

**INITIAL CONSULTATION MEETING FOR THE
SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
FERC Project No. 516**

**Meeting Minutes
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
December 6, 2004 - 9:00 A.M.
Issued 12/17/04**

Attendees:

SCE&G/SCANA – Bill Argentieri and Randy Mahan
TRC – Bill Green, Sean Norris, and Ted Karpynec
SHPO – Chad Long and Richard Sidebottom
SCDNR – Chris Judge
SCIAA – Jonathan Leader was unable to attend the meeting

Bill Argentieri began the meeting with a description of the project. SCE&G's license for the Saluda Hydroelectric facility expires August 31, 2010, and they have contracted with TRC to conduct preliminary cultural resource investigations in support of their FERC relicensing. The project area includes lands in and around Lake Murray, including approximately 640 miles of shoreline around the lake, 50 miles of shoreline surrounding 64 islands, and areas adjacent to the Saluda River from the Saluda Dam to the rapids near the Riverbanks Zoo.

Next, Bill Green described the work that TRC has been contracted to do, including preparing a detailed outline for a Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP), preparing a plan for conducting a cultural resource reconnaissance survey, and providing a tentative plan for conducting an intensive (Phase I) survey.

The first issue addressed was defining the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for initial identification purposes. An agreement was reached that for archaeological resources the APE would extend 50 feet inland from the shoreline or riverbank¹. For above ground properties (i.e., structures, buildings, districts, etc.), the APE would extend 0.25 mile inland from the shoreline or riverbank². Chris Judge asked whether the area adjacent to the Saluda River from the Riverbanks Zoo to its confluence with the Broad River would be included within the APE. No agreement was reached about this particular area, and the matter will be discussed at a later date after consultation between SCE&G and FERC³.

The second issue discussed was the proposed methods for conducting a reconnaissance survey. All parties agreed that an appropriate course of action would be to conduct a shoreline reconnaissance survey (using a boat) to identify areas likely to contain archaeological sites that had not been heavily impacted by erosion. If necessary, limited shovel testing (i.e., one or two shovel tests) would be excavated in each potential site area to determine the degree of erosion. All areas identified would be recorded using a DGPS unit for incorporation into a GIS database. These areas would be targeted for reexamination during the intensive survey stage.

The third issue discussed was the tentative plan for conducting an intensive (Phase I) cultural resource survey of lands within the APE. Bill Green proposed that all islands within the project area, and those areas identified during the reconnaissance survey as being likely to contain archaeological resources, be intensively surveyed. In addition, previously recorded archaeological sites that have not been evaluated for National Register eligibility would be examined as well. The survey/recordation of above ground

resources within the APE would be limited to those resources that were likely to be eligible for the National Register. This tentative plan was agreed to by all parties.

The last major issue brought up for discussion was the identification of potential interested parties. Interested parties would be notified of the project and their concerns taken into consideration. The following individuals/groups were identified:

- Dan Wells, Irmo Chapin Recreation Center (Saluda Shoals Park)
- Randall Shealy, Lake Murray Historical Society
- Richard Kidder, Lake Murray Association
- Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism (Dreher Island)
- City of West Columbia
- City of Columbia
- Newberry Water and Sewer Authority
- Descendants of those interred in inundated cemeteries⁴

Several other issues were briefly discussed as well:

- Bill Green informed those present that he has been in contact with the Catawba Indian Nation and Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians regarding tribal consultation for the project;
- FERC would likely be the ones to take the lead on initiating the production of a Programmatic Agreement for the project;
- The final HPMP would include recommendations on how to deal with National Register listed and eligible structures at the Saluda Dam Complex;
- Chris Judge and Chad Long asked that they be invited along during the initial reconnaissance survey; and
- The minutes of this meeting would be posted for public review at a website being designed for this project (<http://www.SaludaHydroRelicense.com>)

Notes:

1. Subsequent to the meeting, negotiations between SHPO and SCE&G resulted in redefining the APE. The APE for archaeology around the lake now extends 50 feet from the maximum pool elevation (360 ft. Plant Datum) or to the Project Boundary Line (PBL), whichever is farther. The APE for archaeology along the rivers now extends 50 feet from the riverbank or to the PBL, whichever is farther.

