way it is currently, you know, being designated is not sound. You would be better off putting everything into future development, and putting the deed restrictions on it, having the 75 foot buffer which would not be adverse to the Counties or the back property owners than what you are doing.

MR. BOOZER: We appreciate your comments.

MR. FRICK: Do you want to respond to it?

MR. BOOZER: We have very limited ability to control what anyone who owns property, back property, does on their property. Basically the only control we have is through the dock permitting process. Okay? If somebody wants a dock, there is a little quid pro quo, they may have to agree to some things they might not otherwise. If they don't want to buy our property, they don't need to buy our property. Okay? They can do what they want on their property. Now, with regard to Forest and Game Management, we are talking about allowing perhaps one, it is now just going to be Forest Management and no longer be called Game Management. We will allow a single dock, okay? I don't see that as an incentive to get into high density development any more than any other situation around the Lake. So, again, I respect your comment. May or may not disagree. I am not an urban planner and so forth; but we can only do what we can do, which is to control by virtue of our ownership of the strip of land between the back property and the Lake. And that's all we can do.

MR. HANCOCK: I just want to clarify one thing, talking about Forest Management property and the project boundary line. The project boundary line varies in width, even on Forest Management property. It may be smaller in some areas, and it may be larger in some areas. It could go from 10 feet wide to 200 to 300 feet wide in area. And it varies around the Lake, and it varies on each piece of individual property that is out there.

MR. LOUIE DAVENPORT: I am Louie Davenport, and I am President of the (inaudible) Sub-Division Homeowner's Association. And mine will be first a comment and then a question. I don't think there is anything that deteriorates the Lake faster than raw sewage running into it. And I know the County controls the septic tank issue. But are y'all having any dialogue with the County and trying to get the restrictions a little bit tighter to maybe help that problem?

And the other question I have is why would SCE&G develop ten or twelve lots out next to the ramp -- I mean the park at Hilton? I believe you labeled it 1-7. Develop ten or twelve lots and the sewer was within .5 of a mile, and you put septic tanks there. And everybody --- not everybody, but a lot of people out there are already having troubles with septic tanks. And then for y'all to turn around and do that, I don't understand that. It seems to me you would have run that sewer .5 of a mile to solve that problem.

MR. BOOZER: That sort of the thing you hear right there by Hilton, the park side. And every one of those lots work perfectly for septic tanks.

MR. DAVENPORT: But your concern is quality of the Lake, it would seem to me you would have run that .5 of a mile.

MR. BOOZER: No, we are not --- I don't want to get into a debate with what you say the septic tanks or sewer. If you have read the paper, we have got a real problem with fuel

in the Saluda River right now coming from a major fuel spill.

But, and your other question was asking us do we have any dialogue with the County. Not currently, we don't. We do deal with the developers when they come in to develop lots and shoreline, doing the shoreline development. But most of the developments that we are dealing with right now that have any significant size do have sewer and water as part of their amenities. But as far as any direct contact with the County, we do deal with the Counties on certain restrictions and buffer zones, and you know, with Lexington County here specifically with what they have done here in the past with some of their regulations. But, we kind of leave that up to the County to police that.

MR. BOB KEENER: Bob Keener, with the Lake Murray Association. I would like to make a unpaid commercial for the Lake Murray Association, our concern about the septic system.

The Lake Murray Association is conducting monthly water tests from twelve sites the Lake because we are concerned about the water quality. And we are getting samples to check to see if there are problems with septic system leakage. DHEC takes just a few sites; we are checking a lot more, we are checking back in the coves. So, support the Lake Murray Association if think that that is something you need to be concerned about. The question I had was, I noted on Shore Road, or Shull Island rather, there were 22 plus acre sites there with no shoreline, that's on future recreational use.

The question is, how do you all envision that being a future recreation site since there is no water access?

MR. BOOZER: That area you are referring to on Shull Island was put in recreation many, many years ago as part of our initial recreation plan back in the '50s. And there were some plans at that time to maybe have some type of recreation facilities there for the people in that community.

