

## Stacia Hoover

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, September 08, 2006 11:46 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Final Recreation RCG Work Plan, etc.

I did not receive any additional comments on the sections of the working documents that are being finalized. Attached is the latest version of the working documents. You will notice the Work Plan, Vision Statement, Stepwise Process Diagram, and Solution Principles have been marked FINAL. I am also considering the questions in the Standard Process Form as final, but have not marked this section as final since we will be working on completing the form over the next few months.

I will be setting the agenda for our next RCG meeting over the next few weeks, so if there is anything you would like to include on the agenda, please let me know.

Dave



Recreation RCG  
Working Documen...

## Stacia Hoover

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 24, 2006 4:58 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Recreation RCG Working Documents

Good afternoon,

I have gone through and accepted the changes to the Work Plan, Vision Statement, and Solution Principles. I did a little word smithing on the Identified Issues section of the Work Plan--I don't think it's much, but I left it in track changes for you to review. I also added a "Product" under each of the Tasks (and renamed this section to "Tasks and Products").

I moved the Possible Solutions (now "Possible Mitigation Measures to be Considered") to the end of the Work Plan; I have a couple of questions for the group on these. You can see that I left a couple of comments on this section--basically, after reading the clean version, it appears to me that bullet #2, bullet #5, and bullet #7 are all covered by bullet #1 (basically support for the LSR Plan). In the interest of brevity, are you o.k. with me deleting bullets 2, 5, and 7? If you are not, please let me know.

Also under this section, I question whether bullets #8 and #9 are possible mitigation measures--after I read them I thought they read more like a task and are covered by Task 6 (Develop and recommend operation scenarios...). Does any one have a problem with deleting the bullets?

I would like to get any final comments on these sections by next Friday (Sept. 1)--we have reviewed this several times before and I want to make it final. If I don't receive any substantive comments that need additional discussion, I am going to mark the Work Plan (Page 1 through 5 of 5), the Vision Statement (Page 1 through 2 of 2), and the first two pages of the Recreation Plan Development section (the process diagram and the Solution Principles) as FINAL. We will then move forward with filling out the Standard Process Form and resolving the issues.

Questions?



Recreation RCG  
Working Documen...

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2006 2:28 PM  
**To:** 'Patrick Moore'; 'Bill Marshall'; 'Tom Eppink'; 'Charlene Coleman'; 'Guy Jones'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Karen Kustafik'; Kelly Maloney; 'Malcolm Leaphart'  
**Subject:** RE: Study Plan Comments?

I can't stop you from going on your own...but we have to have the study plan done before we get on the water (not only from a scientific perspective, but for insurance and the like too).

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Patrick Moore [mailto:PatrickM@scccl.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2006 1:22 PM  
**To:** Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; Tom Eppink; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart  
**Subject:** RE: Study Plan Comments?

Is this too soon for a flow group field trip?

"Repair of the head cover seal on Unit 2 is still scheduled to begin on or about September 6. This work will require that condenser cooling water for McMeekin Station be bypassed to the tailrace beginning September 5 or 6 for approximately 2 to 3 days. During the bypass period, Saluda Hydro will be required to discharge **2,500 CFS** (about 30 MW) in order to comply with McMeekin Station NPDES permit requirements."

From the weekly update...

Patrick Moore Esq.  
Water Quality Associate  
Coastal Conservation League  
2231 Devine St. Suite 100  
Columbia, S.C. 29205  
803.771.7750

Want to learn more about Coastal Conservation League issues?

sign up at [www.coastalconservationleague.org](http://www.coastalconservationleague.org)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Bill Marshall [mailto:MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2006 12:14 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Tom Eppink; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore  
**Subject:** RE: Study Plan Comments?

Dave,  
I'm working on my comments right now and will be ready to distribute them within a couple of hours.  
Thanks,

Bill

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2006 12:08 PM

**To:** Tom Eppink; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore

**Subject:** Study Plan Comments?

Does anybody else plan on submitting comments to the Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan? So far I have only received comments from Patrick, Tony B., and SCE&G. Today is supposed to be the due date, but I have no problem extending it by a couple of days if necessary.

Please let me know ASAP as Kelly Maloney and I need to plan on addressing received comments and set up a meeting with the TWC.

**Danielle Fitzpatrick**

---

**From:** Bill Marshall [MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2006 3:50 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Tom Eppink; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore  
**Cc:** Dick Christie  
**Subject:** Study Plan Comments - Saluda Hydro Rec Flows Study

Dave and others,

Attached is my edited copy of the proposed study plan.

The main concern expressed in my comments is related to the purpose behind Goal 2 ... to *understand the "rate of change" of the lower Saluda River at various flows at various river reaches.*

To better understand the safety issues associated with rapidly rising water, we need to characterize water level change for specific types of hydro events. As the plan currently reads, it appears to miss the specificity needed to really understand this public safety issue. Therefore, I have supplied suggestions for more specific language.

Thanks for your consideration,

Bill

Bill Marshall  
S.C. Department of Natural Resources  
1000 Assembly Street, Suite 354  
Columbia, SC 29201  
(803) 734-9096  
[marshallb@dnr.sc.gov](mailto:marshallb@dnr.sc.gov)

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2006 12:08 PM  
**To:** Tom Eppink; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore  
**Subject:** Study Plan Comments?

Does anybody else plan on submitting comments to the Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan? So far I have only received comments from Patrick, Tony B., and SCE&G. Today is supposed to be the due date, but I have no problem extending it by a couple of days if necessary.

Please let me know ASAP as Kelly Maloney and I need to plan on addressing received comments and set up a meeting with the TWC.

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** C Coleman [cheetahrk@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 29, 2006 12:36 PM  
**To:** Malcolm Leaphart; Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** Tom Eppink; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Patrick Moore; dchristie@infoaven.infoave.net; tbebber@scprt.com; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; gjobsis@americanrivers.org  
**Subject:** Re: Study Plan Comments?

Rec Flow comments

I agree with all that Tony, Malcolm and Bill Marshall included.

I'd like to reiterate the importance of a valid "flow" study including all flows and a safety analysis on each type of recreational user at different skill levels to completely understand what we are addressing in the Safety context..

Also the release and reaction on August 19 was totally different and had completely different results, than the May release. The August release shows us a few things of great importance. They can raise the river slower to allow egress for users, they can shuffle power sources to provide for reserve responsibilities and Saluda Hydro is not always the "silver bullet". On August 19<sup>th</sup> they needed to cover 315 megs and Saluda Hydro can only cover 200, so they are naturally forced to cover the other needs with other sources.

Any study of the river, flows, safety and responsible management must require a disclosure of generation flow possibilities using full force releasing as an Emergency only response.

Ramping and scheduling when possible and alternative solutions need to be included to better understand how flows, safety and use, all play in the ability of SCE&G to effectively use Saluda hydro responsibly.

I feel a full understanding of 2 recent events be used as somewhat of a base line for how Saluda Hydro can be used. May 17 and Aug 19.

### Points

- 1) we have no true data to understand the process. A tell of the tape and explanation of the reasons why the May event and the Aug event were handled as they were, would serve as an excellent starting point for basic understanding.
- 2) The Saluda is a one of a kind project. For the most part, completely enveloped in an large metro urban area. It has Class III-IV whitewater, historical value, recreational, educational and wildlife protection value, increased public attraction through city development and a man driven flash flood management that can no longer be ignored.
- 3) Our responsibility is for a complete, fair and thoroughly comprehensive analysis of the resource, but that is only attainable with cooperation. We are setting the standard for urban hydro projects with whitewater and high public access and extremely diverse use.
- 4) Much of the initial information can be fleshed out with reports, collective experienced user input, and correlation of valuable information that already exists.
- 5) Then a more direct and targeted approach to studies can be reached to maximize resources and funds.
- 6) The dart board approach is unacceptable.

**Malcolm Leaphart** <malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu> wrote:

Dave, My comments as noted earlier today... embedded below Bill Marshall's comments which I support on the important 'rate' of flow issue. Malcolm

Quoting Dave Anderson :

> Does anybody else plan on submitting comments to the Downstream  
> Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan? So far I have only received  
> comments from Patrick, Tony B., and SCE&G. Today is supposed to be the  
> due date, but I have no problem extending it by a couple of days if  
> necessary.

>  
> Please let me know ASAP as Kelly Maloney and I need to plan on  
> addressing received comments and set up a meeting with the TWC.

>

Quoting Bill Marshall :

> Dave and others,  
> Attached is my edited copy of the proposed study plan.  
> The main concern expressed in my comments is related to the purpose  
> behind Goal 2 ... to understand the "rate of change" of the lower Saluda  
> River at various flows at various river reaches.

> To better understand the safety issues associated with rapidly  
> rising water, we need to characterize water level change for specific  
> types of hydro events. As the plan currently reads, it appears to miss  
> the specificity needed to really understand this public safety issue.  
> Therefore, I have supplied suggestions for more specific language.

>

> Thanks for your consideration,

>

> Bill

>

> Bill Marshall

> S.C. Department of Natural Resources

> 1000 Assembly Street, Suite 354

> Columbia, SC 29201

> (803) 734-9096

> marshallb@dnr.sc.gov

>

Dave,

I endorse and 'second' all of the comments from Tony Bebbler listed below and in his redline comments in his response to you of August 18 on the proposed 'Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study'. In fact, the draft study as noted could be more appropriately titled a 'Downstream Paddlers Flow Assessment Study'. The inclusions that Tony noted are critical to ensure that other recreation uses are not left out. Also, the realization of the tremendous increase in usage because of the new river parks and greenways is extremely significant. As the tv ad goes, "This is not your father's Buick"... Times and conditions have changed, and a continually growing metro area that places so much emphasis on the rivers that flow through it dictates that the

Lake Murray hydro not be managed as it has been for the past 75 years.

Additional comments:

The study itself is not likely to produce any more meaningful information than could be gleaned from a number of the stakeholders with extensive recreational experience on the river. It is unlikely for example, that the study and the use of data loggers is going to produce any meaningful new information as to what levels can be safely wade fished or boat fished, what levels are ideal for various skill levels of paddlers, or what sections need improved access. A study in lieu of listening to the stakeholders will further delay meaningful discussions of the problems found over the past 20 years by those with direct recreational experience on the lower Saluda River.

Trout Unlimited supports science based resource management however, and has funded several studies on the lower Saluda, including the 1985 'Temperature and Flow' study by the USGS, and the 1988 'Oxygen Dynamics Study' by Dr. Hank McKellar, then at the USC School of Public Health. So, if the time and funds are available for a recreational study to determine preferred flows and identify safety issues, that study in theory is supported as long as meaningful input from those with direct experience is not precluded from it or is used in conjunction with it; and, if the study is deemed sound and reasonable by the appropriate resource and regulatory agencies and other scientific peer groups.

There are pertinent, logical conclusions that have unfortunately not been made or acknowledged to date during the relicensing process that have a direct bearing on river recreation safety and that should be basic premises for any studies or further recommendations:

-- Until the entire tailrace river, including the confluence, is covered by a warning system, the public cannot be considered as 'adequately warned' to the dangers of rising water levels. That is, anything less than 100% coverage of the river corridor by a warning system leaves the public in danger, especially without advanced release schedules.

-- Sirens are totally inappropriate for a river level change warning for the lower Saluda because of the intrusiveness of the loud horns on the many residences along the river corridor. Lights or some other less intrusive means of notification of water levels changes are needed as the river now runs through a developed metropolitan area. The 3 existing and any new warning systems should be configured to eliminate the objectionable loud sirens, especially at night.

-- Without announced scheduled releases, the lower Saluda cannot be deemed 'safe' for recreation, especially with a warning system that does not cover the entire length of the river, and with flows that can increase up to 18,000 cfs in minutes. This should be a common-sensical conclusion as the result of not providing river levels to expect for future time periods means uncertainty; and, that uncertainty means danger to the public when they encounter flow levels they had not planned for on a river visit. For example, I can safely kayak to levels of up to several thousand cfs; but, encountering



the quick release of up to 13,600 cfs like on May 17 which I would never have launched in while kayaking at 600 cfs means either a quick beaching or a swim out, with or without my boat, if lucky...; or, if unlucky... severe injury or death from being washed into rocks and strainers or held underwater...

-- Flows of up to 18,000 cfs released in 15 minutes are simply too much to humanly deal with and therefore is a rate of release totally unacceptable to the public. Not accepting that common-sense conclusion means that determining reasonable flow 'rates', including 'ramping' rates, that can be handled safely by anyone with only average strength and river skills (ie, a casual wader/sunbather or tuber/floater) is not likely in the proposed study. The current operational regime is simply too dangerous and should not be continued. If it is, then the public will conclude that their safety has been compromised for economic or expediency reasons.

Malcolm Leaphart, SC Council of Trout Unlimited

\*\* Comments from Tony Bebber, SC PRT Planner, of August 18, 2006:

1. The study plan seems to be skewed toward recreational boating (primarily paddling) and generally ignores wade fishing, bank fishing, swimming/sunbathing/rock use, tubing, and other uses along the river.
2. The study plan does not address potential recreation use associated with anticipated new recreation venues (Three Rivers Greenway, Lower Saluda Greenway/Saluda Shoals extension, potential new park at 12 mile creek, etc.) or residential recreational use (Rivers Edge Subdivision and others).
3. I assume the red dots on the map are the locations for testing. These all appear to be paddling areas and have little to do with other activities. You must consider other recreational activities - wade fishing, bank fishing, swimming, tubing, rock use, sunbathing, picnicking, walking, bicycling, etc. Shouldn't the shoreline along Saluda Shoals Park be a prime spot to be considered?
4. You must also be aware that all current and future users are not "experts" or familiar with the dangers presented by the hydro project river.
4. Attached is a redline version with my recommendations.

Thanks, Tony Bebber, AICP Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office, SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism

It is not so much the example of others we imitate, as the reflection of ourselves in their eyes and the echo of ourselves in their words.

--Eric Hoffer

Charlene Coleman

American Whitewater  
Regional Coordinator

---

Want to be your own boss? Learn how on [Yahoo! Small Business.](#)

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 4:17 PM  
**To:** Tony Bebber; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore; Tom Eppink  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; 'Bill Argentieri'; 'Randy Mahan'  
**Subject:** Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

Here's the draft study plan that has been revised from the comments received via e-mail and from our meeting last week. I have left the changes highlighted to facilitate your review. Since most of you were at the meeting last week, I don't think it will take that long to review this, so I am asking for any comments by next Tuesday, October 3rd. If any one needs more time, just let me know.



Draft Flow  
Assessment Study Pl.

