

APPENDIX F

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM RECREATION MANAGEMENT TWC
MEMBERS

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
1	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	<p>Thoughts on patterns of use on the lower Saluda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flows will influence the pattern of use at various sites; higher flows in warmer weather will bring greater use to Gardendale and Mill Race-a by whitewater paddlers and less use by most other users; • Springtime use by college students (when colleges are in full attendance) is heavy, esp. at Mill Race sites, and this is not captured with the survey starting around Memorial Day. • Much of the springtime use by striped-bass anglers was missed by the survey's time frame. • Trout anglers appear to be largely missed in the survey as these users target shoals areas of the river, many of which are accessed by means other than SCE&G river access sites. <p>To me, the survey reveals dynamic patterns. The heavy use at Mill Race-b is a newly emerged major change in the pattern of use. I was surprised to see higher numbers for Mill Race-b than a. Two years ago the numbers of users in MR-b would have been much less than they are now. Use at the Mill Race sites will continue to change and increase significantly as Three River Greenway is developed. The greenway will include a concrete trail along the river at Riverbanks Zoo, that's about 1 miles between Mill Race a and b; and above the zoo, the</p>	General	<p>The effects of river flow on the patterns of use on the LSR will influence the type of use on the river. This observation should be considered when developing recommendations.</p> <p>Springtime use by college students will be addressed in the Spring Addendum.</p> <p>Springtime use by striped-bass anglers on the LSR will be addressed in the Spring Addendum.</p> <p>Trout anglers using the LSR will be covered in the Spring Addendum. It will include information from people who access the river by means other than public access sites.</p> <p>The potential impact of the Three Rivers Greenway is included in the final Report.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
		greenway will extend another 2 miles upstream to the I-26 crossing. This three mile path is planned for construction within the next year.		
2	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	One concern I have is that the assessment concludes, generally, that sites are in good condition and everything is ok for the most part. That is good news but it seems the useful information in terms of protection, mitigation and enhancement would be the problem areas and places where the current facilities are not quite cutting it. The results also show times of high use and declining rec. quality and we could summarize those in the conclusion to point us to our main areas of potential improvement? This would also help resolve any perception that the recreation assessment runs counter to stakeholder experience, i.e. that everything is generally in good shape.	General	<p>Conclusions are based on the survey data presented in the results sections, which shows, for the most part, the public thinks the sites are in good condition. However, there are sites where improvements can be made and these are discussed within the report.</p> <p>Survey results also show that increased use levels are not always associated with lower opinions of condition or the need for improvements. This may run counter to an individual's experience. The report provides discussion of where the public feels improvement is needed.</p>
3	SCDNR	The appendices were not included in the draft report.	General	The appendices were included in the PDF file of the Draft Report, as stated in the distribution e-mail.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
4	SCDNR	<p>In addition to spring sampling, we recommend that you convene a focus group with trout anglers to determine if they have any additional recreational access needs and/or improvements. Also, the need to convene a focus group to address paddling access should be discussed.</p> <p>We recommend that the recreational site summary (Table 3.1-1) include a column to designate the presence or absence of ADA facilities.</p>	General	<p>The perceptions and opinions of trout anglers will be identified in the Addendum.</p> <p>Paddling access will be discussed within the Downstream Flows TWC and results from this discussion will be incorporated into the Spring Addendum.</p> <p>The column has been added.</p>
5	SCPRT	<p>It is interesting to note that the results at 3.3.3.1 indicate only four (4) of the 14 sites surveyed on Lake Murray could accommodate additional use and the others are either approaching or exceeding their design capacities. Also, at 3.2.2.2, the results reflect that public access sites on the Lower Saluda River are being very well used, frequently at rates at or above their intended capacities.</p>	General	<p>Comment noted. No response necessary.</p>
6	SCPRT	<p>Goal 2: In estimating future demand, it appears that the study used straight population projection growth as the basis. Were the increases/decreases attributable to each activity as described in the SC Recreation Participation and Preference Study considered? This would show substantial growth in the percentage of residents participating in canoeing/kayaking, bird watching, and jet skiing, some steady growth in walking, motorboating, jogging, and hiking, and declines in picnicking, hunting, and sailing.</p>	General	<p>It was understood that the USC (2005) study would provide information appropriate for estimating future use at the project. However, after review of the study (and the Special Report), it was determined that the report provides information on current uses, not projected uses.</p> <p>The USC (2005) study (and</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