We have tried to lease that to the Lexington County Recreation Commission; they wanted to put some tennis courts and things like that out there to provide some recreational opportunities for the folks in the community. But those folks didn't want any kind of development out there as far as tennis courts or anything like that. So, I see George laughing over there. And it is just property that was set aside in probably what we will end up doing with that piece of property, we have got it there, we talked about maybe some overflow parking for the existing ramps. But right now we have no plans. It's just going to stay in recreation. The property adjacent to that is in Forest Management, and there might be something we will look at to change that from recreation to forest management. But it is just property sitting there, just like we referred to all those other future recreation sites that we have got that are being classified, they are just sitting there. If the Recreation Commission came to us and said, "Hey, we would want to maybe do something out there," it's property that we can work with them there.

But we have no plans of doing anything with that piece of property.

MR. HANCOCK: To clarify one thing on the future recreation sites and everything, you know, there is no development plans on each one of those future sites at this time. And, you know, the sites that we have set aside for future recreation, you know, the Federal Regulatory Commission could come up to us and say, you know,

"We may look at it every five years, or whatever." And you know, depending on the need for a specific area, or whatever, that's when those type things will be looked at.

were having a discussion a minute ago about how many multi-slips, or how many lots might be put in, or whether a lot of lots could be put in, a multi-housing. Do you see any situation around the Lake at all that would give you a large number of multi-slips? What would you say would be the largest multi-slip docks you would put in?

MR. BOOZER: Would you repeat the question.

Can't hear.

MS. DOWNS: Okay. My name is Joy Downs, I am with the Lake Murray Association. And my question is, based on your current knowledge of the back properties and what could be developed into, you know, lots of houses, or condos, or whatever. What would be the largest number that you foresee

of your --- Of multi-slips that could go into any one area.

MS

MR. BOOZER: You are talking about on the fringe land that we would --- the future development?

MS. DOWNS: Yes.

MR. BOOZER: Well, you know, based on the, you know, the plan that we are proposing is, you know, it requires for a hundred foot lot, and for each --- excuse me, two hundred foot lot, and they would get 1 1/2 slip per lot. So, it would take a significant amount of shoreline. We used some examples, probably you are looking at 40, maybe 40 slips; if it exceeded that, it would probably be broken up into a 40 or a 20, or 30, or something like that. But it would still have a significant distance between those slips.

MS. DOWNS: Of course, our concern is that anything as large as 40 slips could be maintaining those docks; and you know, that has always been a concern with this organization that there would be --- it wouldn't be properly monitored as it is in a commercial situation where, you know, DHEC will be in it and everyone else. So, how many of those do you think would ever happen on Lake Murray?

MR. BOOZER: That is hard to predict. There is property out there that could accomodate, you know, some marinas of that size. But, you know, still if they would come in with a marina that size they are still going to have to do the five year water quality monitoring before we put them in.

So, it's going to be some checks and balances on that if there is a water quality issue. And also, the other thing that we

need to look at is that if it's over a certain limit, maybe --
- you know, we will consider putting in some type of sewer
pump out system, you know, for marine sanitation device. But
we could do that.

MS. DOWNS: That would be good to put in some kind
of a pump out situation if you have that many docks.

MR. BOOZER: Right. Right now if it is below 10, I
think in the plan we require above 10 that they would have to
put one in. But, you know, right now it's hard to figure, but
what we try to do on this is kind of break it up where
--- of course it depends on where it would be located, how far
they are across the cove; if they are on open water channels,
the water wouldn't be nearly as bad as if they were back, you
know, in a sheltered area. So, those kind of things would be
determined during the planning process.

MR. HANCOCK: Joy, to kind of put it in
perspective, the way it is right now, individuals could have -
-- if they bought fringe land, and they had 100 foot lot, say
they had 1,000 feet and each lot would qualify for a dock,
that's 10 individual docks. And the possibility that those 10
individual docks, 20 boats. And this would actually cut down
on the number of boats on that same amount of shoreline.

MS. DOWNS: Well, if that is true, we ---
(inaudible - noise - no microphone)

MR. HANCOCK: Well, if you kept up with the
Paradise Cove, and you have seen the SCEA on that, and you see

the restrictions that FERC is going to be applying to those type docks, I think you are just going to see that gets tighter and tighter with each one of the applications.