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Malcolm Leaphart [malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 5:09 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** Tony Bebber; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Patrick Moore; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.com; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; dchristie@infoave.net; Tom Eppink; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com  
**Subject:** Re: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan {SpamScore: sss}

Dave,

The draft, including the comments and replies, has evolved to an accurate document of the scope and intentions for the Downstream Flow study as discussed at the past meetings. The disposition of the major issue of future recreational needs is still of key concern. Would you please clarify in the Recreational Flows Plan, exactly what the 'Saluda Recreation Assessment' is, who will be doing it, and when? This is the phrase from the answer you provided to several questions about future recreational needs in the table of comments and responses:

"Future use will be addressed in the Saluda Recreation Assessment"

The concern is that future recreation needs are a major issue because of the inadequate current sites, especially on the lower Saluda, but also on Lake Murray where marinas are closing or have been converted to private use. Most of the stakeholders would have preferred this issue be a starting point for committee efforts, rather than it still not being addressed to date. So, we would appreciate you stating the intentions for an assessment at some future time with some level of certainty and with as much level of detail as you can at this time as to how it will be dealt it ultimately in the relicensing. It is certainly much too important an issue to fail to cover or to loose track of...  
Thanks.

Quoting Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>:

> Here's the draft study plan that has been revised from the comments  
> received via e-mail and from our meeting last week. I have left the  
> changes highlighted to facilitate your review. Since most of you were  
> at the meeting last week, I don't think it will take that long to  
> review this, so I am asking for any comments by next Tuesday, October  
> 3rd. If any one needs more time, just let me know.  
>  
> <<Draft Flow Assessment Study Plan (2006-09-25).doc>>  
>

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Malcolm Leaphart [malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 5:42 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** Tony Bebbber; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Patrick Moore; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.com; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; dchristie@infoave.net; Tom Eppink; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

My request was not for the study details, but to clearly state that the issue of future recreation needs are highlighted as the important issue it is in the draft. So, let me re-state my request and be more specific... The following paragraph from the Downstream Flows does not include any reference to future recreation needs (except the term 'opportunities' which is too vague to infer future needs from). Please add a reference to this paragraph that states that future recreation needs is one of the goals of the Assessment as documented. Thanks.

The 2006 Saluda Project Recreation Assessment is currently being conducted under the Recreation RCG. This study utilizes vehicle counts and on-site interviews of individuals at Project recreation sites to ascertain opportunities, patterns, and levels of use along the lower Saluda River. These data will be reviewed and analyzed to determine what recreation activities are currently supported by access sites along the lower Saluda River, what recreation activities are being participated in by individuals at these sites, how much use the lower Saluda River receives, and any specific comments made by respondents pertaining to safety, river flows, and barriers to access.

Quoting Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>:

> The Recreation Assessment is currently being conducted. The study  
> plan is on the web site:  
>  
> <http://www.saludahydrorelicense.com/documents/001-SaludaRecreationAssessmentStudyPlanFINAL.pdf>  
> ss  
>  
>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Malcolm Leaphart [mailto:malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu]  
> Sent: Monday, September 25, 2006 4:09 PM  
> To: Dave Anderson  
> Cc: Tony Bebbber; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy  
> Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Patrick Moore;  
> bellsteve9339@bellsouth.com; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu;  
> dchristie@infoave.net; Tom Eppink; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com;  
> RMAHAN@scana.com  
> Subject: Re: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan  
> {SpamScore: sss}  
>  
>  
> Dave,  
> The draft, including the comments and replies, has evolved to an  
> accurate  
> document of the scope and intentions for the Downstream Flow study as  
> discussed at the past meetings. The disposition of the major issue of  
> future  
> recreational needs is still of key concern. Would you please clarify in  
> the

> Recreational Flows Plan, exactly what the 'Saluda Recreation Assessment'  
> is,  
> who will be doing it, and when? This is the phrase from the answer you  
> provided to several questions about future recreational needs in the  
> table of  
> comments and responses:  
>  
> "Future use will be addressed in the Saluda Recreation Assessment"  
>  
> The concern is that future recreation needs are a major issue because  
> of the inadequate current sites, especially on the lower Saluda, but  
> also on Lake  
> Murray where marinas are closing or have been converted to private use.  
> Most  
> of the stakeholders would have preferred this issue be a starting point  
> for  
> committee efforts, rather than it still not being addressed to date. So,  
> we  
> would appreciate you stating the intentions for an assessment at some  
> future  
> time with some level of certainty and with as much level of detail as  
> you can  
> at this time as to how it will be dealt it ultimately in the  
> relicensing. It  
> is certainly much too important an issue to fail to cover or to loose  
> track  
> of...  
> Thanks.  
>  
>  
> Quoting Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>:  
>  
> > Here's the draft study plan that has been revised from the comments  
> > received via e-mail and from our meeting last week. I have left the  
> > changes highlighted to facilitate your review. Since most of you were  
>  
> > at the meeting last week, I don't think it will take that long to  
> > review this, so I am asking for any comments by next Tuesday, October  
> > 3rd. If any one needs more time, just let me know.  
> >  
> > <<Draft Flow Assessment Study Plan (2006-09-25).doc>>  
> >  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

**Danielle Fitzpatrick**

---

**From:** Patrick Moore [PatrickM@sccl.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 27, 2006 2:34 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Subject:** RE: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

Looks good to me.

Patrick

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 4:17 PM  
**To:** Tony Bebbber; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore; Tom Eppink  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri; Randy Mahan  
**Subject:** Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

Here's the draft study plan that has been revised from the comments received via e-mail and from our meeting last week. I have left the changes highlighted to facilitate your review. Since most of you were at the meeting last week, I don't think it will take that long to review this, so I am asking for any comments by next Tuesday, October 3rd. If any one needs more time, just let me know.

<<Draft Flow Assessment Study Plan (2006-09-25).doc>>

**Danielle Fitzpatrick**

---

**From:** Bill Marshall [MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 26, 2006 5:18 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Tony Bebber; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore; Tom Eppink  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

The study plan seems okay to me. Thanks.

Bill

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 4:17 PM  
**To:** Tony Bebber; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore; Tom Eppink  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri; Randy Mahan  
**Subject:** Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

Here's the draft study plan that has been revised from the comments received via e-mail and from our meeting last week. I have left the changes highlighted to facilitate your review. Since most of you were at the meeting last week, I don't think it will take that long to review this, so I am asking for any comments by next Tuesday, October 3rd. If any one needs more time, just let me know.

<<Draft Flow Assessment Study Plan (2006-09-25).doc>>



## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Kelly Maloney  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 26, 2006 3:57 PM  
**To:** 'Malcolm Leaphart'; Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** 'Tony Bebber'; 'Bill Marshall'; 'Charlene Coleman'; 'Guy Jones'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Karen Kustafik'; 'Patrick Moore'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.com'; 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'Tom Eppink'; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

Malcolm,

I would agree that future recreation use levels and needs on the lower Saluda River should be addressed in the relicensing process and the Saluda Recreation Assessment (the study plan of which was distributed by Dave) should address all of the concerns that you have raised.

Because we are not considering future uses or needs in the Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan, however, I do not believe that the flow study is the most appropriate forum to discuss the goals and objectives of Saluda Recreation Assessment. I'm not clear on the reason why we would want to specifically highlight a goal of another study for an issue that is not a part of the study plan at hand.

Future uses are not included as part of the goals of the flow study plan because we are attempting to determine the appropriateness of certain flow levels for certain activities. Irrespective of how use levels increase or change in the future, the flows most appropriate for certain activities would not change. Though use distributions may shift and other access locations utilized in the future, the capacity and condition of existing access sites, as well as the potential for additional sites and improvements which would support recreational use of the lower Saluda River, are wholly addressed in the Recreation Assessment.

As you pointed out, there are two places in the flow study plan that reference the Saluda Recreation Assessment: Section 2.1 and Appendix C. Section 2.1 discusses the aspects of the Saluda Recreation Assessment that will be utilized as part of the Phase I investigation for the flow study. Because the flow study is not considering future uses, I believe it would confuse the issue to discuss details of the Recreation Assessment that are not being used or considered here in the flow study. Likewise, I do not believe that Appendix C is the forum to outline the goals and objectives of the Saluda Recreation Assessment. If an issue was raised that we believed to be out of the scope of the flow study but addressed by the Saluda Recreation Assessment, we referenced that document in Appendix C. If you feel it would be helpful to include a hyperlink to the Saluda Recreation Assessment Study Plan (such as the one forwarded by Dave) in Appendix C, we can certainly do that.

Thank you,  
Kelly Maloney

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Malcolm Leaphart [mailto:malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 5:42 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** Tony Bebber; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Patrick Moore; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.com; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; dchristie@infoave.net; Tom Eppink; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

My request was not for the study details, but to clearly state that the issue of future recreation needs are highlighted as the important issue it is in the draft. So, let me re-state my request and be more specific... The following paragraph from the Downstream Flows does not include any reference to future recreation needs (except the term 'opportunities' which is too vague to infer future needs from). Please add a reference to this paragraph that states that

future recreation needs is one of the goals of the Assessment as documented.  
Thanks.

The 2006 Saluda Project Recreation Assessment is currently being conducted under the Recreation RCG. This study utilizes vehicle counts and on-site interviews of individuals at Project recreation sites to ascertain opportunities, patterns, and levels of use along the lower Saluda River. These data will be reviewed and analyzed to determine what recreation activities are currently supported by access sites along the lower Saluda River, what recreation activities are being participated in by individuals at these sites, how much use the lower Saluda River receives, and any specific comments made by respondents pertaining to safety, river flows, and barriers to access.

Quoting Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>:

> The Recreation Assessment is currently being conducted. The study  
> plan is on the web site:  
>  
> <http://www.saludahydrorelicense.com/documents/001-SaludaRecreationAssessmentStudyPlanFINAL.pdf>  
> ss  
>  
>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Malcolm Leaphart [mailto:malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu]  
> Sent: Monday, September 25, 2006 4:09 PM  
> To: Dave Anderson  
> Cc: Tony Bebber; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy  
> Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Patrick  
> Moore; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.com; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu;  
> dchristie@infoave.net; Tom Eppink; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com;  
> RMAHAN@scana.com  
> Subject: Re: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan  
> {SpamScore: sss}  
>  
>  
> Dave,  
> The draft, including the comments and replies, has evolved to an  
> accurate  
> document of the scope and intentions for the Downstream Flow study as  
> discussed at the past meetings. The disposition of the major issue of  
> future  
> recreational needs is still of key concern. Would you please clarify in  
> the  
> Recreational Flows Plan, exactly what the 'Saluda Recreation Assessment'  
> is,  
> who will be doing it, and when? This is the phrase from the answer you  
> provided to several questions about future recreational needs in the  
> table of  
> comments and responses:  
>  
> "Future use will be addressed in the Saluda Recreation Assessment"  
>  
> The concern is that future recreation needs are a major issue because  
> of the inadequate current sites, especially on the lower Saluda, but  
> also on Lake  
> Murray where marinas are closing or have been converted to private use.  
> Most  
> of the stakeholders would have preferred this issue be a starting point  
> for  
> committee efforts, rather than it still not being addressed to date. So,  
> we  
> would appreciate you stating the intentions for an assessment at some  
> future

> time with some level of certainty and with as much level of detail as  
> you can  
> at this time as to how it will be dealt it ultimately in the  
> relicensing. It  
> is certainly much too important an issue to fail to cover or to loose  
> track  
> of...  
> Thanks.  
>  
>  
> Quoting Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>:  
>  
> > Here's the draft study plan that has been revised from the comments  
> > received via e-mail and from our meeting last week. I have left the  
> > changes highlighted to facilitate your review. Since most of you  
> > were  
>  
> > at the meeting last week, I don't think it will take that long to  
> > review this, so I am asking for any comments by next Tuesday,  
> > October 3rd. If any one needs more time, just let me know.  
> >  
> > <<Draft Flow Assessment Study Plan (2006-09-25).doc>>  
> >  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 5:25 PM  
**To:** 'Malcolm Leaphart'  
**Cc:** 'Tony Bebber'; 'Bill Marshall'; 'Charlene Coleman'; 'Guy Jones'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Karen Kustafik'; Kelly Maloney; 'Patrick Moore'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.com'; 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'Tom Eppink'; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@sca.com; RMAHAN@sca.com  
**Subject:** RE: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

The Recreation Assessment is currently being conducted. The study plan is on the web site:

<http://www.saludahydrorelicense.com/documents/001-SaludaRecreationAssessmentStudyPlanFINAL.pdf>

-----Original Message-----

From: Malcolm Leaphart [mailto:malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu]  
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2006 4:09 PM  
To: Dave Anderson  
Cc: Tony Bebber; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Patrick Moore; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.com; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; dchristie@infoave.net; Tom Eppink; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@sca.com; RMAHAN@sca.com  
Subject: Re: Revised Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan {SpamScore: sss}

Dave,

The draft, including the comments and replies, has evolved to an accurate document of the scope and intentions for the Downstream Flow study as discussed at the past meetings. The disposition of the major issue of future recreational needs is still of key concern. Would you please clarify in the Recreational Flows Plan, exactly what the 'Saluda Recreation Assessment' is, who will be doing it, and when? This is the phrase from the answer you provided to several questions about future recreational needs in the table of comments and responses:

"Future use will be addressed in the Saluda Recreation Assessment"

The concern is that future recreation needs are a major issue because of the inadequate current sites, especially on the lower Saluda, but also on Lake Murray where marinas are closing or have been converted to private use. Most of the stakeholders would have preferred this issue be a starting point for committee efforts, rather than it still not being addressed to date. So, we would appreciate you stating the intentions for an assessment at some future time with some level of certainty and with as much level of detail as you can at this time as to how it will be dealt ultimately in the relicensing. It is certainly much too important an issue to fail to cover or to lose track of...  
Thanks.

Quoting Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>:

> Here's the draft study plan that has been revised from the comments  
> received via e-mail and from our meeting last week. I have left the  
> changes highlighted to facilitate your review. Since most of you were  
> at the meeting last week, I don't think it will take that long to  
> review this, so I am asking for any comments by next Tuesday, October  
> 3rd. If one needs more time, just let me know.  
>

> <<Draft Flow Assessment Study Plan (2006-09-25).doc>>  
>

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Patrick Moore [PatrickM@scccl.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 19, 2006 11:03 AM  
**To:** EPPINK, THOMAS G; Kustafik, Karen; Dave Anderson; Malcolm Leaphart  
**Cc:** C Coleman; Bill Marshall; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin  
**Subject:** Rec flow/safety study



Rec\_02\_Flow\_Repo  
rt\_3.21.05.pdf...

Here is the report from the Catawba Wateree Rec flow study. With a few extra questions and a rate of change analysis, we could kill 2 birds with one study.

I am about to distribute a large PDF of the NPS rec study that I have referenced in a couple meetings. I send it in a separate email so if it gets kicked back due to size, you will still get the C-W study.

Patrick Moore  
Water Quality Associate  
Coastal Conservation League  
1207 Lincoln St. Suite 203-C  
Columbia, S.C. 29201  
803.771.7750

-----Original Message-----

**From:** EPPINK, THOMAS G [mailto:TEPPINK@scana.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 19, 2006 10:15 AM  
**To:** Kustafik, Karen; Patrick Moore; Dave Anderson; Malcolm Leaphart  
**Cc:** C Coleman; Bill Marshall; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin  
**Subject:** RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

I don't disagree and would repeat my comment that while a recreation study is best done by survey, safety issues are best addressed by observation, empirical data, and expert input and analysis. I don't think Karen gives herself enough credit - I think what an expert such as she is in her area has to say is far more than mere anecdote.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kustafik, Karen [mailto:kakustafik@columbiasc.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 18, 2006 4:45 PM  
**To:** 'Patrick Moore'; Dave Anderson; Malcolm Leaphart  
**Cc:** C Coleman; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Bill Marshall; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin  
**Subject:** RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

Agree with Patrick on his edits/comments.