2. Subsequent to the meeting, SHPO redefined the APE for structures. The APE for structures around the lake has been reduced from 0.25 mile from the shoreline to 500 feet from the maximum pool elevation (360 ft. Plant Datum) or to the PBL, whichever is farther. The APE for structures near the river has been reduced from 0.25 mile to 500 feet from the riverbank or to the PBL, whichever is farther.

3. Subsequent to the meeting, SCE&G agreed to extend the lower boundary of the APE to the confluence of the Saluda and Broad rivers.

4. Descendants of those interred under the lake were notified at the time of the original license. An actual method of notification for future generation descendants was not determined at this meeting.

**INITIAL CONSULTATION MEETING WITH THE CATAWBA INDIAN NATION
SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
FERC Project No. 516**

**Meeting Minutes
Catawba Cultural Preservation Center
January 21, 2005 - 10:00 A.M.**

Attendees:

SCE&G – Bill Argentieri

TRC – Bill Green and Sean Norris

Catawba THPO – Wenonah Haire and Sandra Reinhardt

Bill Argentieri began the meeting with a description of the project. The project area includes lands in and around Lake Murray, including approximately 640 miles of shoreline around the lake, 50 miles of shoreline surrounding 64 islands, and areas adjacent to the Saluda and Little Saluda Rivers. SCE&G's license for the Saluda Hydroelectric Project expires August 31, 2010, and they have contracted with TRC to conduct preliminary cultural resource investigations in support of their FERC relicensing. The initial notice of intent for the project will be filed with FERC in March or April of 2005.

Next, Bill Green described the work that TRC has been contracted to do, including preparing a detailed outline for a Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP), preparing a plan for conducting a cultural resource reconnaissance survey, and providing a tentative plan for conducting an intensive (Phase I) survey. TRC would also prepare a GIS database of all archaeological sites and historic structures within the APE. Wenonah Haire expressed concern that the GIS database not be made available to the public since it contained sensitive/restricted information about the location of archaeological sites. Bill Green assured her that this information would not be made public and would be labeled "**Privileged Information – Not for Release.**"

Sean Norris proceeded to describe the results of background research TRC has conducted so far. There are 134 archaeological sites and 81 previously recorded historic structures within approximately one-third of a mile from the project area. Of these, 67 archaeological sites and 35 historic structures are within or very near the APE. There are also two historically recorded trails that crossed the Saluda River near Lake Murray. These include a path leading from the Catawba to the Cherokee, and another one leading from Charles Town to Saxe Gotha to the Catawba.

Bill Green then asked Wenonah Haire and Sandra Reinhardt several questions regarding the project.

1) Do you know of any properties of religious or cultural significance or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) within the project area?

Dr. Haire described what a TCP was and then stated she currently knew of no properties of particular concern to the Catawba. However, because of the nature of TCPs one could be identified later on as more information comes to light.

2) Do you wish to review the plans for conducting cultural resource surveys?

Yes. SCE&G is to send all plans and agreement documents to the Catawba THPO for review.

3) What procedures should we follow if human remains are encountered?

Immediately stop work in the area and notify the Catawba of the findings.

4) *Do the Catawba wish to be the liaison with non-federally recognized tribes in the state?*

Yes. The Catawba will notify and work with non-federally recognized tribes when culturally significant discoveries or human remains are found. However, Dr. Haire also said we should send notices to the other federally recognized tribes that may want to participate in consultation. A list of tribes could be obtained from personnel at Fort Jackson or from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Bill Green stated that he had already been in contact with Michelle Hamilton of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians (ECBI) and had invited them to this meeting. Michelle Hamilton, in a prior conversation with Bill Green, stated that although the ECBI wish to be kept informed of the project, in general they would defer to the Catawba for making decisions.

