

SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT RELICENSING

FERC PROJECT NO. 516

Quarterly Public Meeting

September 22, 2005

10:00 A.M. Session

Presented by:

Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt Water Resources

Produced by:

Capital Video

405 Timberpoint Court

Columbia, SC 29212

803.781.6747

PUBLIC MEETING:

MR. STUART: Can everyone hear me okay? My name is Alan Stuart; I'm with Kleinschmidt Associates. This is the first of our quarterly public meetings. We had our re-licensing JAM, Joint Agency Meeting, back in August --- or June, and I'm sorry. And we want to go ahead start these quarterly public meetings and kind of give everyone an update on the progress of the re-licensing. We have some Agendas outside, we also have some additional handouts and operating procedures for those who did not get them off the web site, or were not e-mailed. If you don't have them, you can stop by and pick one up on the way out; or, we can get you one now. As I said, we began this re-licensing, we issued the Notice of Intent on April this year. At that same time, we had also issued the initial stage. We conducted our Joint Agency Meeting on June 16th. And as of August 16th, we began receiving comments from all interested stakeholders. We received thirty-six study requests, forty-four requests for additional information, and nine requests for potential mitigation. Respondents included three Federal Agencies, three State Agencies, one County Agency, two City Agencies, one University, one Local Business, twelve NGO's, and six individuals. This is a breakdown of the Federal, State and Government Agencies that we received comments from. I think everyone --- I see a lot of familiar faces here. And that kind of gives you a breakdown of who is going to be involved in this, or

at least up to this point.

You may notice that we have not received comments from DHEC yet, but we had gotten a response from Gina Kirkland, who is in the process of providing those. These are some of the non-governmental organizations that have provided us comments; we broke them down just for information purposes into State, Federal, and Local. As you can see, there is quite a few interested parties in this proceeding. One thing that you will notice is through this process, you are going to see what we refer to as the "Alphabet Soup". As these meetings convene, we will start using acronyms to identify the various agencies. We have a sheet out front that we have prepared for everyone to try to keep you informed of what each acronym stands for. We are also going to post that on our web site. So, please visit that, it will be updated throughout this process. It will identify certain stakeholders, what the National Environmental Policy Act stands for, NEPA. A whole laundry list of things. The Resource Conservation Groups, right now we are planning to start convening those in November; we are trying to schedule around other re-licensings. What I wanted to do today is put up each Resource Conservation Group that we have and those individuals who have expressed interest or committed to being on those. As you will see, some of them are very large. I think this is the largest one, this is the Water Quality Conservation Group. If you don't

see your name on here, and you are interested, please let us know as quickly as possible. We have some sign-up sheets out front; and if you don't see it it's not because you are excluded from it.

Just let us know, it's because we haven't gotten the information that you are interested. As you see, there is a pretty diverse group of Utility Members, of Lake Home Owners, and various State and Federal Agencies. This is our Fish and Wildlife. Again, this is one of the larger ones. Lake and Land Management. Again, if you don't see your name, and you want to participate, please let us know. Recreation. Operations. Cultural Resources. At the express of some of the Homeowner Groups, it was suggested that we develop a Safety Conservation Group. It is something that I think the Lake Murray Association, I believe, has expressed interest in for many years. We thought this will be a good platform to try to get one going. If you are interested in that Resource Conservation Group, either e-mail Alison at that e-mail address, or just let her know on your way out today, and we will get those forms and get you up on those.

Back on September 9th, we issued a draft version of the Operating Procedures. Many of you noticed that it said "Final". It was an internal final, not excluding anybody from providing comments. We are accepting comments, we are advocating that you solicit us comments. You can send those to Alison; and what we will do is go through them. Evaluating one thing, we developed a protocol based

on past interaction with State, Federal and stakeholders on other re-licensing; it's a tried and proven method. I know we have gotten positive feedback from, I think, NOAA Fisheries, and the DNR; so, we are not looking to recreate the wheel. We want to kick off, we want to start with something we know that works. We know you want to, you know, be involved in the process. So, by all means please submit, you know, some comments. We would like to, you know, review the comments and incorporate those that can help this process along. And we will issue another version once we have received all comments. We are also developing a communications protocol that will be part of the operating procedures. We will also send those out for draft review and comment. So, you will have an opportunity to comment; I know there was a little disconnect there on this final versus draft. But, you know, we are soliciting your input. We have some coming attractions, as I call them. We have the Woodstork Survey coming up this Friday, tomorrow. We are also doing a Saluda Turbine Venting Testing work starting the first two weeks on October. This is SCE&G installed hub baffles (phonetic) on the units, and we need to go back and develop (inaudible) information on the air efficiency after the hub-baffles have been installed so we can optimize the use of those hub-baffles. Also, right here are some of the dates, or "the" dates, that we plan to convene the Resource Conservation Groups. We plan to post these on the web site. I think Alison has

e-mailed those individuals that expressed interest on each one of these. And we are slowly starting to get responses back. It appears that the Agencies have a problem meeting towards the end of the month due to prior commitments on the Catawba-Wateree, and I guess, Bleat and Tillary (phonetic), those other re-licensings. So, these Resource Conservation Groups are going to try to be focused in the first two weeks of the month for Saluda. We are trying to accommodate as many people as we can. So, you might want to kind of block out those two weeks as potential periods where we will be meeting for these Conservation Groups. If you have problems and can't meet, you know, please let us know and we will do whatever we can to accommodate you. But basically what we are going on now is the majority. If the majority of people can meet, then that's what we have to go with. I know it's a very tedious thing to do, but that's just what we have to do to keep this process moving forward.