While the anecdotal experience regarding level that many of us bring to the process is valuable, Patrick's concern about gathering more objective information, especially as it relates to casual river users who are not involved in this process, has merit.

Appreciate hearing us out. KAK

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Patrick Moore [mailto:PatrickM@scccl.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 18, 2006 4:04 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Malcolm Leaphart  
**Cc:** C Coleman; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Bill Marshall; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Kustafik, Karen  
**Subject:** RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

Hey Dave,

That captures it pretty well, only a couple changes,

1) understanding the "rate of change" of the river at various flows at various river reaches

2) an analysis of different flows for various user groups and skill levels that provide the safest conditions. We discussed coming up with parameters for safest, like when folks feel compelled to get off the river based on rate of change, etc.

Thanks for helping craft this,

Patrick Moore  
Water Quality Associate  
Coastal Conservation League  
1207 Lincoln St. Suite 203-C  
Columbia, S.C. 29201  
803.771.7750

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2006 3:49 PM  
To: Malcolm Leaphart; Dave Anderson  
Cc: C Coleman; Dave Anderson; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Bill Marshall; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Patrick Moore  
Subject: RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

We had an informal meeting today after the Safety RCG to talk about a flow study. We reached agreement on providing a draft study plan with the goals of:

1) understanding the "rate of change" of the river at various flows

2) an analysis of different flows for various user groups that provide the safest conditions

I think I captured that right; Jennifer Summerlin took notes for us and can correct me if I am wrong. Another employee at Kleinschmidt (Kelly Maloney) will be providing us with a draft study plan to begin discussions. She is an experienced whitewater rafter and has more experience with flow studies than I do.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact any of the TWC members for answers. Mike Waddell sat in on it too and hopefully provided the same perspective that you would have.

I will be back in town in two weeks if we want to go ahead and schedule a meeting for May 3, 4, or 5. Kelly will be here also, and I have asked her if we can at least have a "straw man" to look at that week.

-----Original Message-----

From: Malcolm Leaphart [mailto:malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2006 8:36 AM  
To: Dave Anderson  
Cc: C Coleman; Dave Anderson; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Bill Marshall; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Patrick Moore  
Subject: RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

I encourage a face to face ASAP also. The 5:00 pm time frame for a weekday works great, as does a downtown location. Maybe Bill Marshall will host again as he offered for this week too, and we can work around his schedule for the

earliest available day?? Give us some dates, Bill... Thanks.

Quoting Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>:

> I know Karen couldn't make it; Tom informed me there would not be a  
> meeting--I think he and Bill talked about it. Pretty much any time

> next week works for me (for a call).

>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: C Coleman [mailto:cheetahtk@yahoo.com]  
> Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 6:02 PM  
> To: Dave Anderson; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Bill Marshall; Guy Jones;  
> Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore  
> Subject: RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

>  
> gee Dave in my life Wed is ASAP  
> i believe we should all be there tomorrow

>  
> Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com> wrote:

>  
> Just so we are all on the same page, there will NOT be a meeting on  
> Wednesday night. We need to schedule a meeting ASAP to talk about our  
> working document and Patrick's request for a recreational flow study.

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: EPPINK, THOMAS G [mailto:TEPPINK@scana.com]  
> Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 7:54 AM  
> To: Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones;  
> Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore  
> Subject: RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

>  
> Can do.

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Bill Marshall [mailto:MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov  
> <mailto:MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov> ]  
> Sent: Fri Apr 14 11:49:55 2006  
> To: Dave Anderson; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones;  
> Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore  
> Subject: RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

>  
> We can meet at the DNR offices again on Wednesday at 5:00 or so, if  
> that works for others. We know Karen cannot make Wednesday, haven't  
> heard from others yet.

> Bill

>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
> From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com  
> <mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com> ]  
> Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 4:47 PM  
> To: EPPINK, THOMAS G; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; Charlene Coleman;  
> Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm Leaphart;  
> Patrick Moore  
> Subject: RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

>  
> I already have a Recreation Management TWC meeting after the RCG  
> meeting on Monday but Tuesday would work. I am sure Malcolm and  
> others would still prefer an evening session because of work  
> constraints.

> Wednesday evening works for me too.

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: EPPINK, THOMAS G [mailto:TEPPINK@scana.com  
> <mailto:TEPPINK@scana.com> ]  
> Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 2:08 PM  
> To: Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones;



> Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore  
> Subject: RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

> Might it be more time efficient to meet after one of the RCG  
> meetings Monday or Tuesday?

---

> From: Bill Marshall [mailto:MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov  
> <mailto:MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov> ]  
> Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 3:02 PM  
> To: Dave Anderson; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Charlene Coleman; Guy  
> Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick  
> Moore  
> Subject: RE: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

> Friends, I am available to meet next Wednesday if others want  
> to so so.

> Also, I took a stab at adding information (and guesstimation)  
> to the working document/list that Dave adapted from Charlene. See  
> attachment.

> Bill

---

> From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com  
> <mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com> ]  
> Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2006 3:56 PM  
> To: Tom Eppink; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave  
> Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm  
> Leaphart; Patrick Moore  
> Subject: Downstream Flows TWC Meeting?

> I haven't seen much communication between this group regarding  
> our "Downstream Flows Working Document". I will be in town next week  
> and am free on Wednesday, or in the evenings if y'all want to get  
> together and chat. Let me know and I will plan something.

> As an update, I haven't received the Instream Flows DVD. I  
> talked to someone at the Rivers Alliance and they indicated they  
> wanted to make sure we got a working copy, but I haven't heard  
> anything since then. I'll double check and let everyone know what I  
> find out.

> Dave

> Learn to get in touch with the silence within yourself and know that  
> everything in this life has a purpose.  
> - Elizabeth Kubler-Ross  
>  
>  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> Love cheap thrills? Enjoy PC-to-Phone calls  
> <[http://us.rd.yahoo.com/mail\\_us/taglines/postman9/\\*http://us.rd.yahoo.com/ev](http://us.rd.yahoo.com/mail_us/taglines/postman9/*http://us.rd.yahoo.com/ev)  
> t=39666/\*<http://beta.messenger.yahoo.com/>> to 30+ countries for just  
> 2¢/min  
> with Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.  
>  
>

**Danielle Fitzpatrick**

---

**From:** Bill Marshall [MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 08, 2006 1:17 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** Malcolm Leaphart; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** RE: LSR Corridor Plan

Dave,

I can provide a presentation to explain both the 1990 and 2000 plans. Tony Bebber and Malcolm Leaphart could also do it as they were on the original LSR Task Force of the late 1980s and have served on the Scenic River Advisory Council since it's beginning in 1991.

As you may recall, at one RCG meeting I gave an overview of the greenway trail concepts contained within the 2000 corridor plan update.

One way or another, I think we can communicate the plan at the next meeting.

Bill

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 08, 2006 1:00 PM  
**To:** Bill Marshall  
**Subject:** LSR Corridor Plan

Bill,

As I was finalizing the Recreation RCG Work Plan, I realized that we have not seen a presentation on the Corridor Plan in the RCG. I know a lot of people are familiar with it, but I think it would be a good idea if the entire RCG was on the same page concerning what the plan suggests and the work that went into it.

Are you interested in giving a presentation at the next RCG meeting? If not you, can you recommend someone else?

The next meeting is scheduled for October 25th at 9:30 am. I can fit you in at any time as I am just starting to plan the meeting.

Thanks,

Dave

**Danielle Fitzpatrick**

---

**From:** Bill Marshall [MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 08, 2006 1:46 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** Malcolm Leaphart; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** RE: LSR Corridor Plan

I have a powerpoint show for the LS Scenic River project that features the primary maps of the corridor plans and captures most of the issues of the plans. In the published docuemnts there are plan views for the whole corridor, for sections, and for sites and I can scan all of them for inclusion in a powerpoint. So, the visual elements are mostly there and between me, Tony and Malcolm, I think the background / historical context can be covered well.

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 08, 2006 1:29 PM  
**To:** Bill Marshall  
**Cc:** Malcolm Leaphart; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** RE: LSR Corridor Plan

I do remember that (now). Do you have any poster boards or the images from the plan (that can be used in PowerPoint) for our use as we begin examining specific sites?

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Bill Marshall [mailto:MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 08, 2006 12:17 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** Malcolm Leaphart; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** RE: LSR Corridor Plan

Dave,

I can provide a presentation to explain both the 1990 and 2000 plans. Tony Bebber and Malcolm Leaphart could also do it as they were on the original LSR Task Torce of the late 1980s and have served on the Scenic River Advisory Council since it's beginning in 1991.

As you may recall, at one RCG meeting I gave an overview of the greenway trail concepts contained within the 2000 corridor plan update.

One way or another, I think we can communicate the plan at the next meeting.

Bill

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 08, 2006 1:00 PM  
**To:** Bill Marshall  
**Subject:** LSR Corridor Plan

Bill,

As I was finalizing the Recreation RCG Work Plan, I realized that we have not seen a presentation on the

Corridor Plan in the RCG. I know a lot of people are familiar with it, but I think it would be a good idea if the entire RCG was on the same page concerning what the plan suggests and the work that went into it.

Are you interested in giving a presentation at the next RCG meeting? If not you, can you recommend someone else?

The next meeting is scheduled for October 25th at 9:30 am. I can fit you in at any time as I am just starting to plan the meeting.

Thanks,

Dave

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 05, 2006 11:08 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Final Study Plans

Recreation RCG,

As a result of the hard work of the Recreation Management TWC and the Downstream Flows TWC, I am happy to distribute two final study plans that will be completed during the coming months.

The first deals with boat densities on Lake Murray and is an additional "piece of the puzzle" that will assist us as we move forward with the Recreation Plan. It will complement the efforts of the Recreation Assessment and is scheduled to be completed by the time the Recreation Assessment report is finalized.



Boating Density  
Study Plan (20...

The second deals with recreation flows on the lower Saluda River and also includes a "safety" component to examine "rate of change" on the River. Results from this study will help us with recreation issues on the river and provide additional information on making the river a safer place to recreate. You may notice that it looks like a couple of the appendices are missing--these are questionnaires that will be finalized during the first phase of the work.



Downstream  
Recreation Flow Ass..

Many thanks to members of the TWCs for their help in finalizing these two studies.

I am planning on reserving some time at the next RCG meeting for questions about either of the study plans.

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 05, 2006 11:39 AM  
**To:** Tommy Boozer; Aaron Small; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Bill Mathias; Bret Hoffman; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; David Price; Dick Christie; Edward Schnepel; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Jennifer O'Rourke; Jerry Wise; Jim Devereaux; Joel Huggins ; John and Rob Altenberg; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norm Nicholson; Norman Ferris; Patrick Moore; Randy Mahan; Roger Hovis ; Skeet Mills ; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Eppink  
**Subject:** Final Study Plan

Safety RCG,

Although we have been working on this study plan under the Downstream Flows TWC (under the Recreation RCG), I wanted to distribute the study plan to members of the Safety RCG as one of the purposes of the study deals with safety issues on the lower Saluda River. If you remember, this RCG did task the TWC with addressing safety issues related to flows on the LSR.

I have blocked out some time at our next RCG meeting to address any questions you may have on this study.



Downstream  
Recreation Flow Ass..

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, September 08, 2006 11:46 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Final Recreation RCG Work Plan, etc.

I did not receive any additional comments on the sections of the working documents that are being finalized. Attached is the latest version of the working documents. You will notice the Work Plan, Vision Statement, Stepwise Process Diagram, and Solution Principles have been marked FINAL. I am also considering the questions in the Standard Process Form as final, but have not marked this section as final since we will be working on completing the form over the next few months.

I will be setting the agenda for our next RCG meeting over the next few weeks, so if there is anything you would like to include on the agenda, please let me know.

Dave



Recreation RCG  
Working Documen...



## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, April 28, 2006 5:20 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** Final Recreation Assessment Study Plan

Here is the final Recreation Assessment Study Plan. We have taken into account the latest round of comments from Tony and Malcolm in this final version. I know many of the comments were concerning determining future recreational needs for the Project and we have included text (most of it Tony's) to alleviate these concerns. I am now turning my attention to a draft "straw man" of how the Recreation Plan will be drafted and ultimately finalized by the Recreation RCG. Hopefully, this straw man will alleviate any other concerns concerning determining future recreational needs for the Project.

In other news, I have shipped the aerial photographs from the 2001 boat counts to our GIS person at Kleinschmidt and will talk to her next week about how best to use these data. We have hit the ground running with the Assessment and I will be traveling over to Columbia next week to coordinate efforts for training field personnel with Kelly Maloney.

Thanks for your hard work in getting this study plan in place. I look forward to working with you on future study plans and our vision of the Recreation Plan.

Have a great weekend!



001-Saluda  
Recreation Assessme.

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2006 10:34 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; 'Bill Argentieri'  
**Subject:** Final Boat Density Study Plan

I know it's been a while since we looked at this (July 19), but Tommy, Alan, and I have been trying to get the "alternative" data from Berger (if you remember, Marty discovered that they had broken the lake up into smaller segments than reported).

We have reached the end of the rope and will proceed with the study plan as discussed. We have made a few changes based on the discussion at the July 19th meeting, but these changes don't affect the way the study will be conducted. Although I have marked this document as final, if you see any "red flags", please let me know as soon as possible so we can adjust the document as necessary. If I don't hear from anyone by next Friday, we will proceed with the study.

If you have any questions, don't hesitate to ask.



Boating Density  
Study Plan (20...



Boating Density  
Study Plan (20...

**Danielle Fitzpatrick**

---

**From:** Bill Marshall [MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 21, 2006 2:52 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Richard Mikell; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Flach; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber  
**Subject:** RE: Draft Recreation RCG Work Plan

Dave and others,

In the attached document, I am offering suggested edits to the draft Work Plan for the Recreational RCG -- my edits are mostly added details to sections on "issues" and "tasks"  
Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,

Bill Marshall  
SCDNR and Lower Saluda SRAC

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 2006 3:57 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Richard Mikell; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Flach; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber  
**Subject:** Draft Recreation RCG Work Plan

Here is the draft work plan for the Recreation RCG that we will be discussing on Monday. See you then!