		<p>We also provided a Special Report from the USC study (provided gratis from USC) with specific percentage use estimates for the Lexington, Newberry, Richland, and Newberry Counties area so you would not have to use the Central Midlands data that covered different counties.</p> <p>The assessment should also consider projected growth in use of the Saluda River in relation to the Three Rivers Greenway which is nearing development and the proposed Saluda Shoals Greenway extension planned by the Lower Saluda River Corridor Plan Update. These should add significantly to the numbers of walkers, paddlers, anglers, bikers, bird/wildlife watchers, and geocachers using the resources.</p>		<p>the special report information) shows participation by activity for the local population. That information is presented in the report. The possibility of adjusting population projections with USC study results was considered, however, it was concluded that a cleaner means of estimating projected use would be to use only population projections. Survey results represent the population of people who recreate at the project by activity, it was decided that trying to adjust population projections by both the survey data and the USC data would be inappropriate. It is notable that using just the population projections with the survey data provides higher projected growth rates than if the population growth rates were adjusted by the USC data. We will review the future use section of the report and will clarify this topic, acknowledging the usefulness of the USC reports in interpreting results.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
				<p>The potential impact of the Three Rivers Greenway is included in the final Report. Use will likely increase along the lower Saluda River when the plan is realized, but we do not have any indication of how much it will increase. The Greenway plans do not provide a use estimate. Bill Marshall (Lower Saluda River Advisory Council), in the January 11, 2006 Recreation Conservation Group meeting confirmed this – they have no information telling them how much use will increase. Conceptually, we all know it will increase, we are simply uncertain of how much.</p>
7	SCPRT	Kayaking is not discussed at Mill Race A/B and is an important use.	General	<p>Sections 3.1.2.2 and 3.1.3.3 mention kayaking at Mill Race A and B.</p> <p>Opinions of kayakers will also be discussed within the Downstream Flows TWC and this information will be incorporated into the Spring Addendum.</p>
8	SCPRT	Appendixes: none were provided.	General	See response to Comment #3.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
9	Trout Unlimited	The total number of respondents (250) is so low that the worth of the study results is questionable... Additional input is needed, especially from target groups as noted below, and also because the study was not conducted in all months of a calendar year.	General	<p>We strongly disagree with the statement that the worth of the study results is questionable. The study was implemented following an approved study plan and rigorous survey research procedures. The study collected valid data to meet the goals for which it was designed. A total of 1,611 surveys were completed during this study. Of those, 1,257 were completed at sites on Lake Murray and 345 were completed at sites on the LSR.</p> <p>The Addendum will solicit additional input regarding non-peak use.</p>
10	Trout Unlimited	<p>In further reference to point 1) no zip mailings as requested by SCPRT of SC PRT, the most knowledgeable of the stakeholders because of the SCOPR [sic] plans he has conducted for over 20 years for that agency.</p> <p>Nor, were any other efforts made for input beyond the person to person interviews at the selected sites, including from the recognized groups whose members have extensive experience from using the river other than waterfowl hunters because of season. Input must be included from key groups such as those on the SC DNR Lower Saluda River</p>	General	<p>The study plan approved by the TWC did not include mail surveys of the general public. The on-site survey did collect the ZIP codes of survey respondents; results show that most respondents reside local to the project.</p> <p>During conversations about the study plan, the TWC agreed they could act as a focus group rather than to try and target every special</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
		<p>Advisory Council like the SC Wildlife Federation, Trout Unlimited, Palmetto Paddlers, and American Whitewater, and also represented as stakeholders. These omissions means that the most active and knowledgeable users were essentially not included in the survey, especially as the access for many is not at any of the sites surveyed. For example, the nearly 400 Trout Unlimited members that mainly access the river through private property and represent several thousand man hours of fishing a year in the LSR were not included. Also, many boaters and others access the river through private property along the river. It is strongly recommended that the significant recreational groups be directly surveyed, at least through their leadership or reps in the relicensing process, or as additional focus groups. The report results should be revised to reflect the concerns and recommendations from those additional surveys, or from input from the appropriate stakeholder groups represented at the next recreational meetings. The Recreation Assessment should not be finalized and filed without their input.</p>		<p>interest group that may somehow have an interest in the project. The survey targeted individuals who use public access sites. Thus, any members of special interest groups who happened to be using public access sites during the study were eligible to be surveyed. SCE&G recognizes the value that special interest groups can provide during relicensing, and has included these groups, including TU, as participants in relicensing. SCE&G also recognizes the importance of including the general public, who may have different opinions than special interest groups, and who also have a right to be represented.</p> <p>The groups mentioned in TU's comments are represented on the relicensing team and their input will be invaluable in making recommendations to the Recreation Resource Group, in preparing the Recreation Plan, and in subsequent contributions to the draft License Application. All TWC members, including</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
				TU, have been asked and are expected to provide input into these documents and decisions. The Recreation Assessment is only one piece of the puzzle that examines public use of public access sites.