MR. LEAPHART: Alan, just a quick question. How long do you anticipate those meetings lasting from --- can you start at 9:30?

MR. STUART: That's Malcolm Leaphart, asking how long we anticipate the Conservation Groups Meetings to last. Honestly, Malcolm, it depends on what Conservation Group it is, and how many issues. I foresee potentially the Water Quality and Fisheries, and Wildlife, will be meeting pretty much all day; as opposed to like

the Cultural Resource, which may only go half a day. Also, what it's going to depend on in the early stages, they will probably be very lengthy meetings because there will be a lot of material to cover; and as they progress they will probably shorten in duration. It's really hard to tell you, you know. What we are trying to do is if we anticipate it being an all day, we say from 9:00 to 4:30. But if we anticipate a shorter schedule, we will say 9:00 to Noon, or something along those lines. That kind of gives you an idea. Yes, Bob?

MR. KEENER: Bob Keener. On the meetings, has there been any consideration to maybe having the schedule changed to permit the people who are working in order to attend may --- Retirees like myself, we can basically get there any time, but to respect people who can --- who are very interested and have a lot to contribute, to have to take leave in order to attend the meetings and participate is a bit much.

MR. STUART: I understand. And as I said the other night, you know, it's a delicate balance. We also have the Agencies who are paid to do this, and it's very hard for them to commit their personal time and have this balanced. One suggestion we keep promoting is for those individuals I know that are interested is to get with you or the representative, and you convey their thought to us. I mean, we are trying to --- like I said, we are trying to meet the needs of the mass, and it's hard when one or

two individuals can't, because it's a commitment I understand. It's a delicate balance. There are times maybe we can come up with creative solutions like maybe convening an evening meeting; have the Agencies stay over, and then meet the next day if they are on, you know, say a Wildlife and Fisheries Meeting in the evening; and then have the Water Quality the next day, or something vice versa, where they can optimize their time, you know, to do this. We may be able to do it in the afternoon --- later in the afternoon. That's one option. The problem is, a lot of these are going to be very lengthy meetings. And, I mean, if we started at 6:00 we could finish at 2:00 o'clock in the morning. You know, that's an issue.

MR. MAHAN: Randy Mahan. Isn't it true that once we have the initial meetings of these Resource Groups that they can establish their own --- a different schedule, and their schedules based upon how their participants can meet these --- we just have to be sure that the Resource Agencies, again, because --- you know, if he says, "Let's do all of this in the evenings," after they put in their, you know, their eight to ten hour day, would you expect them to be there for another four or five hours in the evening? That's not fair to them. Absolutely. I agree we probably would need to find some way, maybe, the committee to consider particularly to know that the public at large is going to have to a real extent. Maybe we need to find time some way to

accommodate them on occasion. The thing about it is that also to say particularly on some of these Technical Groups, we expect people to be a part of these functions to be in attendance and not be once every six months attendee because when somebody comes in you are not up to date, and this happened before, you slow the process down. There is no easy answer, Bob, there really is no easy answer. This is the same kind of protocol we have seen in public re-licensing, and the same issues certainly were present in those. So, if there is a magic bullet that ensures everyone who wants to participate can participate when they want to participate, let us know. But there is no reality to swapping the calendar. Okay.

MR. BROOKS: I'm Tom Brooks from Newberry County, and Kim Westburg is with Saluda. I am not speaking for Kim, but just like the Resource Agencies, you know, we are here representing the Counties. If you have concerns, for representing whatever county you are in- you can call him and we can try to voice your concerns out at this meeting.

MR. STUART: We are looking for suggestions as Randy pointed out, he made a very good point. Once the Resource Conservation Groups convene after this initial meeting, you know, if it suits the majority to meet at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon, and everyone is for it, and all the people can be there, that's great. If there is not an absolute, if the group wants to deviate

from, you know, the morning, that's within their right. We allow that flexibility in the operating plan, I believe. The point is, we just have to keep moving forward.

MR. MOORE: I'm Patrick Moore from SCCCL. And this is you're soliciting comments on the protocol, I was wondering if there was a deadline on those comments. And if you can briefly describe how your going to design it and integrate those comments, how will that be decided.

