SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING RECREATION MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL WORKING COMMITTEE

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER March 3, 2006

final dka 03-22-06

ATTENDEES:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
David Hancock	SCE&G	George Duke	LMHC
Dave Anderson	Kleinschmidt Associates	Tim Vinson	SCDNR
Tommy Boozer	SCE&G	Tony Bebber	SCPRT
Steve Bell	Lake Murray Watch	Jennifer Summerlin	Kleinschmidt Associates

HOMEWORK ITEMS:

- Tommy B. send out acreage of current management prescriptions
- All research dock restrictions and any boating capacity studies the USACE used on Lake Lanier
- Dave scan and email existing boating use study
- Tim send Dave questions used by DNR during previous surveys
- Dave draft inventory form and inventory database

PARKING LOT ITEMS:

Discussion of shoreline classifications

<u>DATE OF NEXT MEETING:</u> March 17, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. Conference Call



SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING RECREATION MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL WORKING COMMITTEE

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER March 3, 2006

final dka 03-22-06

MEETING NOTES:

These notes serve to be a summary of the major points presented during the meeting and are not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting.

Dave A. opened the meeting by briefly going over the objectives of the TWC and what the committee needs to accomplish by the start of the recreation season. The first thing that the committee went over is the facility inventory that has been discussed in the Recreation RCG meetings. Dave reminded the group that they need to have the complete list of amenities by the end of the day in order to complete the facility inventory.

There was some discussion as to how the information would be maintained after it was collected. Dave explained the benefits of storing the information in a database, which would allow SCE&G to easily update the information, and will allow the data to be used in a variety of ways (GIS, brochure, website, etc.). Tommy reminded the group that SCE&G goes through the updating process when it is time to submit their Form 80s and also during the 5-year review of the lake management plan. Tommy noted that the 5-year review was originally a recreational review and has evolved to encompass the entire lake and land management program. The group also discussed how this information would be available on a website.

Dave reminded the group that a website is peripheral to collecting the information; we need to focus since the recreation season is approaching. There was a group discussion of additional variables that need to be collected for purposes of a complete facility inventory. One of the main points from this discussion focuses on ADA compliance. The group agreed that we must contact the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and have them evaluate all of SCE&G's park sites as part of the facility inventory. The group agreed to a final set of variables (to be shown on the inventory form—attached) that must be collected as part of the inventory. Dave will send out a draft form with the information to be collected prior to next meeting and will also begin to design the database that will store the information.

Steve B. indicated that shorelines in the forest management and future development classification and buffer zones are open to the public for passive recreational uses and should be included in the inventory of areas available for public use. Tommy Boozer indicated that he did not want to include these in the inventory of areas "designated" as recreational sites. Steve B. noted that the islands, which have no amenities, are included, so why not the forest management lands, future development, and buffers. David H. and Tommy expressed their concern about advertising buffer zones as designated recreational sites due to the potential for conflict it may create. Steve B indicated that members of the Recreational Resource Group should be aware that these shorelines, while not designated as recreational sites, are available for public use, noting that the FERC recently



SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING RECREATION MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL WORKING COMMITTEE

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER March 3, 2006

final dka 03-22-06

ruled that public access paths to the buffers should be provided as needed. Steve B. suggested that, for the purpose of inventory, forest management, future development, and buffers should be listed as a separate category (i.e., non designated areas, impromptu, passive) and included as part of the recreational resource inventory. The group agreed to further discuss this issue at a later time.

The group briefly returned to the discussion of facility inventory. Dave wanted to make sure that the list of amenities the group has agreed to will satisfy the comments from the SCPRT on the Initial Consultation Document. Tony B. indicated they would, but he would like to see numbers with those variables where a count makes sense (parking spaces, tables, etc.). Dave also wanted to make sure the group agreed that this information would only be collected for SCE&G public areas and not for private or commercial areas. The group agreed, but wanted to make sure the information we already have on private/commercial facilities is not lost.

There was some discussion as to whether the islands need to be taken off the SCE&G facilities list. Tommy wants them to stay on the list because they are an important part of recreational use on the lake. The group agreed to leave the islands on the list and indicate they can be used for primitive camping. Dave questioned the numbers assigned to some private facilities and not others. David H. replied they have not updated the numbers and need to do so as part of this exercise.