MR. STUART: Any other questions on the land rebalancing proposal, or any of the information that Tommy, David, and Randy went over?

MS. JOHN JAKES: I didn't see any reference made whatsoever in this to commercial docks. Are you going to address commercial docks? John Jakes, Lake Murray docks?

MR. BOOZER: This type of section is just for the rebalancing. You know, we just --- this is the future development property, and how we --- what we are proposing to rebalance on the Lake. The Committee has discussed commercial docks and we have come up with the new criteria for that. And we just discussed this a little while ago, we are planning on making a presentation on all the new comings here in the next couple months. But we will go over all that. It's good for the web page, and look on there and you can go back and see some of the things that we discussed. Really we have got it broken down into two. We have got it on easement property, you know, what's --- people owns it at 350 as far as commercial companies, and then the commercial company that owns the setback, and also we are looking at two different classifications. We are looking at what we call a true public marina, with opening to the public. And there are certain criteria for that in the event it's going to be some other

parcel project going on, and then following a more restrictive classification.

MR. STUART: Any other questions? Any questions not related to the presentation that we have gone over this morning on the relicensing in general?

(No response)

MR. STUART: Okay. You are going to have the eight second rule, and they take that as seven, so ---

MR. BURT WELLS: My name is Burt Wells, just an individual property owner. But I was thinking about this water quality issue that is going to be coming sometime down the road, you are going to have septic tank problems. Eventually there is going to be more and more sewer lines around the Lake. What is SCE&G's take on that related to the buffer area? Would a sewer line be allowed to go through a buffer area? Would it have to be outside?

MR. BOOZER: No. We would not allow anything to go through the buffer area. And, like I mentioned earlier, we wouldn't allow sewer lines, if somebody has a septic tank, we would not allow the lines to go into that buffer zone area. So, we very seldom --- I am trying to think right now about we work with some developers. And, you know, traditionally around the Lake we run into problems with sewer leak. They put the sewer about a foot above the 350, or two foot above the 350, and then they pump it, the sewer line. And then they pump it to the lowest part. And then they have got a lift station that

takes it back up to the main pump line. That's where you have the problems, when you lose power and, you know, it's right adjacent to the shoreline, that's when we have seen some sewage getting into the Lake. But one good thing about this proposed plan we are talking about, is that all the development will be behind the PBL. So if they have septic tanks, your drain it can be a minimum of 150 to 200 feet from the Lake. So, that would help out.

MR. WELLS: Well, the reason I was --- we asked it, I am thinking more about the fringeland that was sold between 1984 and now.

MR. BOOZER: Well, how soon ---

MR. WELLS: I've can envision some problems, and to get some gravity flows to them, to give it back to the existing town.

MR. BOOZER: Well, we have got situations where when we first started there were septic tank lines that were allowed to encroach into that buffer zone. You know, ten or fifteen feet. But still that's got seventy-five feet from the water. And, you know, --- and I noticed a lot with the model, disagreement about septic tanks and paying the sewer, but, you know, sewer is a double edged sword. You know, it may help you a little bit with the fuel, but it's going to increase the density two or three times than a normal just regular septic tank would be. So, you know, it's kind of a trade off on some of this. But, you know, water quality is very important to

SCE&G. You know, we are going to do whatever it takes to protect the water quality in Lake Murray. And we will meet in discussions issues, we could attend and see if it becomes a major problem.

MR. BOB KEENER: Bob Keener, Lake Murray Association again. First is going to be for you, Allan. So we have been having these quarterly public meetings. I believe that about next month sometime we are supposed to be having -- or, y'all are supposed to be having a report go to FERC. When is the next quarterly meeting, and what is that going to cover? And you going to have the meetings more frequently, public meetings prior to the submission to FERC.