MR. STUART: Well, the deadline --- we would like to get them as quickly as possible. I would like to have them wrapped up by no later than the middle of October. If it appears that we are getting substantial comments that may change the structure of the plan, possibly what we may do is convene a meeting, to sit down and hash through the problem areas, or areas that appear to have problems. Right now, I know I have received comments from you, you know, which seem fairly easy to address. Without seeing the comments, it's kind of hard to gauge, you know, the course of action. I think ultimately the majority of comments will probably be incorporated without any problem.

MR. MOORE: Okay. It appears to me maybe we're going to have finality in the future and if the process is going to come up sometime over the next few years --- if y'all form maybe a Resource Conservation type entity, a smaller group that could

handle process concerns more efficiently, you know, to discuss all of the issues again --- issues.

MR. STUART: Well, I know you kind of conveyed that the other day and if it's a possibility, you know, I would let Randy talk on that one.

MR. MAHAN: Let us get a --- at least an initial gauge of the definite extent of these comments. It may only take one or two that really say ask for a basic re-ordering of a function we say that we can't consider that without convening a group, we are not adverse to that. Well, see, all the time we've --- it's kind of around the edges, and if it's something we can accommodate without convening another meeting.

We would like to have the opportunity to do that first. If you have really got some great fundamental differences, and there is no way that we can operate with the protocol that you have laid out here without making changes, somebody's talking now. And then maybe you will have to meet with that individual and that group and talk about it. At this time lets look at the depth and breath of these comments before we start setting up more meetings.

MR. STUART: And the other thing is it will help out mine and everybody's time if we could consolidate the comments. And then redistribute, you know, amend the documents instead of sitting down day after day trying to work through it.

MR. BELL: I'm Steve Bell with Lake Watch. Would you consider putting the comments on the website so we can all look at everybody's comments as far as the documents, so we can get a feeling for what, you know, --- including y'all. And then once we get through that, and we look at what the comments are we will be able to tell how to incorporate them; then if we have a problem as they come, or anything, maybe we can meet?

MR. STUART: I don't see where there is a problem, Steve. You know, what we plan to do is put the comments --- or at least my envision, is put the comment in, saying who the provider was; you know, whether we take it there is any problem with it, or it's going to be accepted as written, and just move forward. But I don't personally have a problem, and I don't think SCE&G does. Comments should be made available.

MR. MAHAN: That's fine.

MR. STUART: Yes, ma'am.

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): I have a question about the state agencies being available to come to meetings only during working hours 9:00 to 5:00. Because many of these state agencies have assignments that have to be done in other hours. And I would presume the State is going to pay them the same whether it's at 3:00 in the afternoon or 8:00 at night. So, I think that the State Agencies have a little more flexibility . Because I am fairly concerned if you do get the general public into this process.

MR. STUART: I understand your concern- I can't speak for the State Agencies; but I'm sure --- I see a couple around here who would probably be willing to provide you a comment on that one. Ron?

MR. AHLE: Or not.

MR. STUART: Or, not?

MR. AHLE: I can speak for myself, but I can't speak for all of my co-workers. I think we would prefer that it be done during normal working hours. That would be a preference. But, if there were situations where it needed to be done later, I think that we could have some flexibility.

MR. STUART: I mean, I'm not sure how the pay structures works within the State and Federal Government, but you know, I don't know if it's an overtime issue. You know, I don't know. I can't answer that.

MR. MAHAN: I not paid by the State Agencies to argue their case for them. But, a lot of these same people are also involved currently in the Catawba-Wateree. That's thirteen hydro dams. Okay? So, you've got thirteen projects. Then we can --- something up here for counties, these folks could basically quit their day jobs and just work second shift, and still not be able to attend all of the meetings. We are trying to do what we can to try to remedy that. You are absolutely right. And a lot of them do --- a lot of the people in meetings can --- and they don't get

paid anything extra for that. So, we're not going to presume as Licensee to tell the Agency people that they have got to come in the evenings because one, they are not going to be able to do it, and if they don't then the comments that we are going to get from those Agencies on some very important issues are not going to have the benefit, the kind of information and the structure that they need. So, yes, we are trying to put priority just to accommodate those Agencies who have Statutory Regulatory authority, and particularly those who have authority under the Federal Power Act to demand certain conditions. So, yes, we accommodate them as much as we can. At the same time, I think you will probably find when you get to the Resource Committees, they may be just as well to have an occasional meeting. Again, I am not going to speak for them, but we are not going to ask them to, again, give up their day jobs and take night jobs just for our benefit.

MR. STUART: Something else to consider, these Resource Conservation Groups, at least in the initial stages, are going to meet quite frequently. Then they may not meet, if they are off doing studies or gathering information, they may not meet for three, four months. It just depends on each group. This is not going to be you meet, you know, Monday, Wednesday, Friday from now for the next five years. It's not going to progress like that. It will be very labor intensive in the early stages, and then if the need arises, the groups will convene when the information is

available from developing the Technical Working Committee, that information will go to the Resource Conservation Group; then they will convene a meeting to review it. So, you know, I want to say it's going to be a regular thing; but it will be regular as much as is needed. Yes, Malcolm?