<<Draft Recreation RCG Work Plan.doc>>

## Recreation Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

<b>Facilitator:</b>			
Dave Anderson	Kleinschmidt Associates	dave.anderson@kleinschmidtusa.com	205-981-4547
<b>Members:</b>			
Name	Organization	E-mail	Work Phone
Alan Axson	Columbia Fire Department	cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net	
Alan Stuart	KA	alan.stuart@kleinschmidtusa.com	
Alison Guth	KA	alison.guth@kleinschmidtusa.com	
Amanda Hill	USFWS	amanda_hill@fws.gov	
Bill Argentieri	SCE&G	bargentieri@scana.com	
Bill Marshall	Lower Saluda Scenic River Advisory Council, DNR	marshallb@dnr.sc.gov	
Charlene Coleman	American Whitewater	cheetahrk@yahoo.com	
Charles (Charlie) Rentz		flyhotair@greenwood.net	
David Hancock	SCE&G	dhancock@scana.com	
Dick Christie	SCDNR	dchristie@infoave.net	
George Duke	LMHC	kayakduke@bellsouth.net	
Gerrit Jobsis	Coastal Conservation League & American Rivers	gerritj@sccl.org; gjobsis@americanrivers.org	
Guy Jones	River Runner Outdoor Center	guyjones@sc.rr.com	
Irvin Pitts	SCPRT	ipitts@scprt.com	
James A. Smith	LMA	bkawasi@sc.rr.com	
Jeff Duncan	National Park Service	jeff_duncan@nps.gov	
Jennifer O'Rourke	South Carolina Wildlife Federation	jenno@scwf.org	
Jennifer Summerlin	Kleinschmidt Associates	jennifer.summerlin@kleinschmidtusa.com	
Jim Devereaux	SCE&G	jdevereaux@scana.com	
JoAnn Butler	resident	jbutler@scana.com	
Joy Downs	Lake Murray Assn.	elymay2@aol.com	
Karen Kustafik	City of Columbia Parks and Recreation	kakustafik@columbiasc.net	
Keith Ganz-Sarto		keith_ganz_sarto@hotmail.com	
Kelly Maloney	Kleinschmidt Associates	kelly.maloney@kleinschmidtusa.com	
Larry Michalec	Lake Murray Homeowners Coalition	lmichalec@aol.com	
Larry Turner	SCDHEC	turnerle@dhec.sc.gov	
Leroy M. Barber Jr.	LMA	lbarber@sc.rr.com	
Malcolm Leaphart	Trout Unlimited	malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu	
Mark Leao	USFWS	mark_leao@fws.gov	
Marty Phillips	Kleinschmidt Associates	marty.phillips@kleinschmidtusa.com	
Michael Waddell	TU - Saluda River Chapter	mwaddell@esri.sc.edu	
Miriam S. Atria	Capitol City Lake Murray Country	miriam@lakemurraycountry.com	
Norman Ferris	Trout Unlimited	norm@sc.rr.com	
Patricia Wendling	LMA	wwending@sc.rr.com	
Patrick Moore	SCCCL AR	patrickm@sccl.org	
Ralph Crafton	LMA	crafton@usit.net	
Randy Mahan	SCANA	rmahan@scana.com	
Richard Mikell	Adventure Carolina	adventurec@mindspring.com	
Stanley Yalicki	LMA	joyyalicki@aol.com	
Steve Bell	Lake Murray Watch	bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net	
Suzanne Rhodes	SC Wildlife Federation	suzrhodes@juno.com	
Tim Vinson	SCDNR	vinsont@dnr.sc.gov	
Tom Brooks	Newberry Co.	tbrooks@newberrycounty.net	
Tommy Boozer	SCE&G	tboozers@scana.com	
Tony Bebbber	SCPRT	tbebbber@scprt.com	
Van Hoffman	SCANA Land Mgt.	vhoffman@scana.com	

**Recreation Resource Conservation Group Work Plan  
Saluda River Project**

DRAFT

## Recreation Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

### Mission Statement

The mission of the Recreation RCG is to ensure adequate and environmentally-balanced public recreational access and opportunities related to the Saluda Hydroelectric Project for the term of the new license. The objective is to assess the recreational needs associated with the lower Saluda River and Lake Murray and to develop a comprehensive recreation plan to address the recreation needs of the public for the term of the new license. This will be accomplished by collecting and developing necessary information, understanding interests and issues and developing consensus-based recommendations.

### Identified Issues

- the need for better public access
  - [support creation of public access sites and greenway-trail concepts as proposed in the Lower Saluda River Corridor Plans of 1990 and 2000, which include a linear park and trail system on north bank of river connecting Saluda Shoals Park to Gardendale Landing and to Riverbanks Zoo; and a park/preserve on the south side of river at Twelve-mile Creek](#)
  - access site above the Mill Race rapids ([encompassed within LSR Corridor Plan item, above](#))
  - creation of a state park on the south side of the reservoir
  - creation of a multi-lane boating facility that can accommodate large tournaments
  - non-boating access
  - paddling access
  - expansion of existing facilities to accommodate future growth
  - security at recreation facilities
- [conservation of lands to protect the scenic integrity of the Project and to provide wildlife habitat areas](#)
- using the concept of adaptive management in future recreation planning
- creation of a communication system that would encompass information [to better inform the public of existing and projected conditions regarding lake levels and river flows as related to anticipated hydro operations and maintenance](#)
- protection of the cold water fishery on the Lower Saluda River
- creation of scheduled recreation flows for the Lower Saluda River
- identification of a reliable lake level that will provide year round access for a majority of lake users
- [management of river flows to improve safety for river users \(coordinate with Safety RCG\)](#)
- [minimum flows to provide for recreational navigation and to protect and enhance aquatic life in river \(coordinate with Fish and Wildlife RCG\)](#)

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted:

Deleted: on

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

### RCG Tasks and Responsibilities

- Utilizing and modifying the Standard Process for evaluating and addressing recreation management and access issues specific to the Saluda Project, including developing a vision statement for the Project.

## Recreation Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

- Identifying specific areas where lake level fluctuations may be adversely affecting recreation at the lake, including the nature and timing of the effect (e.g., access to sections of water, access to facilities and aesthetics).
- [Identifying specific areas where river flow changes may be adversely affecting recreation along the river, including the nature and timing of the effect \(e.g., access to and safe use of sections of river\).](#)
- Working with the Operations Resource Conservation Group to identify “reasonable” (based on hydrologic, structural, and other limitations identified) changes and alternatives for modifying project operations, including operations that would benefit recreation.
- [Working with the Safety RCG and the Fish and Wildlife RCG to coordinate actions on issues of mutual interests such as river flows, lake levels, and the siting and management recreational facilities.](#)
- Identifying any studies, if applicable, that need to be performed for identifying and/or evaluating [\(1\) changes to Project operations, \(2\) enhancements to existing facilities, and \(3\) creation of new facilities to provide for public recreational access and opportunities.](#)
- Presenting a range of reasonable alternatives or recommendations to the Saluda Hydro Relicensing Group (SHRG) regarding modifications to facilities or current Project operations, [needs for additional future access and facilities,](#) and provide recommendations for recreation access, facilities, and use.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

### Work Scope and Product

- **Task 1** – Utilize the stepwise process diagram and solution principles to guide the planning process for addressing recreation management issues at the Saluda Project.
- **Task 2** – Develop a Vision Statement for the Saluda Project.
- **Task 3** – Review the operational constraints and current operations of the Saluda Project (see Initial Consultation Document).
- **Task 4** – Answer the list of questions on the Standard Process Form in order to characterize the existing and potential future condition of access and lake level fluctuations – from a recreation setting perspective.
- **Task 5** – Review stakeholder requests (e.g., agency letters) for particular studies and/or enhancement measures to ensure that these are incorporated into study planning, if applicable.
- **Task 6** – Develop and recommend operation scenarios to the Operations RCG for analysis. These scenarios should reflect initial thinking on potential solutions and be designed to narrow the focus of Task 10 below. Analysis by the Operations RCG will focus on an assessment of potential recreational impacts associated with any suggested changes to operations.
- **Task 7** – Discuss results of the Operations RCG analyses.
- **Task 8** – Develop study designs/methods/plans and review agreed upon studies, literature reviews, etc.
- **Task 9** – Check the solution principles to ensure proposed study plans are consistent.
- **Task 10** – Provide recommendations for Project operations and recreation access, facilities, and use to be considered in conjunction with all ecological and recreational issues.
- **Task 11** – Develop a consensus based Recreation Plan for the Saluda Project that addresses all of the issues and tasks identified above.

**Recreation Resource Conservation Group Work Plan  
Saluda River Project**

**Schedule**

**Late 2005/Early 2006**—Finalize Mission Statement, Standard Process Form, Solution Principles, and Work Plan

**Mid-2006**—Complete identification of studies, literature reviews, etc. that need to be completed to address issues and tasks identified in the Work Plan

**Late 2006**—Begin compilation of existing information, review preliminary study results, and draft an outline of the Recreation Plan

**2007**—Complete any studies identified in Task 8 and review results; draft recommendations to SHRG, complete draft Recreation Plan

**2008**—Finalize Recreation Plan and provide comments on Draft License Application

DRAFT



## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Tony Bebber [tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 23, 2006 4:00 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** RE: Draft Recreation Assessment Study Plan



Saluda Recreation  
Assessment S...

I am still concerned that the Assessment as written will not assess the need for future recreation needs - sites and shoreline needed - although I think Marty's 4/20/06 explanation goes a long way toward it. It needs to be worked into the process. The current assessment study plan suggests that the assessment will "identify future recreational needs" yet I do not see the process to do so. It has been suggested in the meetings that a regional survey, potentially interviewing current non-users, will not be a part of the overall study plan. I suggest adding some statements that the Recreation RCG will operate as a focus group of experts offering knowledge of the recreation resources and needs. The RCG will identify additional facilities, sites, and shoreline needed to meet the needs.

The draft also does not include statement that Dave A. noted several times in our meetings that if the on-site surveys do not adequately represent the usage of the sites, additional information may be gathered in Spring 2007 to supplement the data. Since this survey is missing two months of the the peak season (April and May) and several other months, there remains concern about what information we may be missing.

Attached are some recommended changes (in "track changes").

Thanks,  
Tony Bebber

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Wed 4/19/2006 3:44 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri  
**Subject:** Draft Recreation Assessment Study Plan

Alright, one final time. This version addresses Tony's submitted comments and the discussion we had on Monday. I don't think there are a lot of substantive changes to the document, so I would like to finalize this next Monday (April 24th). We are busy writing the draft study plan for the boat density study and the recreation plan. Hopefully, the first drafts will be available during the next two weeks.

Thanks for everybody's hard work on this study plan; I know it's been difficult with everything else going on. I do feel that the results of this study will provide us with some very valuable information as we proceed with addressing future recreation needs for the Saluda Project.

<<001-Saluda Recreation Assessment Study Plan (04-19-06).doc>> <<Public Access Site Questionnaire (04-19-06).doc>> <<Public Access Site Questionnaire LSR (04-19-06).doc>>



## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 19, 2006 3:44 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** Draft Recreation Assessment Study Plan

Alright, one final time. This version addresses Tony's submitted comments and the discussion we had on Monday. I don't think there are a lot of substantive changes to the document, so I would like to finalize this next Monday (April 24th). We are busy writing the draft study plan for the boat density study and the recreation plan. Hopefully, the first drafts will be available during the next two weeks.

Thanks for everybody's hard work on this study plan; I know it's been difficult with everything else going on. I do feel that the results of this study will provide us with some very valuable information as we proceed with addressing future recreation needs for the Saluda Project.



001-Saluda  
Recreation Assessme.



Public Access Site  
Questionnai...



Public Access Site  
Questionnai...

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, August 11, 2006 2:50 PM  
**To:** Tom Eppink; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jennifer Summerlin; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Patrick Moore  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; 'Bill Argentieri'; 'Randy Mahan'  
**Subject:** Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

Attached is the draft "Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan". I would like to collect any comments by August 28th (two weeks) and then schedule a meeting to review comments. Whether this will be a conference call or sit down meeting is up in the air--it will depend on the amount and substance of the comments received. If you have any questions regarding the study plan, feel free to contact Kelly Maloney or myself.



Draft Flow  
Assessment Study Pl.

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Tony Bebber [tbebbber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 18, 2006 9:20 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Malcolm Leaphart  
**Cc:** teppink@scana.com; marshallb@dnr.sc.gov; cheetahtk@yahoo.com; guyjones@sc.rr.com; kakustafik@columbiasc.net; Kelly Maloney; patrickm@sccl.org; Jennifer Summerlin  
**Subject:** RE: Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan



Draft Flow  
Assessment Study Pl.

Dave,  
Malcolm forwarded to me the draft Downstream Rec Flow Assessment Study Plan and I appreciate the opportunity to comment while it is still in draft process. I hope you plan to share with the Recreation RCG before finalizing. My comments are as follows:

1. The study plan seems to be skewed toward recreational boating (primarily paddling) and generally ignores wade fishing, bank fishing, swimming/sunbathing/rock use, tubing, and other uses along the river. 2. The study plan does not address potential recreation use associated with anticipated new recreation venues (Three Rivers Greenway, Lower Saluda Greenway/Saluda Shoals extension, potential new park at 12 mile creek, etc.) or residential recreational use (Rivers Edge Subdivision and others). 3. I assume the red dots on the map are the locations for testing. These all appear to be paddling areas and have little to do with other activities. You must consider other recreational activities - wade fishing, bank fishing, swimming, tubing, rock use, sunbathing, picnicking, walking, bicycling, etc. Shouldn't the shoreline along Saluda Shoals Park be a prime spot to be considered? 4. You must also be aware that all current and future users are not "experts" or familiar with the dangers presented by the hydro project river. 4. Attached is a redline version with my recommendations.

Thanks,

Tony Bebber, AICP  
Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042  
tbebbber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

-----Original Message-----

From: Malcolm Leaphart [mailto:malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2006 3:38 PM  
To: Tony Bebber  
Subject: Fwd: Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan

----- Forwarded message from Dave Anderson  
<Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com> -----  
Date: Fri, 11 Aug 2006 14:49:32 -0400  
From: Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>  
Reply-To: Dave Anderson <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>  
Subject: Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan  
To: Tom Eppink <teppink@scana.com>, Bill Marshall

<marshallb@dnr.sc.gov>, Charlene Coleman <cheetahtrk@yahoo.com>, Dave Anderson  
<dave.anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>, Guy Jones <guyjones@sc.rr.com>, Jennifer  
Summerlin <Jennifer.Summerlin@KleinschmidtUSA.com>, Karen Kustafik  
<kakustafik@columbiasc.net>, Kelly Maloney  
<Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com>, Malcolm Leaphart  
<malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu>, Patrick Moore <patrickm@scccl.org>

Attached is the draft "Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan". I would like to collect any comments by August 28th (two weeks) and then schedule a meeting to review comments. Whether this will be a conference call or sit down meeting is up in the air--it will depend on the amount and substance of the comments received. If you have any questions regarding the study plan, feel free to contact Kelly Maloney or myself.

<<Draft Flow Assessment Study Plan (08-09-06).doc>>

----- End forwarded message -----

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Marty Phillips  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 20, 2006 4:44 PM  
**To:** 'tbebbber@scprt.com'  
**Cc:** Dave Anderson; Alan Stuart  
**Subject:** Clarification of Recreation Studies

Hi Tony,

Dave shared with me that you are concerned about how we will ultimately be able to identify whether there will be a need for expansion of existing recreation sites or potentially new recreation sites at the Saluda Project. He asked if I would share with you how I envision this taking place.