The minutes of this meeting would be posted for public review at a website being designed for this project (<http://www.SaludaHydroRelicense.com>)

Saluda Hydro Relicensing – Cultural Resource Conservation Group

October 14, 2005

Meeting Location – SCE&G Training Center – Columbia, SC

FINAL ACG 11-3-05

Attendees:

Alison Guth	Kleinschmidt Associates
Bill Argentieri	SCE&G
Bill Green	TRC
Sean Norris	TRC
Steve Bell	Lake Watch
Randall Shealy	Lake Murray Historical Society
Karen Thompson	Capitol City/Lake Murray Country
George Duke	Lake Murray Homeowners Coalition
Ralph Crafton	Lake Murray Association
Wenonah Haire	Catawba Indian Nation
Sandra Reinhardt	Catawba Indian Nation
Marianne Zajac	Irmo-Chapin Recreation Commission
Chad Long	SHPO
Randy Mahan	SCANA Services
Jim Devereaux	SCE&G

Action Items:

- Issue draft Stage II Survey Report
TRC *September 2006*
- Post Stage 2 Survey updates on the Saluda Hydro Relicensing website.
Alison Guth *Ongoing*

Meeting Notes:

These notes summarize the major items discussed during the meeting and are not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting. A PowerPoint presentation was used during this meeting and can be accessed at www.saludahydrorelicense.com.

Bill Green opened the meeting and welcomed the group, noting that the purpose of this initial meeting was to describe the processes behind the detection of items and places of cultural significance. He pointed out that this meeting would also describe what has been accomplished up to this point during Stage 1 Reconnaissance Surveys. He began by explaining that there were five primary mandated participants in the process which included FERC, SCE&G, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Catawba Indian Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office (CIN-THPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. He noted that the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was the National group that oversees Section 106 processes.

Saluda Hydro Relicensing – Cultural Resource Conservation Group

October 14, 2005

Meeting Location – SCE&G Training Center – Columbia, SC

FINAL ACG 11-3-05

Bill Green pointed out that the Eastern Band of the Cherokee has expressed interest in the project. He also noted that 18 other Indian tribes have been notified. Bill Green explained that some tribes only want to be notified if burials or other significant objects are found.

Bill Green continued to follow the slides in the PowerPoint presentation mentioning the laws covering the process such as NEPA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. He noted that Section 106 requires that “prior to the issuance of any license ... take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The head of any such Federal agency shall afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation ... a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to such undertaking.”

He noted that initially TRC had to define the undertaking, identify participants and coordinate with SHPO, and define the Area of Potential Effects (APE). He mentioned that discussions with SHPO, SCDNR, and the CIN-THPO, had already been carried out. He also added that the APE for this project was defined as 500 feet from full pool elevation on Lake Murray and 500 ft back from the bank of the lower Saluda River (LSR).

The discussion then began to center more around the details involved in the Stage 1 Reconnaissance Survey which has already been concluded. He mentioned that consultation with SHPO/THPO, Indian tribes and other consulting parties on ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effects was required under law. It was pointed out that the survey included an assessment of any adverse effects on cultural resources. He mentioned erosion as an example. Bill Green continued to note that usually agreement is achieved and they prepare a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) as well as a Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP).

Bill Green explained that the Stage 2 Intensive Survey would begin in the next few weeks. He clarified that Stage 2 would include all of the islands as well as the areas of Lake Murray and the LSR that were selected during the Stage 1 reconnaissance for further investigation.

George Duke inquired as to whether or not the Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) was going to be available to the public. After some discussion among the group it was determined that distribution of the HPMP was limited to agencies due to the sensitive nature of site locations. Chad Long suggested that the HPMP could provide direction for SCE&G to periodically update the public on the status of administering the HPMP.

George Duke then inquired as to what defined an archeological site. Bill Green replied that it usually applied only to sites that are over 50 years of age. The group continued to

Saluda Hydro Relicensing – Cultural Resource Conservation Group

October 14, 2005

Meeting Location – SCE&G Training Center – Columbia, SC

FINAL ACG 11-3-05

discuss various questions that were raised about historical sites, Such as what kind of impact erosion had on historical sites. It was noted that erosion posed a problem because it had the potential to remove artifact bearing soils at the site. Steve Bell inquired as to what defined a historical landscape. It was explained that anything from buildings to battle sites could be defined as a historical landscape, however typically the site in question had to be more than 50 years old unless deemed extremely significant.

Sean Norris then began discussion on what was found during the Stage 1 Surveys. He explained that prior to the survey, TRC met with SCE&G, SHPO, SCDNR, and CIN-THPO. He noted that during the meeting it became apparent that the entire shoreline of Lake Murray needed to be surveyed in order to identify lands that contain cultural resources. Sean showed the group the map of survey sites around Lake Murray. He noted that before TRC embarked on their surveys, their research indicated that there were 42 previously recorded archeological sites around the lake.