MR. STUART: It's about a two point question there. We have to file the Final Application to FERC by August 31st. Our intent is to file it around August 24th to the 25th, which I think is a Monday, to make sure we get it in on time. There are a number of unresolved issues, and the Technical Working Committees will still continue to work. We have contacted FERC and let them know we have developed a schedule for them, and we anticipate trying to have all the agreements, and mitigation measures finalized and submitted to the FERC along with the license article by June of -- no later than June of next year. As far as additional public meetings, I know we had discussed with SCE&G people of having one for the shorelight management plan, because there's a number of changes that are in that. As far as other items, we

have not gotten any integral questions from, you know, the public that would, you know, encourage us to have another public meeting. I don't think they are opposed to having other quarterly public meetings during that process; but I think we need some substance to basically needing one. Any more questions?

MR. KEENER: I guess what I think I heard is that this is probably the last public meeting then.

MR. STUART: Originally this was the last quarterly public meeting scheduled. Again, with the development of the new shoreline management plan there has been some discussion of potentially having one to unveil that, and try to inform the public, educate the public, on the new changes that may happen after all.

MR. KEENER: This has been a good forum. I think it's been a good opportunity; the thing that has disturbed me and I think a lot of others that are here, the unbelievable apathy that has been demonstrated by the community. I cannot understand it, just cannot comprehend it. We deserve whatever we get, that's all I can say.

MR. JIM CUMBERLAND: Jim Cumberland, the Coastal Conservation League. I wanted to follow up this gentleman. A question, a clarification point with Tommy about where sewer and/or septic lines would be allowed to run. We have the development lands. We have got the thirty-five foot setback, which will be a no disturbance zone. Clearly they would not be

allowed in there, as you said it. And then we have the distance between the back edge of that 75 foot setback in the PBL, which is a limited clearing zone, which I understand from our discussion, there will be some sort of control over that. Will septic lines or sewer lines be allowed in that area?

MR. BOOZER: No.

MR. CUMBERLAND: Okay, thank you.

MR. BOOZER: That's why I said, as you know sewer lines are inside the PBS.

MR. CUMBERLAND: Okay. No septic tank fields inside the --- great, thank you, I wanted to clarify that.

MR. STUART: I add to that, I think we are still continuing discussions within TWC; we are defining what other permanent structures will be disallowed in that area as well. We have discussed things as dog kennels, things like that. So, those discussions are continuing.

MR. JOHN FRICK: I am John Frick, I am a back property owner, and I would like to address the issue of apathy. It is not apathy. Most property owners around the Lake have no idea what is being done to them. They have no idea how their land is classified; they are never notified; and the only time they find out how their land is classified or if the classification has been changed when they go to try to sell the property, and go meet with SCE&G. Jackie Knotts advised SCE&G to hold these meetings at night and on the weekend where people could come to the meetings.

These meetings are held during the day. The Technical Work Meetings are held during the day when everybody is working. If you look around the room, most of the people here, the majority of the people here, are from State agencies, and from SCE&G. The rest are retired people, or property owners who are really concerned about the Lake, and take off from work to come. Most people wouldn't have enough vacation, most people don't have enough leave time to attend all the meetings that are here. The meeting we are at now is for show. The real work goes on in the Technical Working Group meetings that are held during the day; there are a good many of them. And the people who are affected can't attend. I think that's a gross oversight by SCE&G; these meetings should have been held when the public and the people who are most affected by this decision actually have a chance to come. When I attend the meetings, there will only be one or two people there that are not retired, or they aren't being paid by the State agencies, or SCE&G to be there. There will be twice as many SCE&G people as there are private property owners, or Lake Murray Homeowners Association, or whatever. And there will be almost that many from State agencies. They are paid to be there. Me, I have to take off, it costs me money to attend. And it shouldn't. And I don't think you will get, you know, a proper outcome where the public is really involved. And an effort has not been made to really involve the public.

MR. STUART: John, I just wanted to make a couple of clarifications. First of all, none of those properties that are being reclassified are individual property owners' property.

MR. FRICK: That's not correct. I can point out two or three property owners whose farms are being reclassified.

MR. STUART: As far as I know, SCE&G's property is what they have reclassified.

MR. FRICK: No, that's not true.

MR. STUART: Tommy, you want to speak to that?

MR. BOOZER: John, you have sat in numbers of meetings, do you see exactly what we are proposing? We are not --- the only property we are reclassifying is the SCE&G property on Lake Murray.