11	Trout Unlimited	Wade fishing was not included in the use category (only boat fishing, bank fishing, dock/pier fishing) – <i>unless that use was included as 'bank' fishing since no boat or dock is used</i> ???. That omission clearly shows that the study did not target the right audience as that is a significant user group as noted in comment 2) as most all the TU members wade fish, mostly with fly rods for sport which was another significant area of recreation use that could have been categorized. Fly fishing only and catch and release only fishing areas are wildly popular all over the country and often are significant drivers of tourist economies.	General	<p>Survey respondents were asked to state the primary recreation activity for the day. “Wading fishing” was included as a category on the LSR questionnaire. If they identified themselves as “wade fishing”, that is what was recorded on their questionnaire.</p> <p>Again, the study was designed to target users of public access sites, per the approved study plan. Some users were anglers and some were not.</p> <p>Specific user groups, such as trout anglers, would have been included in survey and count efforts, if such groups use public access sites from Memorial Day through September 30.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
12	SCDNR	On page 1-1, the text states that SCE&G manages four of the five recreation sites. On page 2-3, the text states that SCE&G manages two of five sites.	Page 1-1	This has been corrected.
13	SCPRT	<p>Page 1-1, I suggest referring to the Lower Saluda River as Lower Saluda River or “the river.” LSR is a term many use, but others will have difficulty following the report.</p> <p>The Lower Saluda River is designated a State Scenic River by the General Assembly, not SCDNR.</p> <p>The text states that SCE&G owns 5 public access sites on the river and manages four. Another reference on page 2-3 notes that 2 of the five sites are managed by SCE&G. This should be clarified.</p> <p>Also, are Mill Race A and B designated sites that are officially open to the public or are they impromptu sites?</p>	Page 1-1	<p>The use of “LSR” is defined on the first page of the report and refers to a specific area.</p> <p>The text has been edited to clarify the scenic river designation, the number of recreation sites that are managed, and Mill Race sites.</p> <p>Mill Race A and B are considered informal sites. Use is recognized and safety precautions are in place, but there are no support facilities at the sites. They are located on property currently managed by the Riverbanks Zoological Society.</p>
14	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	Goal 1i: the study seems adequate in the identification and inventory of existing sites and facilities.	Page 1-2	No response required.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
15	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	Goal 1ii: the study does identify patterns but the limited duration of the study does not allow complete characterization of use patterns.	General	The study was designed to examine typical use patterns from Memorial Day through September 30; the peak summer recreation season. The Spring Addendum is intended to capture use patterns during the shoulder season (January – May). It is intended that the Recreation Management TWC will utilize additional existing information (e.g., creel surveys, boat density study, etc.), and the expertise of the individuals on the TWC to complete the picture.
16	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	Goal 2i: estimation of future recreational use does not seem to account for the enhanced facilities that will be part of the Three Rivers Greenway, which will increase user numbers at Mill Race sites.	Page 1-2	Discussion of the Three Rivers Greenway is included in the final Report.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
17	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	Goal 2ii: the identification of user needs preferences would be improved by conducting a focus group to obtain input from trout anglers. Could also be useful to have a focus group with paddlers.	Page 1-2	Information from trout anglers will be solicited during the Spring Assessment. Paddling access will be discussed within the Downstream Flows TWC and results from this discussion will be incorporated into the Spring Addendum. These groups are represented in the relicensing process and their input will be considered in the development of the Saluda Project Recreation Plan.
18	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	Goal 2iii: the report seems general and not specific in its identification of future needs for new recreation sites and facilities.	Page 1-2	The report provides conclusions, but not recommendations. It is expected that the Recreation Management TWC will use this information, along with other information from other studies and TWCs to develop recommendations that will be included in the Recreation Plan.
19	SCDNR	Goal 1i: the study seems adequate in the identification and inventory of existing sites and facilities. One shortcoming of this section is that the information describing the ADA accessibility of public access areas, which was included in the site descriptions, was not summarized for the sites.	Page 1-2	ADA compliance information is provided in the text and in Appendix C. A summary of ADA compliance will be added in the text.
