

**MEETING NOTES**

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

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

Final acg 9-19-07

---

**ATTENDEES:**

Alison Guth	Kleinschmidt Associates
Bill Argentieri	SCE&G
Bill Green	S&ME
Wenonah Haire	Catawba Indian Nation
Sandra Reinhardt	Catawba Indian Nation
Randy Mahan	SCANA Services
Rebekah Dobrasko	SHPO

---

**MEETING NOTES:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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