MR. LEAPHART: Can you give us a guess as to how many times you think we might meet in the next year or so?

MR. STUART: Did you have anything specific on your mind?

MR. LEAPHART: What I am getting at, I'm looking at six days of annual leave in November. Am I going to have to do this five times in a year, or thirty times in a year? What would be your guess as to all of --- in all of the re-licensing?

MR. STUART: Again, that's a very difficult question to answer. First of all, it depends on how many Conservation Groups you are on. Secondly, as I said, the Fish and Wildlife, and Water Qualities may meet ten times in the next three months. Whereas, the Cultural Resource may meet one time in the next six months. It all depends on the number of issues that the Conservation Groups have to address. To give you --- and don't hold me to this number, I'll try to give you a high end with the Water Quality, I will say it will probably convene probably ten times in the next ten months at a minimum. At a minimum. As, on the low end of the spectrum, the Cultural Resource, I anticipate them meeting probably maybe three times in the next twelve months.

MR. AHLE: I just wanted to a comment to Malcolm. That is, that as we progress in these meetings, that these meetings perhaps like other ones I have been involved with, they step up as it gets towards the end of the process, instead of backing off. Like just for example the Catawba, we had a meeting on Monday, and we're having a meeting on next Monday, and next Tuesday. So, three meetings in like --- well, seven working days. And that's with the Compliance group. That's all I can tell you.

MS. HILL: Generally at the beginning of the process, there will be a lot of meetings, you know, as stated, as David is stating now. Once they begin their studies is it reasonable kind of back off while reviewing the studies after they gather that information, and compile that, then we will start meeting again, review that data, and then towards the end of the process there will be a lot more meetings for them to kind of get ready for their --- to get their application together. So, it kind of goes up, down, and back up.

MR. MAHAN: That's exactly right. It's very simple.

MR. STUART: Yes, please.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): As we pointed out at a meeting in Irmo Monday night, they're a number of the Associations that have representatives on the Resource Group. And I would hope that people who can't get on them would consider them as their, if you will, elected representatives, and make their desires known.

Like the Lake Murray Association is certainly trying to publicize that concept.

MR. STUART: Well, I understand exactly where you are coming from and that is what we tried to advocate. What we anticipate doing is putting each Resource Conservation Group and its members on the web site; everyone can review who is on there.

Please, if you can't be there all the time, first of all keep up through the web site; all the Minutes and notes, and everything will be on there. Secondly, find someone you feel comfortable with in expressing your views, even if you just have to send them by e-mail saying, "Here, I have these concerns." The individual at the meeting will say, "I have a few comments from John Q. Public." And his comments and concerns will be brought to the table for discussion. This is not a seamless process; there has to be some flexibility. There are deadlines that have to be made. I mean, we could do this for ten years if the FERC would allow it. Unfortunately, they only allow us five. And two of those are taken up with them reviewing the Final Application. So, you do the math and see the magnitude of what's involved. It's a very labor intensive process. We are looking for suggestions if, you know --

- What we are attempting to do are tried and proven methods in other re-licensings; but what we found to be the most successful, I don't know if it's the perfect world, but it works for the

majority of people. Like I said, Randy pointed out, Catawba-Wateree, those projects are over --- I can't tell you exactly, probably two dozen counties or something in that general neighborhood. So, their process is kind of geared it along the same lines of what we are trying to do. So, they are making it work, and I don't see where we can't make it work either. Yes, Patrick?

MR. MOORE: (Inaudible) I am a big believer in what goes in to the study equals what comes out of the study, so I was hoping we would talk a little about what will be done in the RCG's and the structure of the TWC and practical knowledge vs. working knowledge.

MR. STUART: The primary purpose of the Resource Conservation Groups are to sit down and develop those issues which are truly project related, identify how we can address those --- gather that information whether it be through a study, existing data, and then send those that need a study go through a Technical Working Committee who has the biological, scientific, engineering, whatever the discipline is; they develop a study scope, they will conduct a study. In the interim the Resource Conservation Groups are still kept abreast of what's going on, the progress they are making; they get a chance to review the technical study plan, you know, provide whatever comment as long as they have, you know,

some scientific knowledge of the process, or what's going to be done. Then the Technical Working Committee will, you know, go off and do the study or, you know, the DNR, consultant, or whoever, you know, ends up doing the study. But it will be under the direction of the Technical Working Committee.

MR. MOORE: (inaudible)

MR. STUART: Technical Working Committee, one of the prerequisites we did have in the plan is to have, you know, biological, scientific or engineering knowledge applicable to that Technical Working Committee.