20	SCDNR	Goal 1ii: the study does identify patterns but the limited duration of the study does not allow complete characterization of use	Page 1-2	See response to comment #15, #1.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
		<p>patterns. Since sampling was conducted between Memorial Day and September 30, 2006, some recreational users such as trout and striped bass anglers, waterfowl hunters, and college students may have been missed or under-represented.</p> <p>Some of the results in this section were surprising to us. The heavy use at Mill Race-b is a newly emerged major change in the pattern of use. We were surprised to see higher numbers for Mill Race-b than for a. Two years ago the numbers of users in MR-b would have been much less than they are now. We believe that recreational use at the Mill Race sites will continue to change and increase significantly as the Three River Greenway is developed. The greenway will include a concrete trail along the river at Riverbanks Zoo, that's about 1 mile between Mill Race a and b; and above the zoo, the greenway will extend another 2 miles upstream to the I-26 crossing.</p> <p>Also, we noted that the facilities on the west side of the Lake, such as Koon Landing, Shull Island, Lake Murray Estates and River Bend, have some of the highest weekly and weekend use ratings of all sites. This may be helpful in prioritizing future recreational improvements.</p>		<p>A focus group was held with waterfowl hunters; results are provided in the Recreation Assessment. Hunters provided information for their entire hunting season (fall, winter and spring). The information provided is not limited to the period Memorial Day through September 30.</p> <p>Information from trout and striped bass anglers, and college students will be obtained during the Spring Addendum.</p> <p>The comments regarding facility use are noted.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
21	SCDNR	Goal 2i: estimation of future recreational use does not seem to account for the enhanced facilities that will be part of the Three Rivers Greenway, which will increase user numbers at Mill Race sites.	Page 1-2	See response to Comment #16.
22	SCDNR	Goal 2iii: this section of the report is pretty general and not specific in its identification of future needs for new recreation sites and facilities.	Page 1-2	See response to Comment #18.
23	SCPRT	<p>Goal 1: It appears the study identified existing <u>public, non-commercial</u> recreation points, services, and facilities fairly well. There was little discussion of impromptu sites or commercial sites.</p> <p>Information should also be included regarding compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) which was specifically noted in the goal statement.</p> <p>Patterns of use at each site were limited by the survey methodology from Memorial Day to Labor Day. As noted in our comments regarding the 3/31/06 draft Study Plan, the assessment missed significant river usage, specifically the trout fishermen who fish primarily between January and June (you may have sampled a few days of this period), and the college student swimming/sunbathing rock use in April and early May. Please also note that anglers use several areas that are not open to public access. Since it is now March and we have missed January through March sampling opportunities, please consider a focus group of the river anglers and focused</p>	Page 1-2	<p>With the exception of the Mill Race sites, the study was not focused on impromptu or commercial sites. Information about these types of sites is available in the Initial Consultation Document.</p> <p>See response to Comment #19 regarding ADA-related text.</p> <p>The study was designed to examine use from Memorial Day through September 30 (please note that sampling went beyond Labor Day); the peak summer recreation season. As requested, trout anglers and student use will be targeted in the Spring Addendum.</p> <p>It is correct that few if any exit interviews were completed with sailors.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
		<p>sampling of college students in April.</p> <p>It is doubtful the study interviewed many sailors either since most dock at private or commercial sites.</p> <p>In general, it appears that sampling is weak and has a limited number of completed interviews, especially along the river (shouldn't Saluda Shoals Park have more than 17 interviews?).</p>		<p>Sampling strategies were appropriate for the approved study plan. The number of interviews at Saluda Shoals Park was not as high as we would have liked. We believe this may be due in part to ongoing road construction at the park entrance during the summer. In addition, interviewers informed us (and we checked) that it was very difficult to get people to stop and participate in the interview while they were on their way out of the park. There were 58 completed interviews at Saluda Shoals Park.</p>
24	SCPRT	Page 2-3. Riverbanks Zoo is not the City of Columbia's. I think it is an independent special purpose district.	Page 2-3	The property is leased to the Riverbanks Zoological Society. This change has been made to the report.
25	SCPRT	<p>Page 2-6. Appendix A was not provided in the draft.</p> <p>As noted above, we are concerned about the small number of completed interviews, especially in the Lower Saluda River sites.</p>	Page 2-6	See response to Comments #3 and 23. The study was designed to examine use at public recreation sites. It was not designed to examine recreation occurring along the entire river.
26	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	Table 2.1-4, line 2: edit: <i>Individual did not speak English.</i>	Page 2-7	Edit has been made to the final Report.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
27	SCPRT	Page 2-7. On Table 2.1-4, I think it was intended to say “individual did <u>not</u> speak English”.	Page 2-7	Edit has been made to the final Report.
28	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	1 st paragraph, last sentence: edit: <i>were</i> should be <i>where</i> .	Page 2-8	Edit has been made to the final Report.
29	SCPRT	Page 2-8. Appendix B was not provided in the draft and since RCG and TWC members were not invited, it is important to see the results of the Waterfowl Focus Group meeting.	Page 2-8	See response to Comment #3.
30	SCPRT	Page 2-9. Information provided for Bundrick Island could be very useful, detailing specific time frames of use and using population growth projections.	Page 2-9	Comment noted.