The process I envision is outlined in the attached document. I'm uncertain of the level of detail that you were looking for – if this is too broad of a description, please let me know and I'll take a stab at providing additional detail. I should also add the caveat that this is how I envision this. Ultimately, I believe the final process will be determined by your group.

Marty



SCE&G Recreation  
Process.doc (...)

*Marty Phillips*  
*Kleinschmidt Associates*  
*75 Main Street P.O. Box 576*  
*Pittsfield, ME 04967*  
*phone: (207) 487-3328*  
*fax: (207) 487-3124*

Tony,

Basically, I try to break these studies down into looking at supply and demand. As with any commodity, a provider – in this case SCE&G – must look at supply and estimate future demand. I also believe that this process builds upon itself – we need to look at everything, but the first step is to examine the baseline and see where we are now. The questions that I believe should be answered, and the data needs that I perceive as necessary and which I understand the TWC is planning on, are summarized below.

**“Does the *existing* supply of recreation sites/facilities meet the *current* demand for them?”  
The answer to this question defines our baseline – it tells us what exists *now* and how it is *currently* used.**

1. Identify supply of recreation sites. In this instance, supply of recreation sites around Lake Murray will be determined using the results of the recreation site inventory. That will tell us (a) what’s available for public access sites and (b) approximately how many people these sites can accommodate at any period in time (site capacity).
2. Estimate whether we are meeting *current* demand for these recreation sites. We need to estimate at what level these sites are being used now. This is determined from our vehicle counts, which will occur concurrently with the site surveys. This information will be supplemented with results from the user surveys, which will tell us whether the patrons of recreation sites feel the existing facilities are adequate to meet their needs, and the staging locations of special events (regattas, fishing tournaments, etc.).

**“Will the current supply of recreation sites/facilities meet expected future demand?”**

1. Determine what *future* participation in recreation might look like. We need to estimate how many more people will be demanding recreational access to the Project. This information will come from estimates of population projections (population trends are an indicator of potential growth in recreation demand); trends in participation in outdoor recreation from national studies, the SC SCORP, the university study that you have referenced, River Corridor studies and other relevant literature.
2. Decide whether the *existing* sites might accommodate our expected *future* use, or whether those sites might need to be *expanded* or new sites *created*. The capacity at which these sites are being used currently will be compared with the estimates of future use to gain an idea of how much additional use in the future a site could or could not handle.

**“If site expansion or new access is determined to be required, where should that occur?”**

1. Identify the recreation sites where expansion might be necessary. Identify the activities that need to be accommodated. Determine whether (a) the site can accommodate an expansion and (b) whether an expansion is desirable at that site. Data required here will come from the site evaluation, professional engineers and resource managers/professionals. For boat launches, also examine maps from the boating density study, survey results, and accident locations to identify whether or not waters in front of the launch can handle additional boat traffic.
2. If it is determined that new sites should be created, the location of any potential site should be determined by examining the following items, at a minimum:
  - a. Location of existing project lands that are available
  - b. Topographic suitability of available project lands to meet the need



- c. Location of other sensitive resources (T&E species, spawning beds, wetlands, etc.).
- d. Current on-water use patterns that might become more concentrated by the development of a new site.

The bottom line here is that this decision will be made based on more than just the results of the recreation studies. Maps are very helpful.

In most cases, study results are considered in cooperation with the resource professionals who are most familiar with the activity occurring at the project. This is a normal part of the process and helps in interpreting the study results. The data alone can't always give you a definitive answer. In this instance, I envision the resource professionals as initially being the TWC.

Ultimately, all the public will get to comment on the conclusions.

And there are caveats. We do not have a crystal ball and don't know what the future might bring in terms of new technologies for new forms of recreation. Sometimes new inventions can significantly influence recreation patterns. Consider how personal watercraft changed recreation on a lake. Other inventions that change how we see people recreate are the new inflatable floating trampolines and water slides. Keep in mind, too, that people's tolerances and views on crowding change over time, as well. As use of a recreation site increases, people will either adjust their tolerances or seek substitute sites. Also, when scoping areas for new recreation sites, as a general rule, we do not wish to compete with commercial facilities.

## Danielle Fitzpatrick

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 05, 2006 2:59 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri; Alison Guth  
**Subject:** Boat Density Study Plan and Meeting

Attached is the draft boat density study plan for your review. I would like to have a meeting the week of July 17th to discuss and finalize the study plan. I know we have the Quarterly Public Meeting at 10 am and 7 pm on the 18th, the Safety RCG meeting on the 20th at 9:30 am, and the Recreation RCG meeting on the 21st at 9:30 am. Some possible meeting times are the afternoon of the 18th, any time on the 19th, or after the RCG meeting on the 20th. This will be a face to face meeting, but we can provide a conference phone if necessary. We could have it at the Kleinschmidt office in W. Columbia (by the airport), or find a place to sit down at Saluda Shoals if we do it between the QPMs.

Please advise as to what date and time work best for you.



Boating Density  
Study Plan (DR...

**Danielle Fitzpatrick**

---

**From:** Tony Bebber [tbebbber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 05, 2006 3:29 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Alison Guth  
**Subject:** RE: Boat Density Study Plan and Meeting

The 18<sup>th</sup> (between public meetings) makes sense to me. I'm also available the afternoon of 19<sup>th</sup>, and after the Safety meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> (estimate the time please),

Tony Bebber, AICP  
Planning Manager  
South Carolina Dept. of Parks,  
Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
803-734-0189  
803-734-1042 fax  
[tbebbber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebbber@scprt.com)  
websites: [www.discoversouthcarolina.com](http://www.discoversouthcarolina.com)  
[www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com)  
[www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

***So many parks. So much fun! So what are you waiting for? Make your State Park weekend and vacation plans today! Call 1-866-345-PARK (7275) or reserve online at [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com).***

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 05, 2006 2:59 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri; Alison Guth  
**Subject:** Boat Density Study Plan and Meeting

Attached is the draft boat density study plan for your review. I would like to have a meeting the week of July 17th to discuss and finalize the study plan. I know we have the Quarterly Public Meeting at 10 am and 7 pm on the 18th, the Safety RCG meeting on the 20th at 9:30 am, and the Recreation RCG meeting on the 21st at 9:30 am. Some possible meeting times are the afternoon of the 18th, any time on the 19th, or after the RCG meeting on the 20th. This will be a face to face meeting, but we can provide a conference phone if necessary. We could have it at the Kleinschmidt office in W. Columbia (by the airport), or find a place to sit down at Saluda Shoals if we do it between the QPMs.

Please advise as to what date and time work best for you.

<<Boating Density Study Plan (DRAFT; 06-29-06).doc>>

## Stacia Hoover

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, June 16, 2006 10:29 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Richard Mikell; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Flach; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Comments on Recreation RCG Work Plan and Vision Statement

The due date for collecting comments on the Work Plan and Vision statement has passed and I am resubmitting the RCG Working Document so that everyone can see the comments that were submitted.

If you hover your cursor over the comment/edit, you should be able to see who submitted the comment.

I would like to collect any additional comments to the new document by July 7. This gives everyone almost three weeks to review the changes and will allow me enough time after the due date to compile any additional comments before our next RCG meeting on July 20.

If you have any questions/comments, feel free to contact me.



Recreation RCG  
Working Documen...

## Stacia Hoover

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, June 16, 2006 10:29 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Richard Mikell; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Flach; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Comments on Recreation RCG Work Plan and Vision Statement

The due date for collecting comments on the Work Plan and Vision statement has passed and I am resubmitting the RCG Working Document so that everyone can see the comments that were submitted.

If you hover your cursor over the comment/edit, you should be able to see who submitted the comment.

I would like to collect any additional comments to the new document by July 7. This gives everyone almost three weeks to review the changes and will allow me enough time after the due date to compile any additional comments before our next RCG meeting on July 20.

If you have any questions/comments, feel free to contact me.



Recreation RCG  
Working Documen...

**Stacia Hoover**

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 08, 2006 10:12 AM  
**To:** 'Tony Bebber'; Dave Anderson; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Alan Axson'; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'Amanda Hill'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; 'Bill Marshall'; 'Charlene Coleman'; 'Charlie Rentz'; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie'; 'George Duke'; 'Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers)'; 'Guy Jones'; 'Irvin Pitts'; 'Jeff Duncan'; 'Jennifer O'Rourke'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Jim Devereaux'; 'JoAnn Butler'; 'Joy Downs'; 'Karen Kustafik'; 'Keith Ganz-Sarto'; Kelly Maloney; 'Larry Michalec'; 'turnerle@dhec.sc.gov'; 'Lee Barber'; 'Malcolm Leaphart'; 'Mark Leao'; Marty Phillips; 'Mike Waddell'; 'Miriam Atria'; 'Norman Ferris'; 'Patricia Wendling'; 'Patrick Moore'; 'Ralph Crafton'; RMAHAN@scana.com; 'Richard Mikell'; 'Stanley Yalicki'; 'Steve Bell'; 'Suzanne Rhodes'; 'Tim Flach'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tom Brooks'; 'Tommy Boozer'  
**Subject:** RE: Reminder: Vision Statement and Identified Issues

They're in the "Working Document" I sent out on May 18th. Attached for your convenience...

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 08, 2006 8:34 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Richard Mikell; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Flach; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer  
**Subject:** RE: Reminder: Vision Statement and Identified Issues

When did you send these or can you resend?  
Thanks,

Tony Bebber, AICP  
Planning Manager  
South Carolina Dept. of Parks,  
Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
803-734-0189  
803-734-1042 fax  
[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)  
websites: [www.discoversouthcarolina.com](http://www.discoversouthcarolina.com)  
[www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com)  
[www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

***So many parks. So much fun! So what are you waiting for? Make your State Park weekend and vacation plans today! Call 1-866-345-PARK (7275) or reserve online at [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com).***

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 07, 2006 5:05 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene

Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Richard Mikell; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Flach; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler

**Subject:** Reminder: Vision Statement and Identified Issues

Just a quick reminder that I would like to collect comments on the recreation vision statement and the "Identified Issues" section of the Work Plan by next week (Thursday, June 15). At that point I will redistribute the document for final approval.

If you have misplaced your copy of the working document, just let me know.

## Stacia Hoover

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 18, 2006 3:03 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Richard Mikell; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Flach; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Subject:** Recreation RCG Working Documents

I have pulled all of the documents we have been working on into a single Word document (at the request of the group). Hopefully this will make it easier to keep up with the progress we are making and means we will have one document to continue working on at future meetings.

There are really (what I would consider) three separate documents in the package. If you notice, they are separated by the page numbers at the bottom of the page (each section has the page number and the number of pages in that section).

The first section is the Work Plan that was introduced in the last meeting. This document contains the RCG membership list, the Mission Statement, Identified Issues, RCG Tasks and Responsibilities, Work Scope and Product, and Schedule.

The second section is the Recreation Vision Statement for the Saluda Project. We started working on this at our last meeting as well.

The third section I have called Recreation Plan Development. It contains the Stepwise Process Diagram, Solution Principles, and Standard Process Form. We will use this to guide us in the process of writing the Recreation Plan.

I know many of you have thought there is a lot of overlap between these documents, and quite frankly, there is a lot of overlap. This is not meant to confuse; it is done to make sure we have the information we need to write a consensus-based plan. For example, why is there a separate page for the Vision Statement when there is a question on the Standard Process Form (#3) about the Vision Statement? As you can see, I have inserted in the Form "Insert Final Vision Statement". The answers to the Form don't have to be complete, they can simply direct us to the appropriate place for the answer. Once we finalize the Vision Statement, we can either insert it in the Form, or leave it like it is.

Finally, a word about the process. Based on comments to the last set of meeting notes, I can sense some concern that the Rag's role has been diminished since we have formed the various TWCs. This is not the case at all. We are somewhere between Step 1 (Determine Desired Future Condition) and Step 2 (Establish Baseline Condition). It is up to the RCG to determine the desired future condition (i.e., Vision Statement). We have asked the various TWCs to complete some of the Step 2 questions. Once this step is complete, all of the available information will be submitted to the RCG, which will then begin the process of Step 3 (Determine What is Needed and When). This means the entire RCG will have a vital role to play as we complete the recreation plan. I am working on a "straw man" of the Recreation Plan that will identify the information we need for the plan and how our group of stakeholders will be involved with the planning process.

Now, back to the document. Part of my homework was to review the "Recreation Interests and Issues" we created a couple of months ago (which has been posted to the web site) and other relevant documents to make sure the "Identified Issues" section of the Work Plan is complete. I have done so and made some slight modifications since the last meeting.

I would like to see what we can accomplish via e-mail and am asking the RCG to review the Identified Issues section of the Work Plan so that we can finalize the issues of concern that we are working on. I would also like you to review the rest of the Work Plan so that we may finalize it (hopefully by next meeting). Also, I would like to finalize the Vision Statement either by, or at the next meeting, so I would like to collect comments on it as well.

If you could have any comments on these two sections to me **by June 15** (one month), I will keep track of them and resubmit the document for final approval.

As always, if you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me.





Recreation RCG  
Working Documen...

## Stacia Hoover

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, April 28, 2006 5:20 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** Final Recreation Assessment Study Plan

Here is the final Recreation Assessment Study Plan. We have taken into account the latest round of comments from Tony and Malcolm in this final version. I know many of the comments were concerning determining future recreational needs for the Project and we have included text (most of it Tony's) to alleviate these concerns. I am now turning my attention to a draft "straw man" of how the Recreation Plan will be drafted and ultimately finalized by the Recreation RCG. Hopefully, this straw man will alleviate any other concerns concerning determining future recreational needs for the Project.

In other news, I have shipped the aerial photographs from the 2001 boat counts to our GIS person at Kleinschmidt and will talk to her next week about how best to use these data. We have hit the ground running with the Assessment and I will be traveling over to Columbia next week to coordinate efforts for training field personnel with Kelly Maloney.

Thanks for your hard work in getting this study plan in place. I look forward to working with you on future study plans and our vision of the Recreation Plan.

Have a great weekend!



001-Saluda  
Recreation Assessme.

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, October 08, 2007 5:54 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart  
**Subject:** Final Spring Addendum

Recreation Management TWC Members,

Attached is the final version of the "Spring Addendum." Thanks to those of you that provided comments; responses to the comment received can be found in Appendix B. We will posting this to the web with an announcement to the Recreation RCG shortly.

Dave



Saluda Spring Use  
Addendum Stu...

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, September 24, 2007 11:21 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart  
**Cc:** 'Bill Argentieri'  
**Subject:** Revised Boat Density Report

Recreation Management TWC Members,

As discussed in our last meeting, here is the "track changes" version of the revised boat density report. This version is being placed on the website today (without the track changes).

Let me know if you have any questions as to why we changed some of the text (remember, none of the results changed).

Dave



Boating Density  
Report Revised...