MR. MOORE: (inaudible)

MR. STUART: We prefer people. If there is, you know --- for instance, I'm going to pick on Bill Marshall somewhere --- he's in here somewhere. There he is. Bill, may not have any practical --- any knowledge as a recreation person. I'm just using him as an example. However, he may be very experienced on rafting below Saluda Hydro. He has, you know, that practical knowledge that you are talking about, which he probably will be very beneficial in a Technical Working Committee. Somebody that lives on the lake, that one is a little --- it's not quite as easy to address as the one I used with Bill. That's why we want their knowledge on the Resource Conservation Group; it's to help steer the Technical Working Committee in the right direction. Randy.

MR. MAHAN: I can see there are a number of issues that don't necessarily require a degree, a science degree, Ph.D., or something to address the issue. Something like recreation, we are not going to necessarily require someone who wants to participate in a recreation group have a degree. There aren't that people, but I believe have, quote, "degrees", in public recreation and recreation planning, and so forth. But now, if we are going to commission a study, and we decided we needed to have a boating view; so, boating --- oh, capacity study. I think at that point the folks who understand statistics and methodologies for doing studies, produce good information, are the ones who ought to be on the Technical Committee. I don't know that I necessarily would have an objection if they decided they wanted to have one, quote, "practical", we'll call it a lay expert on there who could maybe take a little bit of the edge off of academia and put a little bit of reality into it. But for the most part what we are trying to do is to have technical issues, issues that are driven by science, be determined as a working level; or that the information be gathered and evaluated by those who have the knowledge and experience in the science. Give the benefit of that to the larger groups; and they, of course, make the policy decisions based upon --- will make policy recommendations based upon the results, the working

efforts of the Technical Committee. There are going to be some groups you really just don't need. Say, you know, degree'd science degree'd people involved in there to address the issues. Safety may be one of those things on the lake. We've got a lot of folks who live around the lake who understand about the safety issues involved with the lake. We've got folks who recreate downstream. If Charlene were here, she is certainly qualified as an expert, whether you folks wanted to accept it or not, she's going to demand it, you know, Charlene. But she is absolutely somebody who ought to be involved in this; whether or not she has a degree in it or not has nothing to do with it. She is somebody that you would want to have involved, or somebody maybe from River Runner, or one of the commercial --- you know, maybe they need to be involved in those issues a little bit more. But, I know where you are going with that. Somebody who has a lot of experience, has practical knowledge, actually getting out and doing things, should not necessarily be disqualified from participating on one of these.

MR. STUART: Jim (phonetic).

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): How about (inaudible) do we have for technical meetings?

MR. STUART: You are free to attend the Technical Working Committee meetings as an observer all you want. You know,

I don't ---

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): I think that one thing (inaudible) is having people are interested but may not then want to get, you know, cause the situation to slow down, or progress, whatever, you know, to progress; that you can be an observer, but maybe can get a chance to raise their hand and ask a question once in awhile, you know.

MR. STUART: Well, and that's part of the reason we developed these Technical Working Committees to have the knowledge; because, every time you don't understand, that's the first thing that happens; you start asking questions and that bogs down the process of developing the study scope. Your questions come up during the Resource Conservation Groups when you are trying to narrow down and define, "What do we actually need to address this?" Now, if you don't understand the methodology, there will be a study plan prepared. I am sure you could send in a comment and say, "I don't understand what this is going to accomplish." One thing I did notice in the number of the comments, and I am going to use this one as a for instance, was the use of the word "study". It was used - at least in my mind and my experience - very loosely. And one of my examples is, I don't recall who it was, but somebody provided a comment that said, "We need to do a study to determine the best way SCE&G can distribute

operational information." To me, in my mind, that's not a study, that's something that the Operations group sits down and says, "Okay, what are our options here?" You know, "Let's put everything out on the table and pick what we think will work." It doesn't necessarily mean it's a, quote, "study". And, you know, we'd include each of them as a study because that's the way they were listed. But there were a lot of study requests that were along those lines. Doesn't necessarily mean we are not going to address that information.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): You might consider allowing an observer, a specific time during that process to ask any questions in five minutes, you know, or something like that. But, anyway, it's a good idea to have observers there even if they can't participate, but --- there's a way to work through that.

MR. STUART: Yeah, participating is just that. As to what you put into it, as long as it doesn't bog down the Technical Working Committees. We are not excluding anybody from them. As Randy said, "If you have, you know, practical knowledge or real time knowledge, like if you are out there on the River, you are an expert rafter, or kayak or something like that, but you don't have a recreational degree, obviously your influence is very vital in a Technical Working Committee geared for doing a rafting study, for instance. Or, whatever the Technical Working Committee is doing.