In conclusion, Sean noted that a total of 620 miles of shoreline along Lake Murray were assessed as well as 25 miles of riverbank on the Saluda, Little Saluda, lower Saluda rivers and major tributaries. He stated that 40 new archaeological sites were recorded as well as eight newly recorded structures. He explained that the oldest findings ranged from 8,000 to 10,000 years old up to Epting's Campground which was established in 1937. George Duke asked Sean to explain the meaning of "site". Sean replied that a site usually consisted of a ridge top or high area. These are areas where shovel tests were performed. He continued to note that when an artifact was found the site was assigned a number.

Sean mentioned that from the Stage 1 survey it was concluded that there are approximately 89 miles of shoreline that need to be further surveyed during Stage 2. He explained that during Stage 2 shovel tests will be performed, sites will be recorded and marked with GPS, and they will be assessed as not eligible, potentially eligible, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. Sean also noted that each island will be surveyed in its entirety during Stage 2 as well.

George Duke inquired if the surveys were performed below the 360' line during Stage 1 Reconnaissance. Bill Green responded that they will survey the area up to where the lake level is at that time. George Duke also requested that updates on progress be reported. The group decided that the website would serve as a good place to post this information.

Bill Green noted that during Stage 2, some surveys need to occur on private property. In which case, letters will be sent out to land owners requesting permission to access the property. If landowners explicitly state that they do not want a survey conducted on their property, then they will not survey the property.

Bill Argentieri asked as to what actions were required from SCE&G in regards to the identified historic properties. Bill Green replied that most of the houses that were

Saluda Hydro Relicensing – Cultural Resource Conservation Group

October 14, 2005

Meeting Location – SCE&G Training Center – Columbia, SC

FINAL ACG 11-3-05

identified are ineligible for listing, except for Epting's Campground. However, Epting's Campground is not impacted by the Project.

Discussions also centered on preparing an historic properties brochure that describes the cultural resources around Lake Murray and could be placed in the Lake Murray Welcome Center. It was discussed that an artifacts display may be prepared for the Welcome Center as well.

The meeting came to a close with a decision to hold the next Cultural Resources meeting on September 8, 2006, after Stage 2 surveys are concluded.

The meeting adjourned around 11:00

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
CULTURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION GROUP**

Final JMS 09-22-06

***Saluda Shoals Park
September 8, 2006***

ATTENDEES:

Bill Argentieri, SCE&G
Jeni Summerlin, Kleinschmidt Associates
Ken Styer, S&ME

Bill Green, S&ME
Beckee Garris, CIN
Rebekah Dobrasko, SHPO

ACTION ITEMS:

- Prepare a list of categorical exclusions
Bill Argentieri
- Find a pre-Lake Murray dam map
Bill Argentieri
- Contact Saluda Shoals Park about booking a room for the next meeting
Bill Green

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

***Date: March 2, 2007
Location: TBA***

MEETING NOTES

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING CULTURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION GROUP

Final JMS 09-22-06

**Saluda Shoals Park
September 8, 2006**

MEETING NOTES:

These notes serve as 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 welcomed the group, and noted that the purpose of this meeting is to: (1) update committee members on the results of the Stage II Cultural Resource investigations to date, (2) discuss/approve the draft mission statement, discuss goals for the Cultural Resources Conservation Group (CRCG), and (3) schedule the next meeting date (see attachment A for meeting agenda).

PowerPoint presentation on the results of the Stage II cultural resource investigations to date

Bill G. handed the floor over to Ken Styer and he briefly reviewed the results of the Stage I reconnaissance survey (click on the follow link to access the PowerPoint presentation <http://www.saludahydrorelicense.com/documents/SaludaHydroCRCGMeeting.9-8-06.final.edited.ppt>) During the Stage I survey 42 previously recorded archeological sites and 40 new sites were identified. Also, eight newly recorded historic structures were identified with one site eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). He then briefly discussed the Stage II survey areas and noted that to date 80 islands and 75 shoreline areas of Lake Murray, and 2 islands and 1.5 miles of river bank in the Lower Saluda River have been examined. The remaining areas to be surveyed for the Stage II survey are 55 islands in Lake Murray, 6 shoreline areas in Lexington County, and 96 shoreline areas in Newberry and Saluda Counties. He noted that he was denied access to five shoreline areas and six islands.