31	SCPRT	Page 2-10. Also for Bundrick Island, was the weekday use estimate of 45% of weekend use based on any data or just a chosen number? The last sentence says future use estimates are provided for Lake Murray and the Lower Saluda River but does not say where.	Page 2-10	The weekday use estimate of 45% of weekend use was derived from the ratio of weekday to weekend use for Lake Murray public access sites during the study period. Edit has been made to the final report. Future use estimates edit has been made to the final report.
32	SCPRT	Page 2-11. 12 th line: “...arrives at 8 am, then the parking area would <u>be</u> full...” On Table 2.2-1, I suggest changing “Sample” to “Example”.	Page 2-11	Edits have been made to the final Report.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
33	SCPRT	<p>Page 3-1. Appendixes C, D, and E are not provided in the draft.</p> <p>It is noted that there are “130 private, commercial, and public recreation sites in the study area” but only provide data on the public sites.</p>	Page 3-1	<p>See response to Comment #3.</p> <p>The study only addressed public access sites; additional sites are generally described in the ICD.</p>
34	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	Table 3.1-1 L. Saluda Sites: question: Why is swimming attributed to Saluda Shoals Park and not at other river sites?	Page 3-2	Table 3.1-1 has been edited to correct this.
35	SCPRT	Page 3-2. I suggest adding acreage to the site inventory summary and consider naming it “Public Recreation Site Inventory Summary.”	Page 3-2	Edit has been made to the final Report.
36	SCPRT	Page 3-5. Discuss where to find a summary of the information listed below 3.1.1.1 and provide a table.	Page 3-5	The tables are provided in Appendix C, as mentioned at the top of Section 3.0.
37	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	8 th line: edit: <i>staffed seasonally staffed.</i>	Page 3-6	Edit has been made to the final Report.
38	SCPRT	<p>Page 3-17. There is a note that parking at Rocky Point occurs roadside. Is this because there is no parking area provided?</p> <p>Conditions may limit use here as shown by only two interviews conducted.</p>	Page 3-17	<p>There is no designated parking at Rocky Point. The site has a looped gravel drive and parking occurs along the side of this looped drive.</p> <p>Very few people were encountered at this site. Remember that interviews were conducted with people as they exited the sites.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
39	SCPRT	Page 3-18. Dreher Island State Recreation Area also offers a primitive group camp area. Fire rings are associated with campsites or picnic areas. We should list the number of slips provided at the marina.	Page 3-18	Edit has been made to the final Report. The number of slips at the marina is listed in Appendix C.
40	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	Doesn't Mill Race have picnic tables at the upstream site? They did at one point, I don't know if they are still there. Carry-in canoe and kayak access should also be mentioned as this is a primary area for that type of rec. Are safety sirens really part of the site inventory? It seems misplaced. The inventories for the lake sites do not mention any safety measures taken to aid in lake recreation safety, such as shoal markers etc.	Page 3-19	Mill Race A and B do not have picnic tables. Kayaking and whitewater boating are discussed in the Mill Race A and B description. Shoal markers are generally associated with the lake, not with individual recreation sites. However, if there are shoal markers or channel markers that you consider associated with a site, please advise. The TWC has been clear that safety is an issue of concern at the Mill Race sites, so it seemed important to mention that here.
41	SCPRT	Page 3-19. First sentence of the last paragraph should take credit for "including a recently established website."	Page 3-19	Edit has been made to the final Report.
42	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	3 rd Paragraph, 1 st line: edit: change <i>consul</i> to <i>council</i> .	Page 3-20	Edit has been made to the final Report.
43	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	Add section on the new website?	Page 3-20	The website was not active when the draft Report was written. We have included a mention of the new website with a brief description.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
44	SCPRT	<p>Page 3-20. I understand the phone call system is being considered for termination since the website has been established.</p> <p>The Lower Saluda Scenic River Advisory Council should be referenced properly and “color-coded river markers <u>that</u> are positioned...”</p> <p>Riverbanks Zoo is not managed by the City of Columbia.</p>	Page 3-20	<p>The phone call system is not being considered for termination. The phone system that is being considered for termination is the Lake Murray Information Line, not the ringdown phone system.</p> <p>Edits have been made to the final Report.</p>
45	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	<p>“Mill Race A and B are not formal recreation sites.” By this do we mean they are not in the project boundary? Or is it facility determinative?</p>	Page 3-21	<p>For the most part, it is facility determinative and does not have anything to do with the Project boundary. See also response to Comment #13.</p>
46	SCPRT	<p>Page 3-21. Add kayaking and fishing to the list of activities at Mill Race A & B. It is noted that no formal facilities are provided. Are any recommended based on interviews, observations by recreation consultants, etc.?</p>	Page 3-21	<p>Edit has been made to the final Report.</p> <p>From responses to the survey, most people requested trash cans and restrooms. Kleinschmidt has not provided recommendations to the TWC. It is anticipated that the TWC will make recommendations based on these results and other input.</p>
47	SCPRT	<p>Page 3-22. Note that the trail at Gardendale is short (provide a distance if possible). Is it really a biking trail? Fishing/hiking trail is probably more correct.</p>	Page 3-22	<p>Edit has been made to the final Report.</p> <p>Individuals were observed riding mountain bikes along the trail during the site inventory.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
48	SCPRT	Page 3-23. How large is Saluda Shoals Park (and note how much is SCE&G and how much is ICRC). Note miles of trail – paved, unpaved. I'm surprised you couldn't find 100 people to interview here.	Page 3-23	Saluda Shoals Park is 240 acres – the land is owned by SCE&G and leased to the ICRC. Trail mileage at Saluda Shoals Park was not determined. While Saluda Shoals was the most used site on the LSR, clerks experienced difficulty getting people to stop at the exit to be interviewed.
