

**MEETING NOTES**

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY  
SALUDA HYDRO PROJECT RELICENSING  
Low Inflow Protocol Focus Group**

**Lake Murray Training Center  
November 12, 2008**

final ACG 1-6-09

---

**ATTENDEES:**

Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt Associates  
Alison Guth, Kleinschmidt Associates  
Scott Harder, SCDNR  
Bill Marshall, LSSRAC, SCDNR  
Ray Ammarell, SCE&G  
Jim Cumberland, SCCCL

Steve Bell, LW  
Bill Argentieri, SCE&G  
Dave Landis, LMA  
Reed Bull, Midlands Striper Club  
Dick Christie, SCDNR

**DATE:** November 12, 2008

---

**INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCUSSION**

*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.*

Alan Stuart opened the LIP Focus Group meeting and noted that purpose of this meeting was to review concerns that DNR had on the LIP, as well as review additional information that Ray had put together. Alan also explained that at this point, he did not see the group achieving agreement on an LIP as they were still very far apart. However, it was noted that they would reevaluate at the close of the meeting.

Scott Harder began the meeting discussions with a presentation from DNR on their concerns with the LIP as it was currently being discussed. Scott began his presentation with the management guidelines for lakes from the State Water Plan. He pointed out that an important goal in the plan was the balance of water. Scott further noted that DNR must consider resources from a state perspective and when water shortages arise, the negative impacts should be balanced among the users and other lakes in the state.

Scott explained that using SCE&G's spreadsheet model, he has analyzed the outcomes of various LIP scenarios. He discussed both the fixed inputs to the scenarios as well as the varied inputs. SCE&G explained that the 400 cfs minimum outflow scenario was not applicable because the units could not reach a level that low efficiently; therefore 500 was more realistic. The group continued to review the graphs that Scott developed depicting different inputs and scenarios. Scott noted that the main question to be answered was how much to allow the lake level to drop before flows are reduced in the LSR.

Scott reviewed lake level graphs during low flow years under several proposed scenarios. An example of 2001 was shown and it was illustrated that the 0 foot drop scenario and the 1 foot drop scenario was very similar while the 2 foot drop and 4 foot drop was very similar. It was shown that in 2004 there were no differences between the triggers. In 2007 the group viewed that none of the LIP scenarios returned back to the guide curve.

Ray pointed out to Scott that whatever trigger is used for the LIP implementation (0,1,2 or 4), when the lake level drops off of the guide curve, the objective of the State Water Plan is being accomplished to some degree. The group then compared the different stages with 14, 30, and 45 day inflow averages. Bill Argentieri observed that the 30 and 45 inflow averages could cause the lake to drop 1.5 to 2 feet while waiting for the inflow average to taper off. Reed Bull asked the group if Jim Ruane had studied what happens to the water quality of the lake with the new minimum flows, as the Striper Club was interested in this information. Reed continued to note that from a striped bass standpoint, Jim had shown that the higher flow years were the worst for the striped bass. Reed expressed concern that the bad conditions could increase with the increased minimum flows. Alan noted that he would contact Jim Ruane to get his take on this question.

Scott went on to discuss the conclusions in the presentation, he noted that one key question was how long to maintain the recommended minimum flows in the spring and summer at the expense of the lake. Scott noted that the two foot trigger provides prolonged flows without much additional impacts on the lake. He further pointed out that in the worst drought situation that they had information on (2007 to 2008), there were minor differences between the 0,1, and 2 foot triggers. Scott concluded by noting that DNR believed using the 2 foot lake level trigger and the 14 day inflow averaging period is a reasonable balance between upstream and downstream users.

After the presentation, the group discussed DNR's proposal. Steve Bell noted that they were concerned about whether or not these same scenarios would be seen in the next 50 years. Dick Christie explained that the best science now was to establish a hydrologic period of record, such as 50 years, as one could not predict what would happen in the future. Dick continued to note that at some point in the future it would be wise to reconvene and discuss the LIP, as the period of record will have changed at that point.

Dave Landis explained that they had questions regarding how the current flows have actually affected the river over the past 70 years, as they have not observed the records where it has been detrimental. He further pointed out that if the river was in its optimal range, they would like the lake to be optimal as well. Dave continued to note that it originally seemed like individuals wanted a run of river scenario, where there were high flows and low flows and both sides shared the pain. However, he noted, now it seems that certain entities desire it to be more flow controlled.

Noting the discussions, Bill A asked if LMA and Lake Watch had a proposal that they would like to present to the group as DNR has done. Bill A. further pointed out that this proposal should be specific and not a generalization. Dave replied that as far as the averaging period goes, they believe the 14 day is reasonable. Dave continued to noted that they want to make sure there are procedures in place that slow the lake level drop as much as possible when providing flows downstream. Steve added that he would like further review on the proposed minimum flows. He also noted that if there was no rainfall coming in, that SCE&G would not drop it down to 354' immediately in the fall knowing that there will be fall safety flows. At this time, Steve and Dave reiterated their request to

meet with DNR about the minimum flows before making any decision on the LIP. Dick noted that he has been trying to coordinate with Bob Perry on a date and time for this meeting and that he would try to set something up before the end of this meeting. Reed added that if the lake goes below 354', recreation on the lake does not completely come to a halt. He continued to note that he believes the group has done a good job of putting stop losses in the model and he pointed out that at some point they are going to have to agree that that is the best they can achieve. Alan pointed out that he believed the common ground was to have a program in place that does not deplete the reservoir so far during one year that there is no water left the next year. The group discussed the need for an adaptive management scenario for the LIP. Dick explained that during the Catawba relicensing an annual meeting with a five year review process was put in place for the LIP, and the group agreed that this would be also appropriate for Saluda.

The group noted that they were close, the question was how to achieve agreement between the 1 foot and 2 foot lake level drops. Steve noted that they would put something together to present to DNR and the group. Dick noted that DNR was willing to make a presentation to homeowner groups if that is needed. Dick also noted that they would be happy to explain minimum flow needs. However the instream flow recommendation is from the instream flow group therefore, Dick noted that he does not believe DNR can speak to that recommendation.

The group discussed any questions on Ray's report that was issued to the group. There was a question on North American Vertical Datum '88 versus Plant Datum. Ray explained that Plant Datum was an arbitrary datum established prior to the construction of the dam and there is a 1.5 foot difference between that and NAVD. The group continued to make a few changes interactively to the wording of the document.

The group concluded that Lake Watch, LMA and DNR would meet on or around December 2 to discuss their opinions on an LIP. There will potentially be another LIP Focus Group meeting during the first part of January.

Group adjourned.