The results of Stage II intensive survey to date are 77 newly recorded archeological sites, which include: 30 prehistoric sites ranging from Early Archaic to Late Woodland (10,000 to 1,000 years ago), 32 historic home sites from 19th and early 20th century, and 5 historic cemeteries. He noted that several research themes were developed from results of these investigations, including prehistoric and historic utilization of the Saluda River drainage, resource utilization, and trade and interaction.

PowerPoint presentation on the Tree House archaeological site investigations

Bill G. began discussing the Tree House archaeological site investigations on the Lower Saluda River. He noted that the site is about 12 acres in size and has deeply buried artifacts with excellent preservation. He then began to explain the stratigraphic profile of the Tree House dig and noted that the dark line on the graph represents soil from 15,000 years ago. He mentioned that they sampled soils at these depths to find possible artifacts that date back as much as 15,000 years ago. Bill G. noted that the Tree House could be one of the most important archeological sites in the Southeastern United States. The site has known occupations dating back more than 5,000 years ago. He noted that Tree House investigations on the Lower Saluda River will continue through winter 2006.

MEETING NOTES

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING CULTURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION GROUP

Final JMS 09-22-06

**Saluda Shoals Park
September 8, 2006**

Discussion/approval of the draft mission statement

The group then began to discuss the following mission statement for the Cultural RCG. Beckee Garris noted and the group agreed that “prehistory” should be changed to “precontact”. The group decided to allow RCG committee members to comment on the mission statement once more and should then be posted on the website as final.

The mission of the Cultural RCG is to provide recommendations that will be used in the creation of an Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) for the Saluda Hydro Project license application. The objective of the HPMP is to outline policies and procedures that will be used for avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating potential adverse effects on historic properties that are being affected or have the potential to be affected by project operations. The CRCG also will provide input regarding ongoing consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, a list of Categorical exclusions for the project, and provide suggestions for creating public information and/or displays regarding the history and precontact of the Lake Murray area.

Bill G. reviewed the following goals of the Cultural RCG:

- General Recommendations for HPMP
- Ongoing consultation for Saluda Hydro Project
- List of categorical exclusions (in conjunction with Operations and Lake and Land Management RCGs)
- Creating public information and displays for the Project
- Other goals

There was a brief discussion about including categorical exclusions in the HPMP. Bill G. noted that categorical exclusions are activities that SCE&G performs that do not have the potential to affect historic properties. Bill Argentieri noted that he would help put together a list of categorical exclusions.

Public information/display on historical sites around the Saluda Hydro Project

The group discussed preparing public information and a display that describes cultural resources around the Saluda Hydro Project. It was suggested that this information include rules about trespassing on archeological sites (*Why looting is not a good idea*). The group also suggested informing local law enforcement agencies about the locations of these historical sites. It was also suggested that a pre-dam map that demonstrates the landscape before Lake Murray was constructed would make an educational display item. The group agreed that public information and/or a display of the archeological finds around the Saluda Hydro Project should be placed at Saluda Shoals Park, Lake Murray visitors center, and the Lexington museum. It was also suggested to include some information about these historical areas on the SCE&G website.

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
CULTURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION GROUP**

Final JMS 09-22-06

***Saluda Shoals Park
September 8, 2006***

Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for March 2, 2007. Bill Green noted that the first draft of the Cultural Resource Investigation should be sent out in early January of 2007. He mentioned that this will give committee members the opportunity to read and comment on the report.

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
CULTURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION GROUP**

Final JMS 09-22-06

**Saluda Shoals Park
September 8, 2006**

Attachment A

Meeting Agenda for the Cultural Resource Conservation Group

**Meeting Agenda for the Cultural Resource Conservation Group
Saluda Shoals Park
September 8, 2006
9:30 AM -12:00 Noon**

9:30 – 9:40 Welcome and introduction.