49	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	1 st paragraph, next to last sentence: note: one ramp at Metts landing is for trailer launches and the other is for carry-in launch of canoes/kayaks.	Page 3-24	Edit has been made to the final Report.
50	SCPRT	Page 3-24. Last sentence: did the other 16% percent request any improvements?	Page 3-24	Table 3.2-12 and 3.2-13 report the additional facilities and improvements suggested by survey respondents. Of the 86 individuals interviewed at Metts Landing, 75 made recommendations.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
51	SCPRT	<p>Page 3-28. Table 3.1-3: Zip Code Data may be more informative. One half of Irmo residences and quite a number of Richland County communities have Columbia addresses. This also shows that the college students using the Mill Race sites have not been adequately represented.</p> <p>What does the footnote “a” have to do with the river?</p>	Page 3-28	<p>Table 3.1-2 and Table 3.1-3 have been edited in the final Report.</p> <p>The Addendum is intended to address public access site use patterns and user preferences during the shoulder season (January – May).</p> <p>Individuals were asked whether they own waterfront property on Lake Murray.</p>
52	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	<p>“Facilities were also identified for Mill Race B, which essentially has none. But in this case, it is the lack of facilities that individuals enjoy.” What data do we have for this? Restrooms and trashcans right?</p>	Page 3-29	<p>Comments received by individuals either in response to the need for additional facilities or improvements or additional comments indicated a need for restrooms and trashcans but generally no other facilities; several individuals indicated that they enjoy the area the way it is.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
53	SCPRT	Page 3-30. Table 3.1-4: Identify how many days in May were surveyed. Are there just 3 holidays in the whole report – Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Labor Day? If so list them in the proper months as separate items and drop the “holiday” moniker.	Page 3-30	<p>A total of 5 days in May (May 27 – May 31) were included in the sample frame. All 5 days are considered holiday days. Report has been edited to include the distinction that the study period extended from May 27 through September 30.</p> <p>Holiday use is discussed in general terms (use for all holidays) throughout the document. Hence, the distinction of “holidays” during May, July and September rather than the proper names for each holiday weekend.</p> <p>Holidays are distinguished as such because recreational use on holidays is generally different – greater – than on nonholiday days. Holidays can be treated as times of special events, but you generally would not manage a project to meet the need associated with holidays. Instead, you might initiate special management programs to accommodate those few periods when use is unusually high.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
54	SCPRT	Page 3-31. Last sentence: Since the assessment did not sample October through most of May, we can not be sure when ½ of <u>all</u> use occurs. The report would probably be safe in saying that “ <u>most</u> use occurs...”	Page 3-31	Sentence has been clarified in the final Report.
55	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	Table 3.1-7, comment: The survey period missed heavy use by college students and use of striped bass anglers during spring (April-May). If survey had captured more days in the spring figures for May weekdays and weekends would likely be much greater than this table indicates.	Page 3-35	Comment noted. The Addendum is intended to address public access site use patterns and user preferences during the shoulder season (January – May).
56	SCPRT	Page 3-35. Last sentence in 3.1.3.3, same comment as page 3-31.	Page 3-35	Sentence has been clarified in the final Report.
57	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	Table 3.1-8: Can we have a similar chart for A and B? We can further stress they are outside the boundary if we need to.	Page 3-37	Table E-1 reports the primary recreation activities for Mill Race A and B.
58	SCPRT	Page 3-37. Table 3.1-8 about wade fishing: the study missed the private/informal sites such as Oh Brother Rapids/Ocean Blvd. and missed the time of year that most people fish. Perhaps a focus group of river anglers would help. The overall sample size seems too small.	Page 3-37	Again, the goal of the study was to assess use occurring at public access sites. See response to Comment #1. river anglers will be targeted in the Spring Addendum. We believe the sample size was adequate for the study as proposed – to examine activity occurring at public access sites.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
59	SCPRT	Page 3-38. First full paragraph: I wonder if the results would be the same with year-round sampling? Wording changes are probably needed here that clarify that summer was the only season sampled.	Page 3-38	Comment noted. Clarification has been provided in the final Report.