MR. MAHAN: I might even suggest that people who are on the Technical Commission with on the issue groups, who really want to understand it, they know that they don't have the scientific knowledge and experience to really get in on some of the technical issues, but if they want to be educated I think it's a good idea for them to sit in on them. I have got a degree in English, but trust me, there is nothing in my educational background that qualifies me to do much of what the heck I'm doing now. But, I have been exposed to it for the past thirty years. And you do pick up some facts. So, there is value for the people who ultimately are going to make those kind of decisions to help define the issues and help to come resolution. To understand as much as they can even if they are not going to actually be able to help the design and study, and help them to evaluate scientifically what the results are going to be. So, I would encourage folks to come as observers. I think that's the certainly an advantage.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): If you have a lot of knowledge you can benefit the groups; you might not want to be right in the middle of it but sit back and there's something they might be able to show you.

MR. MAHAN: I'm not likely to be on any technical committees, unless we have one for English majors.

MR. STUART: Yes, Lee.

MR. BARBER: You have a process established for individuals to submit their credentials the various committees?

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): That has not happened.

MR. STUART: Well, that is something --- that's a very good comment. We certainly can, you know, solicit that information if you feel --- or, at least a process for review. You know, if you feel technically qualified, whether it be through real life application, or academics, if you feel that you are being excluded from a Technical Working Committee and feel you should, I think that's a very good idea. Certainly can implement that as part of the procedures. Yes, Malcolm.

MR. LEAPHART: Will the minutes for that Technical Working Committee be published also?

MR. STUART: Absolutely. At that time, what you may want to do, Steve, you know, what you are talking about, if you are reading the minutes from a Technical Working Committee, drop one of those people a line. What I hope to do is have a, you know, not a figure head because that's not a good term, but, a point man or person in the Technical Working Committee. And say, "Okay, I have this question. What does this word mean? Or, what does this do?" You know, if there is a certain question you have, I hope they can, you know --- We want this to be an educational process for

everyone. Unless I'm just really going to miss the boat here, there will be so many practicing biologists that come out of this process, if you stay up to speed you will be amazed at the scientific knowledge you will get out of this.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): About the minutes --- when you post that stuff on the web site, you know,---- could you do your best to get that up there as soon as possible.

MR. STUART: Well, the Technical Working Committees, that's why we are trying to keep them small so you can get this information distributed as quickly as possible. That's the best -- goes back to having questions all throughout the thing. When you have to go through and explain a battery of questions to your people that aren't knowledgeable in that field, or that very small niche, that's when it bogs down the process.

MR. MAHAN: We'll try to be sure we get the minutes of each meeting on the site as quickly as we reasonably can because old information isn't necessarily as helpful as new information. So, we understand your take on that. That means, we can do like, you know, the Federal Courts and have a transcript by the end of the day.

That ain't going to happen, but we certainly hope to have the minutes available so that they are still fresh and there is plenty of time for you to ask your questions before the next Technical

Committee Meeting may meet, or something of that sort.

MR. STUART: Yes, Bill.

MR. MARSHALL: Bill Marshall, the Department of Natural Resources. Looking in your Operations Procedures and Section Number 6, the procedures for making recommendations and --- I suppose those are procedures for making final recommendations from a resource conservation group, or with guide for the interim. And what particularly, the question I would have relates to some of the previous discussions; such as Item Number 4 under Section 6, says: Members are expected to provide scientific or data based support for their proposed recommendations. Obviously, we all would desire to have a lot of information to support our views. But what you were saying earlier supports that just experience, expertise and knowledge goes a long way. You don't necessarily have to have a bunch of data to make a recommendation. Because part of this process is to go get educated, experience that says we need additional information. So, if we are going to go (inaudible). We don't have to have information that says we need to get information.

MR. STUART: That's correct. Yeah, that's correct.

MR. MARSHALL: For example, we know you have issues among the public about safety on the Lower Saluda. If we don't have a lot of data that says how many people are using the River, and how

many near drowning we might have out there, or anything like that.

And so, you can get in a situation where we are assuming today or whether there is a safety problem on the Lower Saluda. You might say, "Well, we've got a little bit of data", and somebody can argue, "well that's not enough data, it's not an issue." But that's what I want to make sure of not getting into. And I don't think I'm hearing that at all. But just wanted to throw that out to you.

MR. STUART: Yes. I don't necessarily think, no --- I agree with you, that's not. At the same time we also don't want to send SCE&G down a rabbit hole chasing data just for the sake of chasing data. There's a fine balance there.

MR. MARSHALL: Sure. Okay. There has to be a reasonable rational argument for going after a particular path of study.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): Going back for a second. On the Technical Committees, who assigns the people to the Technical Committee? Who is responsible for the assignment of those individuals?

MR. STUART: Ultimately it's going to be through the Resource Conservation Group itself.

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): Does approval ---

MR. STUART: I wouldn't say assign, that might be a little strict of a word. But, I think those individuals will step

up to the forefront who are the best, most knowledgeable in that area will form the Technical Working Committee. It's like fish entrainment, for instance. Let's pick that one. I don't know if Ron is the right person, or it might be Hal Beard. I mean, you know, I know quite about fish entrainment; I'm sure I will be up there, you know, expressing the lead. And as the group gets smaller, you will recognize that I know a lot about it, and Ron knows about it; and you will say, "Okay, you guys go off and do that. That sounds good to me." It's going to be one of those processes where you have to just take each issue one by one to get to that goal.