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, September 17, 2007 1:24 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Beber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart  
**Subject:** Recreation Plan "Straw Man"

Recreation Management TWC Members,

As per our meeting last week, I am sending around the Recreation Plan "straw man" that we have looked at previously. If you go back to the July 21, 2006 RCG notes, you can see where we discussed it. This version was the one we worked on that day and includes the track changes we made at the meeting.

I have made the CDs of the example recreation plans and will be getting them in the mail tomorrow.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Recreation Plan  
Straw Man (07-...

**SOUTH CAROLINA  
ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY**  
*COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA*

**SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT**  
*(FERC NO. 516)*

**RECREATION PLAN**

DRAFT

*JULY 2006*

*Prepared by:*

***Kleinschmidt***  
*Energy & Water Resource Consultants*

SOUTH CAROLINA  
ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT  
(FERC NO. 516)

RECREATION PLAN

DRAFT

JULY 2006

Prepared by:

***Kleinschmidt***  
*Energy & Water Resource Consultants*

**SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA**

**SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT  
(FERC NO. 516)**

**RECREATION PLAN**

**DRAFT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	1
1.1	Regional Setting.....	1
1.2	Lake Murray .....	1
1.3	Lower Saluda River .....	1
2.0	DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND STORAGE.....	1
3.0	SITE DESCRIPTIONS, USE ESTIMATES, AND BOAT DENSITY ANALYSIS .....	1
4.0	FACILITY DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY.1	
4.1	Standard Process.....	1
4.2	Standard Process Steps and Questions.....	1
4.3	Recreation Solution Principles .....	2
5.0	FACILITY DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIZATION AND SCHEDULING .....	2
5.1	Prioritization Consultation .....	2
5.2	Implementation Schedule.....	2
5.3	Annual Consultation .....	3
5.4	Recreation Plan Addenda.....	3
6.0	RECREATION CONCEPT PLAN EVALUATION .....	3
6.1	Suitable Sites for Development .....	3
6.2	Unsuitable Sites for Development .....	3
7.0	OTHER ISSUES ADDRESSED WITHIN THE RECREATION RCG CONSULTATION PROCESS .....	3
8.0	REFERENCES.....	4



## **1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

These sections will be basic descriptions of existing and/or planned future recreation opportunities.

### **1.1 Regional Setting**

This section will briefly describe recreation opportunities in the Lake Murray region. In order to be consistent with the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), the region is defined as the “Capital City & Lake Murray Country” tourism region and includes the counties of Richland, Lexington, Saluda, and Newberry.

### **1.2 Lake Murray**

This section will briefly describe Project facilities, Lake Murray, and recreation opportunities available on the lake.

### **1.3 Lower Saluda River**

This section will briefly describe recreation opportunities available on the lower Saluda River. We must also describe what is actually in the project boundary.

## **2.0 DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND STORAGE**

This section will basically be the methodology from the Recreation Assessment Study and the Boat Density Study.

## **3.0 SITE DESCRIPTIONS, USE ESTIMATES, AND BOAT DENSITY ANALYSIS**

This section will incorporate results from the Recreation Assessment Study and the Boat Density Study.

## **4.0 FACILITY DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY**

This section will describe the consultation process with the Recreation RCG. We will incorporate the following subheadings to help describe the process.

### **4.1 Standard Process**

This section will describe the Standard Process that we are using in the Recreation RCG.

### **4.2 Standard Process Steps and Questions**

Basically, this will be a list of the four steps and the final questions from the Standard Process form.

#### 4.3 Recreation Solution Principles

This will be a reiteration of the final Solution Principles we are following.

#### **5.0 FACILITY DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIZATION AND SCHEDULING**

The following questions briefly describe the process we will use for determining facility development and prioritization.

**“Does the *existing* supply of recreation sites/facilities meet the *current* demand for them?”  
The answer to this question defines our baseline – it tells us what exists *now* and how it is *currently* used.**

1. Identify supply of recreation sites. In this instance, supply of recreation sites around Lake Murray will be determined using the results of the recreation site inventory. That will tell us (a) what’s available for public access sites and (b) approximately how many people these sites can accommodate at any period in time (site capacity).
2. Estimate whether we are meeting *current* demand for these recreation sites. We need to estimate at what level these sites are being used now. This is determined from our vehicle counts, which are occurring concurrently with the site surveys. This information will be supplemented with results from the user surveys, which will tell us whether the patrons of recreation sites feel the existing facilities are adequate to meet their needs, and the staging locations of special events (regattas, fishing tournaments, etc.).

#### 5.1 Prioritization Consultation

**“Will the current supply of recreation sites/facilities meet expected future demand?”**

1. Determine what *future* participation in recreation might look like. We need to estimate how many more people will be demanding recreational access to the Project. This information will come from estimates of population projections (population trends are an indicator of potential growth in recreation demand); trends in participation in outdoor recreation from national studies, the SCORP, River Corridor studies, and other relevant literature.
2. Decide whether the *existing* sites might accommodate our expected *future* use, or whether those sites might need to be *expanded* or new sites *created*. The capacity at which these sites are being used currently will be compared with the estimates of future use to gain an idea of how much additional use in the future a site could or could not handle.

#### 5.2 Implementation Schedule

**“If site expansion or new access is determined to be required, where and when should that occur?”**

1. Identify the recreation sites where expansion might be necessary. Identify the activities that need to be accommodated. Determine whether (a) the site can accommodate an expansion and (b) whether an expansion is desirable at that site. Data required here will come from the site evaluation, professional engineers, and resource

managers/professionals. For boat launches, also examine maps from the boating density study, survey results, and accident locations to identify whether or not waters in front of the launch can handle additional boat traffic.

2. If it is determined that new sites should be created, the location of any potential site should be determined by examining the following items, at a minimum:
  - a. Location of existing project lands that are available
  - b. Topographic suitability of available project lands to meet the need
  - c. Location of other sensitive resources (T&E species, spawning beds, wetlands, etc.).
  - d. Current on-water use patterns that might become more concentrated by the development of a new site.
3. Develop a prioritization schedule that will identify the approximate time frame for these improvements to occur.

5.3 Consultation Process

**Deleted:** Annual

Decide on a periodic consultation review after the implementation schedule is developed.

5.4 Recreation Plan Addenda

**Deleted:** We will include an annual consultation with the SCDNR and SCPRT that will review improvements made during the prior year and review the schedule for the upcoming year. If the schedule of improvements needs adjusting, it can occur at this meeting.

Include a description of an addendum to the plan to address plan updates.

**Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering

**Formatted:** Normal

**6.0 RECREATION CONCEPT PLAN EVALUATION [LEAVE SECTION 5.0**

**FACILITY DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIZATION BEFORE THIS SECTION 6.0, BUT MOVE SCHEDULE AND CONSULTATION SECTIONS AFTER THIS SECTION 6.0 ]**

**Deleted:** We will include an annual report describing improvements made during the previous year and plans for the coming year; basically meeting notes from the annual consultation.

This section will describe the detailed improvements that we agree will take place.

**Deleted:** Sites.

6.1 Sites Suitable for Development

This section will describe the sites and the improvements to those sites.

**Deleted:** Sites.

6.2 Sites Unsuitable for Development

During the course of consultation, we may find that a site may need improvements that are unfeasible for a given reason. We will record why these sites are unsuitable in order to provide a record for future use.

**7.0 OTHER ISSUES ADDRESSED WITHIN THE RECREATION RCG  
CONSULTATION PROCESS**

If we have any other recommendations related to recreation, we will describe them in this section.

## **8.0 REFERENCES**

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Bill Marshall [MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 11, 2007 10:24 AM  
**To:** Alan Stuart; Tony Bebber; Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Jim Cumberland ; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Alison Guth  
**Cc:** BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Spring Addendum Draft Report

Alan -- regarding the objectives of the study: Generally, I think we have assumed that we already know what the user activities are; therefore, we were after better numbers on the users... By my recollection, knowing that there is heavy usage of the river in the spring by college students and anglers, I primarily wanted to get a better handle on the numbers of these users. Secondly, we wanted input regarding needs and preferences. Comments on the study plan probably indicate that few of us held much hope for on-campus interviews and I think we did encourage getting into the field with more surveying. Water under the bridge at this point; and now I suppose we'll do the best with what we have. Thanks to Tony for giving the report his thorough review.

Bill

---

**From:** Alan Stuart [mailto:Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 10, 2007 8:28 PM  
**To:** Tony Bebber; Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Jim Cumberland ; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Alison Guth  
**Cc:** BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Spring Addendum Draft Report

All,

I have read Tony's comments on the report find them interesting and appreciative for him providing them. Not being a recreational specialist, something I'm still struggling with is with respect to these USC/college students. It is my understanding we did not potentially capturing some usage patterns of these individuals during the first study. I was out during the IFIM study (early June) and we had transects established at both Shandon Rapids and Millrace and made a point to carefully observe these folks. The users were both PREVELANT all during the day (from about noon to dusk) and they appeared to be overwhelmingly college age students (late teens to mid/late 20's) Whether these folks were actually registered at a local college I cannot say for certain. However, I did notice some cars with student parking stickers, some without. My point I guess I'm getting at, they all appeared to be engaged in all similar activities, sunbathing, some floating on pool floats, partying and what I would simply call general socializing (which included ALL kinds of activities from what appeared to be two grizzly bears locked in a grappling match for mating rights to well I'll leave that to everyone's imagination). I guess I'm still trying to figure out how use patterns of the "college students" would deviate significantly from the "non-college students" we observed in the Rec Study. Honestly, I didn't see the opportunity to do much more than what they were doing. I did notice the tremendous amount of dogs these people seemed to bring with them. It literally reminded me of the dog park at Saluda Shoals but on a much larger scale. On a more positive note, I did notice DNR was actively patrolling the areas (kudos to Bill Marshall's and Tim Vinson's group).

I agree with Tony that we may have not captured the actual Jan-May period. However, what I do question is, am I to understanding we were attempting to collect use data (patterns) on "college age" folks we may have missed or were we attempting to gather usage information specifically from USC college age students (with the assumption they participated in some activity outside what's been described and previously observed in the other study). I know we attempted to convene a focus group with students and where unsuccessful. However, based on my observations and the conflicts during the IFIM study with "student age users", I'm not sure we missed anything in

terms of use patterns from Jan-May that we didn't collect during the regular survey. Short of they may not have been in the water as much during the Jan-May period because of air temperatures. Even still I can't imagine it would significantly deviate from what I observed and how current education level would influence the use patterns. With all of this said, I'll leave it to you recreational folks to work through this.

My 1 cent worth of worthless of anecdotal information....thanks for allowing me to ramble...Alan

### **Alan Stuart**

Senior Licensing Coordinator

#### ***Kleinschmidt Energy and Water Resources***

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone: (803)951-2077

Cell 803.640.8765

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]

**Sent:** Monday, September 10, 2007 5:16 PM

**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Jim Cumberland ; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart

**Cc:** BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com

**Subject:** RE: Spring Addendum Draft Report

Dave and others:

My comments on the "Spring Addendum" are as follows:

General:

It appears that the only "new" on-site data collected was in late May and only on three (?) dates on the lower Saluda River. This was after local colleges adjourned in early May. This time period likely reflects similar usage as the "Summer" study done in 2006 and adds very little to the concern about different usage patterns in January through May. Some new data was collected from user groups – anglers at a special meeting of the Saluda River Chapter of Trout Unlimited/Federation of Fly Fishers, and knowledgeable river users during the test flows for another study in late May. Specific responses to the questions were not provided in an appendix so it could reviewed by those on the committees. The "Spring Addendum" uses the "Summer" study and two other secondary data sources to estimate January through May usage, providing very suspect data and negates the original reason for the "Spring Addendum." I am not sure the goals of the study were met.

Specific:

Page 1-4, Goal 1: should be (January-May, 2007).

Page 2-1, Section 2.1, 4<sup>th</sup> sentence: "Primary data entailed facilitated meetings and two days of personal interviews of recreationists who use recreation sites on the lower Saluda River.

Page 2-2, Table 2.1: provide a footnote for both mentions of the "2006 Recreation Assessment": A. Includes data from public recreation sites only from Memorial Day weekend through Labor Day weekend, 2006.

Page 2-2, Table 2.1: provide a footnote for "Public site monitoring reports during drawdown": B. Excludes February and March data.

Page 2-2, Table 2.1: there is a discrepancy from the study plan to the draft addendum in the source column. Originally it should have been the Recreation Management TWC rather than knowledgeable river users. Perhaps this should be explained in a footnote.

Page 2-4, discussion of USC Students: provide a statement that USC (and other local colleges?) adjourn in early May (perhaps students did not respond because they were in exams or at home by the time the attempted contact was made?). Provide how many students were interviewed.

Edit: Interviews occurred on one week days and one weekend days during a period of warm sunny weather.

Page 2-5, 2.1.3: the lack of data for February and March in the drawdown report is another reason real surveying was needed during this January through May time period, rather than dependence on secondary data. Thank you for explaining in the addendum that the estimate provided gives a poor relationship between month and recreational use.

Page 3-3, Table 3.4: Note that Parksite is closed January through March and these 1,730 estimated recreation days should be distributed to other nearby recreation sites. Also, Bundrick Island is primarily a summer venue (swimming, skiing, gathering). Its usage should also be distributed to other nearby sites – at least January through March.

Page 3-7, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: did the recreational use on the river “mirror the pattern of use on Lake Murray” because it was estimated from Dreher Island State Park data, with no adequate river usage data from the same time period?

Page 3-8, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence: “Most (58%) of this effort was from the bank (including wade fishing).”

Page 3-12, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: use Bill Marshall’s corrections regarding the LSR Corridor Plan and Update.

Page 3-13, Table 3.6 and next paragraph: Where is Old State Road public access? It has not been discussed in other documents.

Page 3-14, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: typo in wal~~k~~ing.

Page 3-14, last paragraph: “Sixty-six percent of those who were aware of the siren and flashing lights stated they had never heard and/or seen them before.”

Page 3-15, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: Chorley Island should be Corley Island.

Page 4-1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: Insert as first sentence or third sentence: “Except for specific surveys in late May, this “Spring Addendum” used secondary data primarily from prior years to estimate usage and patterns.”

Page 4-2, last paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence: change to: “This study presents some additional information concerning spring use (January-May) at the Saluda Project.”

Page 4-2, last paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence: change to: “Types of use were characterized through interpretation of the qualitative data provided by the user group meetings and two interview days at the Mill Race sites in late May, 2007.”

Appendixes: please add appendixes with responses to various questions, number of interviews, etc. so the TWC and Resource Committee may evaluate the usefulness of the addendum.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment.

**Tony Bebber**, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042

[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)

## Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2007 12:26 PM

**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Jim Cumberland ; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart

**Cc:** Bill Argentieri; Randy Mahan

**Subject:** Spring Addendum Draft Report

Good morning,

Attached is the draft Spring Addendum study report for your review. I would like to have your comments submitted by September 10th (one week longer than normal, but with the holiday being in the middle, I thought the extra time is needed). After this date, I would like us to reconvene to discuss plans for moving forward with the recreation plan.