MR. FRICK: Only the SCE&G owned property?

MR. BOOZER: Owned property.

MR. FRICK: That is not true.

MR. BOOZER: Well, you can come up and talk to us after this.

MR. FRICK: You lease property, real property. The future developments, too, are forest land and/or natural. And there's a couple of them.

MR. BOOZER: The only property we have done is SCE&G's property.

MR. FRICK: That's not true.

MR. BOOZER: Well, I'm just telling you what we have done.

MR. FRICK: Well, you know, I can prove it.

MR. REGIS PARSONS: I'm Regis Parsons, homeowner. I have been asked to ask a question by Linda Harmon, who is a homeowner. She wants to know why are the pieces of property being reclassified from future development to forest management, it's property which she has deed rights on. She wants to know, "Will she be able to do the things that the deed provides on the SCE&G owned land, or will she be prohibited from doing those things?"

MR. MAHAN: If a property owner sells the property and retained rights in the deed, they retain those rights. So, if she has rights, retained rights, in the property that was purchased from her parents, or folks before her, she still has those rights. SCE&G can't trample on those rights. Okay? Now, that is unless --- I've seen it in Washington, decide that having those rights nothing --- in this case it's basically pastured rights, go down and clear right down to the water, if the FERC were to decide it would be disadvantageous to protection of the quality of the scenes and so forth around the Lake to have that done, they could require us to come back and condemn whatever reserved rights those are. I have no idea who would do that. We are not going to ask them if they do that. Okay? But I just want everybody to understand that we are subject to being required to do things perhaps that we

might not want to do. The simple answer is, she has those rights; they are her rights; SCE&G is not going to trample on those rights.

UNIDENTIFIED LADY: I am going to ask a question that I expected some other person to ask. I am an individual property owner of approximately 2 1/2 acres on the Lake, on Shoal Island. I have a buffer in front of me, probably of 7 feet, 10 feet; and I have an individual dock. How is this proposal going to affect me?

MR. HANCOCK: It will not affect you. This property that you have in front of your lot, if you have the buffer --- if you have a current buffer zone in front of your property, and you have a dock, this does not affect you one bit. It's only affecting any future property that SCE&G has, future development property, and that's the only thing that it is affecting that we have not sold as of this date.

UNIDENTIFIED LADY: I don't own that buffer zone.

MR. HANCOCK: I understand that. You have a buffer zone that goes from 70 feet to 10 feet, or whatever the case may be. Have you previously purchased fringe land?

UNIDENTIFIED LADY: (inaudible)

MR. HANCOCK: How much shoreline do you own?

UNIDENTIFIED LADY: 163 feet.

MR. HANCOCK: Okay. And it's not going to affect you at all. You have your dock, and nobody is going to come to you and say, "You have got to give up more of your property,"

or anything. It does not affect you.

UNIDENTIFIED LADY: And if I need to rebuild as far as my dock?

MR. HANCOCK: You contact us and we will talk to you about rebuilding your dock, maybe getting a dock modification. We may have some ideas that you may want a different type dock, you know. Probably you have all stationery dock at this time. You may want a floating dock to go with that; but we will talk to you at that time.

UNIDENTIFIED LADY: Thank you very much.

MR. HANCOCK: You are welcome.

MR. STUART: Any other questions or comments?

(No response)

MR. STUART: SCE&G staff will be around for a little while if you have a specific question.

MR. HORACE COLBY: I thought this was limited to only one question. I am Horace Colby. I will say this to the group in y'all presence. My Dad has owned property in the state, that includes (inaudible) and Saluda River since 1939.

We have had nothing but good neighbor relationship with SCE&G. That's all I would like to say. I think if we would do one thing, if we and the people would read --- if you can't understand what you are reading, SCE&G will tell you what it means. And I think this is good here and all what I have been

to. But, good neighbors. That's my only comment. Thank you.

MR. STUART: I think that's a perfect way to close this meeting. We will have another meeting tonight if you are interested in coming back for more pain, I am sure there will be other questions that people have. So, we encourage you to come out. Thank you.

PUBLIC MEETING ADJOURNED.