STEVE BELL: If the stakeholder wants to bring in an expert or, you know, someone who has that expertise and offer them as a technical, working with the Technical Committee, we can also do that.

MR. STUART: Positively, You know, we don't have all the experts, you know. If you know of someone that is willing to contribute to this ---

MR. (UNIDENTIFIED): According to the Agency, there is an opportunity to bring in experts from the NGO's or whatever (inaudible)---

MR. STUART: Yes, if they have that knowledge. Now, when you are talking about an expert, they should have very --- you

know, they should have a package of credentials that demonstrate them as an expert. And that goes more along the lines of, not the practicality of it, but the scientific, the engineering or the biological knowledge base to be called an expert.

MR. MAHAN: Steve, clearly we are going to have our quote experts to gather information, analyze information. We are not the holders and the gatherers of all truth. Certainly if somebody else has an expert, somebody with qualifications that would assist the process, yes, we want to hear from them.

MR. STUART: Based on some of the work we have done in the past, specifically with water quality, I know Jim Ruane, whose name you will hear quite a bit about water quality, he is very well respected. He has worked on the Catawba-Wateree Relicensing; he has done a W2 Model on Lake Murray; he has worked with Hank Keller from the Department of Natural Resources; he comes with very high credentials, and very reputable knowledge of Limnology (phonetic). One of my goals is to have him give a presentation on the W2 Model that he prepared. This was done back when we were revising the DO Standard. And it's a very valuable tool, and it provides a great deal of information that I don't think a lot of people are aware of. Those are the kind of things I hope those groups start forming. You know, get this knowledge out. You know,

I know we quoted it in the ICD, but writing about it does not do as much justice as him getting up there explaining the practicality of it and what it actually means, and can do it as a useful tool. Yes, ma'am.

MS. HILL: I'm Amanda Hill with the U.S. Fish Wildlife Service. In the document it refers several times to a facilitator in each of the meetings. Is SCE&G going to hire a professional facilitator for this? Or is Kleinschmidt going to do this?

MR. STUART: I think at this point, Kleinschmidt is going to do it. They also --- there is John Hall who is a very good facilitator that works at SCE&G, he does it a side bar kind of --- you know, it's a hobby of his. One of the most, I guess ---

UNIDENTIFIED: Which hobby?

MR. STUART: Well, it's his hobby, but, you know, he may do it on a professional level. I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED: Kleinschmidt is going to do it?

MR. STUART: Yes. We'll primarily be on it, I think. We will also probably have a resource, you know, technical members like Shane will be on the Wildlife, Fish and Wildlife, you know. He's a very good Wildlife biologist, knows a lot. He's been working with the woodstork. So there will be a fine mesh of everyone on there. Yes, ma'am?

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): So, are you going to solicit

qualifications? Because I guarantee there are a lot of people here (inaudible) might not suggest to the public, the fact is they need to (inaudible) of Lake Murray, we have got to have people with credentials that would appreciate satisfying.

MR. STUART: We have opened these Resource Conservation Groups to anybody that wants to be on it. Again, if someone feels they are qualified to be on one of these Technical Working Committees, I advocate them to offer their credentials to the group and see where they fit in; without being --- having a specific issue to address, I can't --- you know, I can't do it. Bob Keener, he may be the world's authority on fish entrainment for all I know. I don't know what --- you know, I don't know everybody's past, I don't know what they're involved in. If they want to get involved and have that ability, by all means.

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): Somehow I think the word should go out that so the people should come forward and justify their credentials.

MR. STUART: As I have always advocated in the past, the public is the best avenue for dissemination of information.

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): But your website could be one too.

MR. STUART: I don't disagree. You know, as we get into these Resource Conservation Groups, I think those will very much come to light. Other questions? Yes, Bill?

MR. MARSHALL: Bill Marshall for the Department of Natural Resources. In terms of getting membership to the Committees, it's pretty open up until they start, and even after they start, I guess. It's wide open enough to do it, because if anybody can get on ---

MR. STUART: On the Resource Conservation Group?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. STUART: Yes, the Resource Conservation Group is the mother ship of the issue, Fish and Wildlife, for instance. Yes, there are protocols in there for those individuals that want to get in after the process has been started. We want people to get in early if possible; but it's openly up to them to get up to speed if they come in three months into the process.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, to do it, it's essentially a matter of contacting Alison. Right?

MR. STUART: Exactly. If you want to be on this Conservation Group, we have advocated that from the get-go throughout this whole process.