MEETING NOTES

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING
CULTURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION GROUP**

**Saluda Shoals Park
September 8, 2006**

Final JMS 09-22-06

- 9:40 – 10:15 PowerPoint presentation on the results of the Stage II cultural resource investigations to date.
- 10:15 – 10:30 PowerPoint presentation on the Tree House archaeological site investigations.
- 10:30 – 10:45 Questions about the investigations
- 10:45 – 10:55 Break
- 10:55 – 11:10 Discussion/approval of the draft mission statement (see below).
- 11:10 – 11:40 Goals for the CRCG
- General Recommendations for HPMP
 - Ongoing consultation for Saluda Hydroelectric Project
 - List of categorical exclusions (in conjunction w/ Operations and Lake and Land Management RCGs)
 - Creating public information and displays for the project
 - Other goals
- 11:40 – 12:00 Questions and open discussion
- 12:00 Schedule next meeting and adjourn

Cultural Resource Conservation Group (Draft Mission Statement)

The mission of the Cultural RCG is to provide recommendations that will be used in the creation of an Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) for the Saluda Hydroelectric Project license application. The objective of the HPMP is to outline policies and procedures that will be used for avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating potential adverse effects on historic properties that are being affected or have the potential to be affected by project operations. The CRCG also will provide input regarding ongoing consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, a list of categorical exclusions for the project, and provide suggestions for creating public information and/or displays regarding the history and prehistory of the Lake Murray area.

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.

MEETING NOTES

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

***S&ME Offices
July 12, 2007***

Final acg 9-19-07

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
Rebekah Dobrasko	SHPO

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 discussions and noted that this meeting was a follow up to March 2, 2007 meeting. He explained that S&ME went out on June 12th with SCE&G to look at 10 sites in the Project area that were being impacted during the Stage II survey. He noted that at the time they went out, the lake level was at 356' P.D, which was significantly higher than it was during the original survey. Green then presented the group with a PowerPoint update of the Stage II survey results. He also distributed a sheet that listed the significant sites and their revised management recommendation as of May 29, 2007. Green reviewed that during the Stage II survey, 156 archaeological sites and 42 isolated finds were investigated. Of those sites, 136 sites and 42 isolated finds were recommended ineligible for the National Register. Three sites were recommended eligible for the NRHP, and 17 sites were recommended potentially eligible for the National Register. He explained that the lake was down during the original survey, however, the water is 6 to 8 feet higher, and that a few of the sites are inundated and others have no erosion problems once the lake is at normal pool elevation.

The group viewed a map of the sites on the Lake for review. Green also discussed each site with the group. He explained that site 38NE742/38SA224 was given the second ID because it is actually in Saluda County.

Collectively, the group reviewed each of the significant sites (*see attached document*) and the recommendations for each site. Wenonah Haire asked if the artifacts are located to the interior of site 38NE636. Green noted that some of the artifacts were along the shoreline, however most were more interiorly located.

When discussing site 38NE638, Bill Argentieri asked what the options were in the future. Green noted that there were several options that included data recovery or mitigation for a more significant site. On site 38NE639, Green explained that stabilizing the shoreline was not feasible without destroying the historic character of the site. Green explained that the revised recommendation was to monitor the site during drawdowns below 350 PD.

When discussing site 38SA110, Green pointed out that the current recommendation was to stabilize using water tolerant vegetation. Argentieri asked if button bushes and willow trees would be appropriate. Haire noted that she would prefer that whatever vegetation was used was planted densely so that it provided multi-use protection/stabilization.

The group took some site to discuss 38LX531. This site is recommended as eligible for NRHP and stabilization or mitigation is recommended. There were discussions about performing a data recovery on this site. It was noted that some of the artifacts were located in adjoining property, and the property owners may not allow SCE&G to go through with the data recovery. It was explained that an attorney from SCE&G will discuss this with the homeowners' attorneys. Green also added that there is erosion on that site, most of which is occurring on the private property. Green also noted that the site was possibly more significant on the private property. Green suggested performing a more intensive data recovery at this site, in lieu of possible mitigation at other, less significant sites. Rebekah Dobrasko noted that that may be an option. Haire also agreed that it was worth discussing as long as there were still routine checks on the other significant sites. Green explained that they did not see any evidence of looting at any of the sites.

Green reviewed what had taken place since the last meeting with the group. He explained that they have submitted the draft Stage II survey report to the agencies. He noted that he also have started the draft of the HPMP. Haire and Sandra Reinhardt noted that they did want to be signatories to the Programmatic Agreement. Argentieri also noted that they were also looking into providing brochures on Cultural/Historic resources in the Lake Murray visitors center and a display at Saluda Shoals park.