September 12 to September 14 work best for me. It should be about a half day meeting to discuss the information we have collected over the past year and then make plans to move forward with a draft recreation plan by the end of the year.

Please let me know what dates work best for you and I will set up the meeting time and location.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

<<Saluda Spring Use Addendum Study Report (2007-08-20;DRAFT).doc>>



**Kacie Jensen**

---

**From:** Bill Marshall [MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 07, 2007 4:56 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Jim Cumberland ; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart  
**Cc:** BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Spring Addendum Draft Report

Dave and others --  
I have a few edits and comments to offer.

On page 16 (or 3-2), Section 3.1.1 -- It will be helpful to explain the term "recreation days."

On pages 26-27 (or 3-12 and 3-13), Section 3.2 -- The attachment contains my edits for Section 3.2 to clarify that the Saluda Corridor Plan Update of 2000 does recommend additional, new access to the river above I-26 (and elsewhere); and that would be via the proposed trail system along the river, even upstream of Saluda Shoals Park. It is only the "number and location" of "access points" (i.e. points of entry to the corridor) that was considered "sufficient" in the words of the plan. I also added mention of an access recommendation (at Twelvemile Creek) from the original Corridor Plan of 1990 that is still worthy of consideration.

And regarding additional motorboat access: a closer read of the Plan Update shows that this is not recommended. It says that "the consensus was that improvements to access points should only develop new facilities for non-powered watercraft" and then goes on to acknowledge that motorboat access at Gardendale would be helpful to those who become stranded downriver in high flow conditions. In other words, we recognize there is a legitimate point regarding boater safety here, but most are reluctant to open the river to any more motor boat use at this time.

Regarding visitor numbers from Saluda Shoals Park -- It may be appropriate to qualify the figures in some way explaining that some portion of the visitors are not recreating on the river or outdoors. The attached article highlights visitation at the park and notes that many are visiting for meetings and receptions and not outdoor recreation. Perhaps folks at the park have a ballpark estimate of how this would split out.

That's all I have for now. Thanks for allowing us to review and comment.

Bill Marshall

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2007 12:26 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Jim Cumberland ; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart  
**Cc:** Bill Argentieri; Randy Mahan  
**Subject:** Spring Addendum Draft Report

Good morning,

Attached is the draft Spring Addendum study report for your review. I would like to have your comments submitted by September 10th (one week longer than normal, but with the holiday being in the middle, I thought the extra time is needed). After this date, I would like us to reconvene to discuss plans for moving forward with the recreation plan.

September 12 to September 14 work best for me. It should be about a half day meeting to discuss the information we have collected over the past year and then make plans to move forward with a draft recreation plan by the end of the year.

Please let me know what dates work best for you and I will set up the meeting time and location.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

<<Saluda Spring Use Addendum Study Report (2007-08-20;DRAFT).doc>>

<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/144577.html>

Posted on Mon, Aug. 13, 2007

## The popular place you didn't know about

### Saluda Shoals Park, the 2nd most-visited attraction in area, quietly lures crowds

By JOEY HOLLEMAN  
[jholleman@thestate.com](mailto:jholleman@thestate.com)

Saluda Shoals Park is a conundrum. How can the best-kept secret in the region also be the second-most-popular daily attraction?

Almost daily, visitors to the Imo Chapin Recreation Commission park off Bush River Road tell park rangers they had no idea it was there or that it offered so much.

Yet, the park's attendance of 393,937 in the fiscal year that ended June 30 ranks behind only longtime attendance champ Riverbanks Zoo and Garden, at 899,675, and well ahead of No. 3 EdVenture, at 193,102.

Saluda Shoals park ranger Jay Robinson said he gets the "I had no idea this was here" comment often when talking with visitors on the park's trails.

"They'll say things like 'This is a brand new park, right?' and you say, 'No, it's been here a while,'" Robinson said.

Saluda Shoals opened with a boat ramp, parking lot and short trail in 1999. It didn't start blossoming until 2002 with the construction of picnic shelters, education and meeting facilities, and a more extensive trail system.

Dave Zunker, who recently left his post as vice president of the Midlands Authority for Convention, Sports and Tourism for a similar job in New York, was surprised by the Saluda Shoals attendance figure.

"But I guess I shouldn't be when you start to think about the various uses for that place," Zunker said. "It's not just an outdoors center. They do weddings. They do conferences. They do education. They do seminars."

Two of the top three attractions in the Midlands are relatively new. EdVenture opened in 2003.

The rest of the list is made up of museums and state and national parks.

The attendance list gathered by The State doesn't include events such as USC athletics, Colonial Center concerts and the crowds that flock to the graduation ceremonies at Fort Jackson. It's just for facilities open on a regular basis that compile annual attendance figures, which rules out the popular Three Rivers Greenway trails.

Because every organization compiles its figures differently, the numbers aren't an apple-for-an-apple comparison. For instance, Saluda Shoals' numbers get a boost from the hundreds of wedding receptions scheduled each year at its River Center, while Riverbanks Zoo doesn't include the attendance for after-hours parties in its figures.

Zoo executive director Satch Krantz was encouraged 10 attractions in the Midlands topped 100,000 in attendance.

"That tells me we're developing a critical mass of attractions where people can stay a day or two and have plenty to do," Krantz said.

© 2007 TheState.com and wire service sources. All Rights Reserved. <http://www.thestate.com>

### 3.2 Site Use and Perceptions of Site Conditions and Needs on the Lower Saluda River

Limited information is available in the existing literature regarding which sites are used by various user groups or suggested improvements to sites for recreational use. The creel surveys conducted on the LSR indicated several items that were the “most important thing to make the fishing trip more enjoyable.” Most anglers indicated “other,” but no indication was given as to what these “other” responses were. About 27% responded “more or improved boat or bank angling access”, 19% indicated “improvements to water quality and/or water level control”, 10% said “litter”, and about 2% said “law enforcement” (Beard, 1999).

The best indication of recreational needs for the lower Saluda River comes from the Lower Saluda River Corridor Plan and Update (SCDAP, 2000; SCWRC *et al.*, 1990). The general idea of the Corridor Plan Update is to have a trail down the entire length of the Saluda River and connect with the Three Rivers Greenway to link Saluda Shoals Park with Gardendale, Lake Murray, and Riverbanks Zoo. General recommendations from the Update about the number and location of recreational access points to the River from I-26 to the Saluda Dam indicate that the current access points at Hope Ferry (Metts), Gardendale, and Saluda Shoals are sufficient; however, the more detailed section plans recommend a trail system to access riverfront areas above Saluda Shoals Park where the Scenic River designation begins and all areas downstream of the park to the zoo. The original Corridor Plan recommends additional river-access points to include a park on the south side of the river at the mouth of Twelve-mile Creek. Both the original Corridor Plan and the Update recommend that no additional motorboat access be provided on the river, though the Update does acknowledge that a take-out for powered boats at Gardendale would help motor-boaters stranded downstream in high flow conditions.

**Deleted:** from the Update are that new access is not needed

Below I-26, the Update recommends a new take-out on the north side of the River near Stacey’s Ledge, improvements to the portage around Mill Race rapids, and a put-in with limited access by foot (with remote parking) for the Oh Brother Rapids/Ocean Boulevard area. The Update also identified a need for emergency access on the south side of the river below I-26, suggested access to parking areas, restrooms, and other improvements should be fee based, and the facilities should be ADA compliant. Furthermore, the Update suggested facilities at access areas should be as unobtrusive as possible. For

**Deleted:** Gardendale should be improved so that motor boats could be trailered at that location.

example, the Update suggests no parking should be visible from the river and buildings should fit in to the landscape and use natural materials.

**Kacie Jensen**

---

**From:** bill mathias [bill25@sc.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 07, 2007 9:33 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** RMAHAN@scana.com; Alan Stuart; Tommy Boozer; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bill Mathias  
**Subject:** Comments on Revised Final Boating Density Study

Dave,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the revised Final copy of the Boating Density Report.

I trust that the attached comments/observations are self-explanatory, but feel free to contact me if clarification is desired. If I failed to copy anyone who was present at our meeting, please forward a copy to them.

Thanks again.

Bill

**COMMENTS ON THE BOATING DENSITY REPORT  
(FINAL – REVISED) PREPARED BY KLEINSCHIMDT  
FOR SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT, AUGUST  
2007**

**COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY BILL MATHIAS  
SEPTEMBER 6, 2007**

While I still have some misgivings about the revised version of this report, there is no doubt that it is a great improvement over the “original Final,” especially with regard to the footnoting of precedents used and in the clarification of some phraseology.

While much could be said about the study, I offer the following observations/comments.

My primary concern remains that a lay or novice reading of the report is likely to misinterpret the report relative to actual Lake use/capacity on several issues.

1. On page 1-1 one of the purposes of the study is stated as “3. Examine whether recreational boat use of Lake Murray is currently above, below, or at a desirable, or optimal level. This intent is restated on page 4-2, “Based on current population projections, Lake Murray should not reach the optimum (emphasis added) level of boating identified in this report during the proposed new license term (30-50 years).” However, the emphasis of the report appears to me to be upon the maximum boating capacity of the Lake. I did not find any definition of, or estimate of, the optimum boating density. This issue needs to be clarified because the maximum and optimum levels are distinctly different issues.
2. Because of the use and computation of numbers, the study suggests greater precision than is warranted.
3. While precedents from the sources cited are likely the best available, it appears that there is apparently little methodology research literature available on studying boating density on lakes. Therefore, the results should be considered to be much more tenuous than the certainty that is implied in the report.
4. The study is limited by the original assumptions made by The Louis Berger Study which divided the Lake into segments. As there are no criteria presented for how this was accomplished, the segmentation appears to have been arbitrary. At the very least, no rationale nor criteria is presented indicating how the Berger segments were devised; nor was there any rationale presented for utilizing the segmentation in 2006 other than the fact that The Berger study utilized it. Specifically, the data from 2001 and 2006 which indicate that sailing occurs only in segment 3 is completely beyond credibility. While this may technically be accurate by counting sailboats in the photographs, it is not credible to anyone who frequents segment 2 where all three sailing clubs are located and hold races and

- regattas year round. (The report indicates that one of the sailing clubs is in segment 1, but that is incorrect.) The report acknowledges this fact, but it needs to be emphasized to prevent misinterpretation even by a casual reader of the report. This is a good illustration of what concerns me about the interpretation/use of this study for decision-making purposes now and especially in the future as those persons involved in the relicensing effort now will be replaced by policy-makers/decision-makers over the years who may not pick up on the subtleties of this report.
5. On page 4-1, the report states, “Although the study plan was quantitative in design, results should be used in a qualitative fashion.” This point is too subtle for most readers and policy-makers and should be stated more clearly.
  6. On the same page, the study states, “This study provides the RMTWC with an understanding of areas...” I suggest that the results are more nebulous, thus making this an overstatement of the implied precision of the study.
  7. The report (p. 4-2) acknowledges that portions of the report are based only upon responses from users of the public boat ramp/recreation areas. While it is important to state this limitation, one cannot accurately know if user response from private facilities, such as the sailing clubs and privately owned marinas would cause the conclusions drawn to be different or not. Again this is a subtlety that will not be comprehended by many readers; therefore, greater emphasis of this possible difference should be made.
  8. On page 4-4 it is stated that “However, different use distributions would have affected the estimated optimum use of each segment...” This is another source of potential misunderstanding by casual readers. It also is a good example of the precision of the use and computation of numbers implying greater precision that is warranted
  9. Also on page 4-4, reference is made to population growth being the best estimator of boating growth. Yet in the same paragraph, it states that Saluda County, one of the four counties in which the Lake is located, had conflicting data, thus casting doubt on the use of this “principle.”
  10. On page 4-4, the report states, “Caution should be used when using these results (in the paragraph above or in the entire report?) in future recreational planning.” I would add in the current recreation planning also.

I suggest that a specific section be added entitled LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY in which the above comments and perhaps additional limitations contributed by others could be included. This would, in my opinion, more adequately call attention to all readers, especially casual readers, that one should not be misled by the apparent precision of the report because of the use of numbers and computations. Although some limitations are stated throughout the study, it would be more forthright in stating all limitations in one section of the report.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this revised Final Report.



## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Kelly Maloney  
**Sent:** Friday, August 24, 2007 3:51 PM  
**To:** 'Bill Argentieri'; 'tbooz@scana.com'; 'rmahan@scana.com'  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bret Hoffman; Dave Anderson  
**Subject:** Draft Recreation Flow Study Report

**Contacts:** Bill Argentieri

Gentlemen,

Good Afternoon. I hope this email finds you well. Attached for your review and comment is the Saluda Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Report. The files are provided in a zip folder due to their size and include the draft report and flow model output appendices. If you have difficulty opening the documents, do not hesitate to let me know and I can send them via hardcopy, CD, posted to an ftp site or whatever your preference. Also, if you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

Kelly Maloney

***Kleinschmidt Associates***

***Energy and Water Resource Consultants***

141 Main Street, PO Box 650

Pittsfield, Maine 04967-0650

207-487-3328 x 271

207-487-3124 fax

[Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com](mailto:Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com)



Draft Flow  
Assessment Report.z.

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2007 12:26 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Jim Cumberland ; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart  
**Cc:** 'Bill Argentieri'; 'Randy Mahan'  
**Subject:** Spring Addendum Draft Report

Good morning,

Attached is the draft Spring Addendum study report for your review. I would like to have your comments submitted by September 10th (one week longer than normal, but with the holiday being in the middle, I thought the extra time is needed). After this date, I would like us to reconvene to discuss plans for moving forward with the recreation plan.

September 12 to September 14 work best for me. It should be about a half day meeting to discuss the information we have collected over the past year and then make plans to move forward with a draft recreation plan by the end of the year.

Please let me know what dates work best for you and I will set up the meeting time and location.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Saluda Spring Use  
Addendum Stu...

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2007 12:26 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Jim Cumberland ; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart  
**Cc:** 'Bill Argentieri'; 'Randy Mahan'  
**Subject:** Spring Addendum Draft Report

Good morning,

Attached is the draft Spring Addendum study report for your review. I would like to have your comments submitted by September 10th (one week longer than normal, but with the holiday being in the middle, I thought the extra time is needed). After this date, I would like us to reconvene to discuss plans for moving forward with the recreation plan.

September 12 to September 14 work best for me. It should be about a half day meeting to discuss the information we have collected over the past year and then make plans to move forward with a draft recreation plan by the end of the year.

Please let me know what dates work best for you and I will set up the meeting time and location.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Saluda Spring Use  
Addendum Stu...

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Marty Phillips  
**Sent:** Friday, July 20, 2007 1:28 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Jim Cumberland ; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Alison Guth  
**Subject:** Spring Addendum Update Email

Recreation Management TWC,

Good afternoon! I just want to let you know that you should be receiving the draft of the Spring Addendum Study Report in about two weeks. I also want to give everyone a preliminary "heads up" on a necessary change in the methods we had to use for-estimating spring use on Lake Murray.