60	SCPRT	Page 3-39. If sightseeing is popular at the Gardendale canoe throw-in site, perhaps some additional security/law enforcement should be recommended.	Page 3-39	The connection between sightseeing and a need for additional security is not immediately apparent; however SCPRT is encouraged to suggest this recommendation to the TWC. Comment noted.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
61	SCPRT	<p>Page 3-40. Please note that the reference to beach swimming/sunbathing from the USC study has to do with going to “an ocean beach to swim in the surf or sunbathe”. The Saluda Project assessment should be using the “lake/river swimming” information. In the discussion of freshwater fishing, the participation rates from <u>1990 to 2005</u> are provided in the USC report. The percentage of people fishing has declined slightly since 1990, but the overall number of people who fished increased by about 200,000 individuals. Eliminate SCPRT from the statement about the Central Midlands Planning District. In the last sentence, I would note “...survey respondents are <u>mostly</u> residents of the...” Furthermore, I provided a Special Report of recreation information from the 2005 USC study for the four counties of the Saluda Project and I suspect this information will be more pertinent to your report. I recommend using it for your discussion here and in Table 3.2-1. I recommend including pertinent things left out of the table such as jet-skiing, canoeing/kayaking/rafting, waterskiing, and sailing, and, if space is needed, eliminate beach swimming/sunbathing (ocean), attending outdoor sporting events, weights and exercise machines, etc.</p>	Page 3-40	<p>Table 3.2-1 has been edited to reflect this distinction.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Decline in fishing activity is noted.</p> <p>Edits have been made to the final Report.</p> <p>Only the top 25 most popular activities are presented in Table 3.2-1.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
62	SCPRT	Page 3-41: In the discussion about the population increase for the Saluda River counties (Rich/Lex), population is expected to increase by 40 percent - from when to when? In the last paragraph, explain why the use will not expand equally with the population growth of 29.3% or 52.9 percent (instead of 7%).	Page 3-41	Edit has been made to the final Report. Recreation days are expected to increase by 23 percent from 2006 to 2030 – not 7%. Edit has been made to the final Report.
63	SCPRT	Page 3-42: First sentence: I think it was intended that population is expected to increase by an average of 4.35 percent <u>for each of the 5 year periods</u> over the next 30 years <u>for a total of x percent</u> . In the last sentence, consider beginning with: “Applying current outdoor recreation trends and existing public recreation facilities with few anticipated changes, fishing may likely....”	Page 3-42	Edit has been made to the final Report.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
64	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	Shouldn't we strive to anticipate use for the life of the license? I cannot recall what the rationale was for stopping at 2030?	Page 3-44	<p>The South Carolina Budget and Control Board only provided population projections to the year 2030 at the time the report was written.</p> <p>SCE&G will be required to periodically monitor the capacity at which recreation facilities are being used via the FERC Form 80. SCE&G is required to complete this report every 6 years. The report provides an estimate of the capacity at which recreation facilities are being used. Any need for additional capacity will be determined at that time. This is probably a better way to determine future needs than to try and perform complex modeling procedures that cannot account for potential changes in recreation activities in the future (e.g., new inventions).</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
65	SCPRT	Page 3-45: Walking, etc. seems low here since 83% of the state's population participates in it. However, it could be due to the limited resources provided (short trails at Saluda Shoals and Dreher Island) and splitting dog walking out as a separate category. Or we could have missed a large segment of the population by only surveying people at the few public access areas.	Page 3-45	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Recreation Assessment targets use and user preferences at public access sites. These uses generally have a nexus to the project. Given that most of the public access sites provide for primarily water-related activities, it is not surprising that so low a percentage of respondents reported walking as a primary activity. It is not that there are limited resources at the project, but rather the facilities at the project are more related to water.</p>
66	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	<p>“Second, the parking areas at the two Mill Race sites are actually overflow parking for Riverbanks Zoo. As a result, some zoo patronage was likely included in this assessment.” This would only be true on days when zoo attendance was at a certain level. River parking and zoo parking are usually distinctly separate at Mill Race A and B. Before we discount any cars we could ask the zoo for their attendance numbers and at what number the parking groups merge into one. Just a thought.</p> <p>“Third, vehicle counts potentially include drive throughs.” Cars that were not stopped were counted?</p>	Page 3-55	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>All vehicles that entered the public access sites were counted. These counts potentially include vehicles that drove through the site and did not park. Vehicles were not counted as they exited the site.</p>

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
67	SCPRT	Page 3-60: On the Waterfowlers' recommendation about slowing residential development, consider and explanation in parentheses or footnote something like: "State law requires waterfowl hunting setback from houses and marinas at least 350 yards in Lexington/Richland Counties and 250 yards in Newberry/Saluda Counties. Houses and marinas should be excluded from any areas planned for waterfowl hunting."	Page 3-60	Edit has been made to the final Report.