Upon reviewing the sheet that had been handed out on significant sites, Dobrasko pointed out that S&ME was recommending Phase II surveys on four sites. Green clarified that on 2 of the 4 sites, Phase II surveys were only recommended during the next major drawdown. Argentieri noted that they would be willing to get started on site 38LX531 early, if everything went through. Argentieri then asked what would take place if they did move forward with the data recovery before the Programmatic Agreement was finalized. Dobrasko noted that they would not need a separate MOA, SCE&G would just need a data recovery plan and SHPO's approval. She added that as long as all the parties involved agree to the early data recovery, she didn't see a problem. Dobrasko also suggested early discussions with the FERC regarding it. Argentieri asked how long after the data recovery plan was issued until there was approval to begin work. Dobrasko, Reinhardt, and Haire all noted it would be about 30 days, unless issues arose with the plan.

Bill also asked the group what type of monitoring they would be looking for as part of the HPMP. He added that possibly SCE&G Lake Management could look at the sites when they are out in the area, but as far as a physical report, they would prefer that one be done on a 2 or 3 year basis. Haire noted that this would probably be acceptable as long as they had assurance that if looting was detected, SCE&G would go out more frequently. She added that it was more protected now that the water was higher.

The group expressed that they were comfortable with the direction that the group was going. Green noted that they would hold off on scheduling the next meeting until more progress has been made.

Table 1. List of Significant Sites and Management Recommendations for the Saluda Hydroelectric Project (FERC Project No. 516).

Site No.	Description	NRHP Recommendation	Original Management Recommendations	Site Condition as of May 29, 2007, and Revised Management Recommendations
38LX526		Eligible	No further work at this time/Monitoring	No further work at this time/Monitoring
38LX531		Eligible	Stabilization and/or Mitigation	Stabilization and/or Mitigation
38LX537		Potentially Eligible	No further work at this time/Monitoring	No further work at this time/Monitoring
38LX539		Potentially Eligible	No further work at this time/Monitoring	No further work at this time/Monitoring
38LX540		Potentially Eligible	No further work at this time/Monitoring	No further work at this time/Monitoring
38LX554		Potentially Eligible	No further work at this time/Monitoring	No further work at this time/Monitoring
38LX555		Potentially Eligible	No further work at this time/Monitoring	No further work at this time/Monitoring
38NE636		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Minor amount of erosion on shoreline. Stabilization not feasible. Monitoring during major drawdowns below 350 ft. Plant Datum
38NE638		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Moderate erosion along shoreline. Stabilization along most of site not feasible. Phase II testing.
38NE639		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Minimal amount of erosion. Monitoring during major drawdowns below 350 ft. Plant Datum.
38NE666		Eligible	No further work at this time/Monitoring	No further work at this time/Monitoring
38NE742/ 38SA224		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Over 90% of the site is inundated at 356.5 ft. pool elevation. Phase II testing during next major drawdown below the 350 ft. elevation. Previously Stabilized/Monitoring
38RD134		Potentially Eligible	None	Previously Stabilized/Monitoring
38SA1		Potentially Eligible	None	Previously Stabilized/Monitoring
38SA110		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Minor amount of erosion on shoreline. Stabilization using water-tolerant vegetation. Monitor after stabilization.
38SA128		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Shoreline is inundated at 356.5 ft. Minimal erosion on exposed banks of the site. Stabilization not feasible. Monitoring during major drawdowns below 350 ft. Plant Datum.
38SA129		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Minimal amount of erosion on shoreline. Monitoring during major drawdowns below the 350 ft. Plant Datum.
38SA148		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Shoreline inundated at 356.5 ft. pool elevation. Remainder of site protected. No further work.
38SA150		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Over 90% of site inundated at 356.5 ft. pool elevation. Phase II testing during next major drawdown below the 350 ft. Plant Datum.
38SA159		Potentially Eligible	No further work at this time/Monitoring	No further work at this time/Monitoring
38SA169		Potentially Eligible	No further work at this time/Monitoring	No further work at this time/Monitoring
38SA174		Potentially Eligible	Stabilization or Phase II Testing	Considerable erosion along shoreline. Stabilization not feasible. Phase II testing.
243-127		Eligible	None	Develop protocols in the HPMP
63-0521		Eligible	None	No further work