After lunch, the group concentrated on existing use data and the need to collect additional data for purposes of relicensing. Dave summarized the study request for recreation and went over the studies that need to be in place by the start of recreation season. Dave asked the group if a carrying capacity study was necessary given SCE&G cannot regulate the numbers of boats on the lake. Dave preferred the term boat density study and reminded the group that SCE&G has conducted this type of study in 2001. There was some discussion as to how the boat counts provide useful information and possible uses of this information in analyses of crowding on the lake. The group agreed to look at the existing boating count study and make a determination if this type of study needs to be conducted again. Dave will scan the report and send to the group so they can make a determination by Friday, March 10.

The group then discussed some of the studies done in support of the Catawba-Wateree relicensing for Duke Power. Tony pointed out the user surveys they conducted at existing sites as well as the surveys done of the surrounding region to determine the need for more access sites. Tommy B. questioned if this information was useful for locating new recreation sites. Tony replied that not only did the surveys do that, but also provided information as to satisfaction with existing facilities. Tommy reminded the group that the main determination they will use in deciding locations of new sites is whether SCE&G owns the property—it is highly unlikely that SCE&G will purchase additional properties for future sites.



SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING RECREATION MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL WORKING COMMITTEE

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER March 3, 2006

final dka 03-22-06

Dave questioned the group if it would be possible to use counts conducted during the remediation project to estimate use at recreation facilities. The group agreed this information might prove useful, but is probably not an accurate reflection of use. The group discussed doing a use estimate of SCE&G facilities as well as conducting a survey of users at these sites. Tim mentioned the DNR has some questions they use for these types of surveys and he will send the questions to Dave. Dave will also look at the Catawba-Wateree study and see if there are any applicable questions the group can use. Dave will draft a questionnaire for the group's consideration at the next meeting.

Dave reminded the group that we must reach a decision on the boat density study as soon as possible so the group can finalize plans for the recreation season. Tony pointed out the season starts on April 1 and he would like to see the survey conducted over an entire year. The group examined the calendar for the coming weeks and agreed to have conference call on March 17 to talk about a user questionnaire. Dave reminded the group that the LSR needs to be included in any studies. After reviewing the homework items, the meeting adjourned.



SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING RECREATION MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL WORKING COMMITTEE

LAKE MURRAY TRAINING CENTER March 3, 2006

final dka 03-22-06

Additional Comments Received

Charlene Coleman: Well as a comment. I'd have to say Steve Bell raises a valid point, that I also questioned. I too believe there should be an acknowledgement of public ownership of such areas. The ostrich never saw anything with his head stuck in the sand. I see this inventory as a great asset in pursuing restoration of damaged buffers by "undetermined", sudden plant death by shore fronting landowners. Some of the islands I know are private and should be documented as such. I feel certain they do not pay taxes on this land. A public trail around the lake would be an awesome project too. Also, I'm pretty tired of people clearing all the way to the river too.

Patrick Moore: The Coastal Conservation League and American Rivers support including project lands open to public recreation in the recreation inventory. These lands have existing recreational uses that will probably only increase in the future. To get the full picture of current and future recreational use on Lake Murray it would be useful to know who uses these lands now, who is likely to use them in the future, which ones have public access from roads/other public lands etc. We can figure out a way to include these project lands open to public recreation and avoid advertising them as public recreation areas. I am under the impression that part of our job is to make a recomendation to the L&LM RCG about the current and future shoreline classifications based on our recreation studies



Site Visit/Inventory Forms

Inspected by:			Date:
Site Name/Code:			
Address:			
City:		Zip Code:	
Facility Type:			
Campground/Campsites		Picnic Area	Day Use
Overlook Site		Informal Site	
Access:		A \	
Paved access		# of lanes	
Unpaved access		# of lanes	
Operations:		7	/
Manned	<u> </u>	Seasonal	
Unmanned	_	Year Round	
Fee (\$)			
Site Facilities:			
# Type		# Type	
Picnic Tables	_	Potable Water	
Grills		Dumping Station	
Firepit/ring		Boat Ramp	(# of lanes)
Sanitation		Docks	
Trails (specify use		Playground	
Shelter		Showers	
Designated Swim Area		Food	
Store		Marina	
Fuel			

Parking Lots:	
# Type	
ADA spaces	Spaces delineated?
Regular spaces	Curbs?
Vehicle & trailer spaces	
Sanitation Facilities:	
Type: # Wor	# # men Men
Flush	
Portable	
Campground/Campsite:	
RV sites	Cabin sites Tent sites Wilderness sites
# of sites	Cubin sites Tent sites Whatmess sites
On site parking	
Water front	
ADA compliant	
Boat Launch Facilities:	
Hard surface	Unimproved
Gravel	Carry In
Courtesy/Fishing Docks:	
Courtesy/Fishing	Dimensions ADA Compliant