68	SCPRT	Page 3-61: Please footnote some of the larger "other recommendations" such as Parksite, Dreher Island, Bundrick Island, and Sunset.	Page 3-61	The requested information has been incorporated into Appendix D.
69	SCPRT	Page 3-62: Please footnote some of the larger "other facilities" such as Parksite and Bundrick Island and "miscellaneous" such as Bundrick Island.	Page 3-62	The requested information has been incorporated into Appendix D.
70	SCPRT	Page 3-65: Please footnote some of the larger "other recommendations" such as Saluda Shoals and Mill Race A.	Page 3-65	The requested information has been incorporated into Appendix E.
71	SCPRT	Page 3-66: Please footnote some of the larger "additional or improved other facilities" such as Saluda Shoals, Mill Race B, and Hope Ferry (should be Metts?).	Page 3-66	The requested information has been incorporated into Appendix E.
72	SCPRT	Page 3-67: It is interesting to note that most of the respondents have never heard or seen the sirens/lights at the recreation site at which they were interviewed.	Page 3-67	Comment noted.
73	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	Along with the general conclusions that can be drawn i.e. LSR sites were in overall good condition, it seems useful to list in the conclusions specifically which sites need what specific measures at what times.	Page 3-71	This type of information will be discussed in the TWC and finalized in the Saluda Project Recreation Plan. See also response to Comment #18.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTS	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
74	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	However, sites X,Y, and Z were found to experience overcrowding etc during X,Y, and Z periods. Agree with Malcolm here, the main membership user groups should be directly surveyed.	Page 4-73	Edit has been made to the final Report. See response to Comment #10.
75	SCPRT	Page 4-70: In 4.1, provide results of the ADA assessment.	Page 4-70	Edit has been made to the final Report.
76	SCPRT	Page 4-71: 2 nd paragraph: "While some of those activities occur on shore, most of the sites are <u>designed for and</u> used to access the lake..."	Page 4-71	Edit has been made to the final Report.
77	SCPRT	Page 4-72: 2 nd paragraph: change "midlevel use" to "a moderate level of use". Are these also the largest in acreage or closest to population centers?	Page 4-72	Edit has been made to the final Report. Some of the sites are large (e.g., Dreher Island) and can accommodate a large number of users. Other sites are close to population centers (e.g., Damsite, Larry L. Koon Boat Landing) and may have the greatest number of users due to this.

Response to Comments on the Recreation Assessment Study Report

Saluda Project

APRIL 2007

COMMENT #	COMMENTER	COMMENT	PAGE #	RESPONSE
78	SCPRT	<p>Page 4-73: First partial paragraph, add a sentence: “Furthermore, little sampling occurred during the regular university school year and much use of the Mill Race A and B areas is expected to be from this group.”</p> <p>Second full paragraph: Saluda Shoals is noted as the largest site on the river, please provide acreage for these. Also, “cartop” launching would be better described as “throw-in” since many use trailers to get canoes/kayaks to Gardendale.</p>	Page 4-73	Edits have been made to the final Report.
79	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	<p>Appendix E, Table E-1: Primary Recreation Activities at Lower Saluda Sites: comments: Saluda Shoals Park seems to show less river/water-based activity than the other sites on the river. Was the survey focused on people at the landing area of SSP or at admission area? Interesting that the activity of “sightseeing” is not reported to occur in Saluda Shoals Park, while sightseeing is a major use at Gardendale: I think “sightseeing” may be capturing the illicit activities that occur at the sites that are not controlled/gated.</p>	Appendix E	<p>Survey clerks were stationed at the exit to the Park next to the Administration building and therefore captured users of all areas of the park, not just the landing area.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
80	Bill Marshall/SCDNR	Table E-4: at bottom, table has incorrect footnote.	Appendix E	Edit has been made to the final Report.
81	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	“There are 15 public access sites on Laky Murray that are owned by South Carolina Gas and Electric...”	Page 1-1	Edit has been made to the final report.
82	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	In Table 2.1-4: Individual Did <i>Not</i> Speak English	Page 2-7	Edit has been made to the final report.
83	Coastal Conservation League/American Rivers	“Currently SCE&G is working with the Ssafety Resource Conservation Group...”	Page 3-20	Edit has been made to the final report.