MR. MAHAN: I seriously think that the groups start out pretty big and pretty vigorous, and then there is a rather high rate of attrition. Some of that is they decide they don't want to spend that much time. And some of it is they recognize that there are enough people in that group already concerning their issue,

really dogging that issue, that they decide, "I can withdraw because I'm comfortable that my issue is going to be raised." We didn't want to start out by saying, "You can only have fifteen people on this group," and then have the problem of deciding which of these fifty people who wanted to are going to be those fifteen. And that could be very difficult. We start out broad, and again I think the attrition rate is going to be pretty high and pretty quick basically because --- I think more so because they have seen that the other people who are really going to be forming those issues, and maybe even people who understand the issues better than they do. So, I may be wrong. I would wonderful, I guess, if we could have twenty-five or thirty people on each of these because there is so much interest and they have got so much to add to the process. But, what we are doing, we are talking a couple of years; a lot of commitment, people who have a lot of enthusiasm up front that really kind of weans a little bit as we get down the road.

MR. STUART: You have to have staying power during this process. Other questions?

(No response)

MR. STUART: That's all I have today. Please get us comments that you have on the operation procedures as quickly as possible. We want to go ahead and wrap those up. So, you will be

getting copies of the communications protocol that I referenced. We are obviously soliciting comments on those. Those are not final. Ma'am?

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): Are we going to get comments --- I believe it's the agencies specific--- Are we going to get general comments back from you on our ICD comments?

MR. Stuart: We hope to get those done in the Resource Conservation Groups. But if you want official comments, we probably could prepare some. I know, you know, there were some studies we thought may be a little --- there was additional information that would cover those study requests. But we can either raise those at the Resource Conservation --- or Conservation Group level, or an official submittal.

MS. UNIDENTIFIED): If we could get letter back, if there was anything that we should do, request that one of the Fish and Wildlife studies(inaudible - a lot of banging noises) and then (inaudible - loud banging noises). And maybe you would have that information (inaudible) and if you could send us back something explaining that, that would be (inaudible).

MR. MAHAN: We can do that, Amanda. Understanding that the Resource Committees in a sense, I guess, could end up overruling what our initial reaction to your request is.

We may decide, "Well, we have already got enough data on the

book," or, whether we can get together and satisfy that. The Resource Committee may decide, "No, there is additional work that we think needs to be done; and, therefore, you are going to do it." So, we certainly will respond back to you; we're not going to be the final arbiters of that until we have the benefit of the Resource Committee input to it.

(At this point the meeting became very disorganized)

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): It's just there have been other relicensings where the applicant refused to do the study, giving us no reason why.

MR. STUART: I really think ---

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): An applicant just refused ---
(inaudible) --- to her question.

(Several people speaking simultaneously)

MR. STUART: You might be a little premature and --- No, at this point I don't think we have taken a stance or SCE&G has taken a stance on this ---

MR. MAHAN: (inaudible) not going to be, you know, (inaudible) our initial reaction. And that's basically it, because we don't want to (inaudible) the answer to all these requests - (inaudible).

MR. STUART: I think they would like a chance to work things out, you know, at that level before just taking a position.

We are not here to take positions, I don't believe.

MR. MAHAN: (inaudible)

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): (inaudible)

MR. MAHAN: (inaudible) response (inaudible) a reason of what's going on, and then when we see you commit to the (inaudible) Committee meetings, you will understand.

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): (inaudible) would like to get some type of response (inaudible).

MR. STUART: Other questions?

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible) (a lot of people talking simultaneously out of order, laughing)

MR. MAHAN: --- agency comment. If the agency would have to have some kind of ---But, again, it may be ---My letter is going to be --- I don't want to write while we're here, but we have received your comments, we appreciate your comments, appreciate you --- is going to be determined by the Resource Conservation, may be something like that. But I would hope ---

MS. (UNIDENTIFIED): (inaudible)

MR. MAHAN: Yeah, we understand you need to (inaudible). We'll give you something to do (inaudible). How about that? And we can do the same thing for you, Bill. And other agencies. But, how many comments did we get ---

MR. STUART: An awful lot of comments.

MR. MAHAN: So, we would rather not have to try to address each and every one of them at this point because we are going to be addressing them in the Resource Conservation Groups. But we can certainly --- I don't know, did we acknowledge receiving comments?

(UNIDENTIFIED): We sent letters out (inaudible).

MR. MAHAN: But we didn't say perhaps who read --- (inaudible) and that would be considered after the Resource Conservation Groups.

MR. STUART: Right. Any other questions or comments?

(No response)

MR. STUART: We'll be convening these quarterly public meetings to give updates on the progress for those people that are interested in the process itself but do not want to get into the minutia of the Resource Conservation Groups, or Technical Working Committees. If you know of people who are interested, please, you know, ask them to come out, that hopefully these will very informative. What I would like to do in the future, once the Resource Conservation Groups are formed, is to give updates at these quarterly public meetings on what they have done over the last couple, three months, just to keep everybody informed. And that's pretty much all I have for today.

MR. MAHAN: We have another meeting this evening; if you didn't get enough this morning, feel free to return.

MR. STUART: I want to thank everybody for coming out. If you have questions, please let us know.

END OF PUBLIC MEETING.