If you remember, we originally planned to use monitoring reports from the Remediation Project to-estimate the percentage of use that occurs from January to May on Lake Murray. Unfortunately, and unbeknownst to us at the time, the monitoring reports did not include the months of February and March. We tried to estimate use for February and March using a simple regression, but did not have sufficient data to predict use with confidence. As a plausible alternative, we employed the same methodology we used on the LSR and calculated percentages of use based on 2006 monthly visitation to Dreher Island. We felt that it wasn't too much of a stretch to use the same methodology on both the river and the lake.

We also were challenged in gaining the interest of university students. We tried to recruit students who were involved in various outdoor clubs, but could only garner interest from the club advisors. In fact, not one student showed any interest. In lieu of that, we interviewed students at Mill Race. A discussion of efforts to engage university students and the subsequent interviews is provided in the forthcoming report.

Other than that, things went smoothly.

On another note, we hope you enjoyed Alan's presentation of the boat density study at the Quarterly Public Meeting. Also, if you didn't see the paper, Tim Flach wrote an article on this report:  
<http://www.thestate.com/news/story/111243.html>

Once we get the spring addendum study report finalized in the coming weeks, Dave will send out a general schedule for the rest of the year outlining the steps to complete the recreation plan.

Have a great weekend.

Marty

*Marty Phillips  
Kleinschmidt Associates  
141 Main Street P.O. Box 650  
Pittsfield, ME 04967  
phone: (207) 487-3328  
fax: (207) 487-3124*

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Tony Bebber [tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 15, 2007 11:28 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer  
**Cc:** Alison Guth  
**Subject:** RE: Final Saluda Boat Density Report

Thanks for making all the changes and explanations. On the map figures on pages 3-8 through 3-11, I think the footnote would be more clear if it read: "Boating activity distributions are from information derived at public access areas only (Kleinschmidt, 2007) and applied to boat count estimates determined from aerial photographs."

Thanks again.

### **Tony Bebber**, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042  
[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)

### **Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina**

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 15, 2007 10:14 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** Alison Guth  
**Subject:** Final Saluda Boat Density Report

Recreation Management TWC Members:

We are pleased to announce we have completed the edits to the Boat Density Study Report based on the comments received from TWC members.

We will be posting the report on the relicensing website in the next couple of days, but I wanted y'all to see the final product and how we handled your comments before taking it "public". I have attached a document that lists the comments received and our response to the comment.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

<<Boating Density Report (2007-06-15;FINAL).pdf>> <<Saluda Boat Density Report - Response to Comments (2007-06-14;FINAL).pdf>>

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Tony Bebber [tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 15, 2007 11:28 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer  
**Cc:** Alison Guth  
**Subject:** RE: Final Saluda Boat Density Report

Thanks for making all the changes and explanations. On the map figures on pages 3-8 through 3-11, I think the footnote would be more clear if it read: "Boating activity distributions are from information derived at public access areas only (Kleinschmidt, 2007) and applied to boat count estimates determined from aerial photographs."

Thanks again.

### **Tony Bebber**, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042  
[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)

### **Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina**

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 15, 2007 10:14 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** Alison Guth  
**Subject:** Final Saluda Boat Density Report

Recreation Management TWC Members:

We are pleased to announce we have completed the edits to the Boat Density Study Report based on the comments received from TWC members.

We will be posting the report on the relicensing website in the next couple of days, but I wanted y'all to see the final product and how we handled your comments before taking it "public". I have attached a document that lists the comments received and our response to the comment.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

<<Boating Density Report (2007-06-15;FINAL).pdf>> <<Saluda Boat Density Report - Response to Comments (2007-06-14;FINAL).pdf>>



## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, June 15, 2007 10:14 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** Alison Guth  
**Subject:** Final Saluda Boat Density Report

Recreation Management TWC Members:

We are pleased to announce we have completed the edits to the Boat Density Study Report based on the comments received from TWC members.

We will be posting the report on the relicensing website in the next couple of days, but I wanted y'all to see the final product and how we handled your comments before taking it "public". I have attached a document that lists the comments received and our response to the comment.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Boating Density  
Report (2007-0...



Saluda Boat Density  
Report - R...

**Kacie Jensen**

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, May 14, 2007 4:18 PM  
**To:** 'Tony Bebber'; Alison Guth  
**Cc:** 'Van Hoffman'; 'Bill Marshall'; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie'; 'George Duke'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Joy Downs'; Kelly Maloney; 'Lee Barber'; 'Malcolm Leaphart'; Marty Phillips; 'Patrick Moore'; 'Steve Bell'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tommy Boozer'  
**Subject:** RE: Results of Lake Murray Assoc. survey of adjacent landowners

Attached is the report provided by the Lake Murray Association; thanks Joy!

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 03, 2007 8:03 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Alison Guth  
**Cc:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Results of Lake Murray Assoc. survey of adjacent landowners

I could not find on the relicensing website the results of the LMA survey as discussed recently when reviewing the Recreation Assessment. Can you provide me a copy or post and notify? If it is to be a part of the data we are using to plan recreation improvements, we all need to see it. Descriptions of the methodology would help too.

Thanks,

**Tony Bebber**, AICP  
Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042  
[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)

**Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina**

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

**Kacie Jensen**

---

**From:** Tom Ruple [truple@sc.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 11, 2007 1:10 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Alan Stuart  
**Cc:** Joy Downs; Dave Landis  
**Subject:** LMA Sept 05 Survey Report - Final

Attached per your request is the final report for the LMA Sept 2005 survey. Alan and Dave Anderson please acknowledge receipt so I will know you received. Thanks, Tom

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dick Christie [dchristie@comporium.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 11, 2007 10:26 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Subject:** FW: Boating Statistic Information

Dave - hope this is what you need!

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Gary Sullivan [mailto:SullivanG@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2007 1:09 PM  
**To:** Dick Christie  
**Subject:** RE: Boating Statistic Information

MR. CHRISTIE,  
SEE IF THIS WILL SUFFICE. I WENT BACK FOUR YEARS.  
GARY

---

**From:** Dick Christie [mailto:dchristie@comporium.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 08, 2007 3:02 PM  
**To:** Gary Sullivan  
**Subject:** RE: Boating Statistic Information

Thanks for compiling the accident information, Gary. I will let you know if either Duke or SCE&G has any questions. As far as the marine event data, SCE&G would like to know how many marine events were held on Lake Murray (fishing tournaments, sailboat regattas, etc. ) and where (which boat landing) they were held for a 5 year period. If you have that information, I would greatly appreciate it. No rush. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Gary Sullivan [mailto:SullivanG@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 03, 2007 7:04 AM  
**To:** dchristie@InfoAve.Net  
**Cc:** Alvin Taylor; Hank Stallworth; Bob Perry; Ed Duncan  
**Subject:** Boating Statistic Information

Mr. Christie,  
I hope this will provide you the information you need. If not let me know.  
Thanks,  
Gary

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dick Christie [dchristie@comporium.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 08, 2007 2:57 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Subject:** FW: Boating Statistic Information

Hi Dave - [here is the accident data for Lake Murray \(and Keowee\)](#). I will request the marine event data. Also, as far as I know, we do not have any comments related to the boating density study.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Gary Sullivan [mailto:SullivanG@dnr.sc.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 03, 2007 7:04 AM  
**To:** dchristie@InfoAve.Net  
**Cc:** Alvin Taylor; Hank Stallworth; Bob Perry; Ed Duncan  
**Subject:** Boating Statistic Information

Mr. Christie,  
I hope this will provide you the information you need. If not let me know.  
Thanks,  
Gary

**Kacie Jensen**

---

**From:** LEAPHART, JR., MALCOLML [MALCOLML@mailbox.sc.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 02, 2007 2:29 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; RMAHAN@scana.com; rparsons12@alltel.net; Richard Mikell; sjones@imichotels.net; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber  
**Cc:** keithcloud@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

We are glad that you will be soliciting member preferences from Trout Unlimited members at their May 14 meeting as that input will supplement the initial survey results where most of those were not included. Mike is working with the Saluda River Chapter President, Keith Cloud, to help coordinate your visit, including an announcement on their website to encourage members to attend. We are assuming that you will have each complete a membership survey after reviewing those with them for maximum input - but that is not clear from the addendum guideline??

And we are glad that you will have a focus meeting with Trout Unlimited leaders for organizational positions planned in May. Mike Waddell will represent TU at the focus meeting since you have scheduled while I am out of town. The TU position statement that I filed as comments to the ICD in August, 2005 still provides our written organizational requests and recommendations and should provide the framework for the meeting. Mike will be glad to discuss the various issues further, including any new ones raised to help facilitate understanding on both sides. We will develop any additional responses as needed in writing quickly after the meeting and followup reviews with chapter, state council, and national TU leaders.

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Wed 5/2/2007 1:47 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; LEAPHART, JR., MALCOLML; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; rparsons12@alltel.net; Richard Mikell; sjones@imichotels.net; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber  
**Subject:** Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation RCG Members:

For those of you that are not aware (either by being a member of the Recreation Management TWC or by seeing the presentation a couple of weeks ago), the Recreation Assessment Study Report has been finalized and is posted on the Saluda Hydro Relicensing website. The presentation is also on the website at this time. I have attached an executive summary of the report for you use as well.

The RCG should be aware that, based on comments received from RMTWC members, we will be completing a

"spring addendum" to this report to capture spring use at the Project as well as solicit preferences from a couple of groups that TWC members felt were missed either because of temporal reasons (their activity participation typically occurs outside of our sampling period) or because they use private access. I have attached the final study plan for this addendum so you will be aware of what's going on in this TWC.

Other than that, things are progressing smoothly. The RMTWC is currently reviewing the Boat Density Study Report (comments are due by Friday) and the Downstream Flows TWC has scheduled the dates of the recreational flow assessment. All three of these studies should be complete by the end of the summer.

From here, the Recreation Management TWC will be looking at all the information we have and begin to draft a Recreation Plan for the Saluda Project. Once a draft is completed in the TWC, we will distribute to the RCG for their input.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

<<Saluda Recreation Assessment Study Report Executive Summary (FINAL).pdf>> <<Spring Use Addendum Study Plan (2007-04-13;FINAL).pdf>>

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Alan Stuart  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 02, 2007 4:29 PM  
**To:** 'LEAPHART,JR., MALCOLML'; Dave Anderson; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Alan Axson'; Alison Guth; 'Amanda Hill'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; 'Bill Brebner'; 'Bill Marshall'; 'Charlene Coleman'; 'Charlie Rentz'; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie'; 'George Duke'; 'Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers)'; 'Guy Jones'; 'ipitts@scprt.com'; 'Jeff Duncan'; 'Jennifer O'Rourke'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Jim Devereaux'; 'JoAnn Butler'; 'Joy Downs'; 'Karen Kustafik'; 'Keith Ganz-Sarto'; Kelly Maloney; 'turnerle@dhec.sc.gov'; 'Lee Barber'; 'Mark Leao'; Marty Phillips; 'Mike Waddell'; 'Miriam Atria'; 'Norman Ferris'; 'Patricia Wendling'; 'Patrick Moore'; 'Ralph Crafton'; RMAHAN@scana.com; 'rparsons12@alltel.net'; 'Richard Mikell'; 'sjones@imichotels.net'; 'Steve Bell'; 'Suzanne Rhodes'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tom Brooks'; 'Tommy Boozer'; 'Tony Bebbber'  
**Cc:** 'keithcloud@yahoo.com'  
**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Study Report

Hi Malcolm,

I feel the need to provide some input. The point of the focus group is to get opinions from a cross section of river users (i.e. *wading* fishermen) you feel were somehow missed. Further the questions in the survey which will be distributed to TU chapter members will be consistent with those administered during the field study. The purpose is quite simply to obtain information consistent with those other users of the river. The questionnaire will address areas of access, safety use etc just as it did for those folks using the river at the time of the survey. If we were to administer a different survey then the information would bias against the other users. In the FERC relicensing process all user groups should have the opportunity to provide input and that is what we are trying to do. Our job is not to tip the balance of power in any one direction but to ensure all groups are represented and this will be accomplished by the focus group process.

Additionally, you have said on numerous occasions that TU's recommendations contained in your comment ICD letter continue to be the organizations position. I believe this to be the case and believe it to be widely accepted by all of the other stakeholders active in the relicensing process. Therefore, I don't understand your comment regarding "focus meeting with Trout Unlimited leaders for organizational positions". Again, the point of the focus group is not to obtain positions as they have already been clearly defined. We will not be soliciting positions from anyone, simply opinions. We are not looking for positions during the focus group nor will it become a confrontational or adversarial activity (i.e. complaint session). We want to implement the survey as outlined in the study plan and continue to refine the recreational use study.

On last item that requires attention, the focus group is limited to the chapter meeting and does not include the flow evaluation exercise that Mike (representing the TU organization) will be attending in your absence. In the message on the TU website advertising the meeting (which I think is a great idea) the flow evaluation is referenced and it may be interpreted by your members this is open to everyone. Please make sure the message reflects that this flow exercise is limited to the "expert panel" assembled through the TWC and not an open invitation to attend or participate. If your members would like to personally evaluate on their own during those days that is completely up to them and a purely personal decision on their part.

I hope this clarifies a few things I perceive as being misconstrued.

Thanks....Alan

-----Original Message-----

**From:** LEAPHART,JR., MALCOLML [mailto:MALCOLML@mailbox.sc.edu]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 02, 2007 2:29 PM

**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill;



BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; RMAHAN@scana.com; rparsons12@alltel.net; Richard Mikell; sjones@imichotels.net; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler

**Cc:** keithcloud@yahoo.com

**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

We are glad that you will be soliciting member preferences from Trout Unlimited members at their May 14 meeting as that input will supplement the initial survey results where most of those were not included. Mike is working with the Saluda River Chapter President, Keith Cloud, to help coordinate your visit, including an announcement on their website to encourage members to attend. We are assuming that you will have each complete a membership survey after reviewing those with them for maximum input - but that is not clear from the addendum guideline??

And we are glad that you will have a focus meeting with planned in May. Mike Waddell will represent TU at the focus meeting since you have scheduled while I am out of town. The TU position statement that I filed as comments to the ICD in August, 2005 still provides our written organizational requests and recommendations and should provide the framework for the meeting. Mike will be glad to discuss the various issues further, including any new ones raised to help facilitate understanding on both sides. We will develop any additional responses as needed in writing quickly after the meeting and followup reviews with chapter, state council, and national TU leaders.

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

**Sent:** Wed 5/2/2007 1:47 PM

**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; LEAPHART, JR., MALCOLML; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; rparsons12@alltel.net; Richard Mikell; sjones@imichotels.net; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler

**Subject:** Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation RCG Members:

For those of you that are not aware (either by being a member of the Recreation Management TWC or by seeing the presentation a couple of weeks ago), the Recreation Assessment Study Report has been finalized and is posted on the Saluda Hydro Relicensing website. The presentation is also on the website at this time. I have attached an executive summary of the report for you use as well.

The RCG should be aware that, based on comments received from RMTWC members, we will be completing a "spring addendum" to this report to capture spring use at the Project as well as solicit preferences from a couple of groups that TWC members felt were missed either because of temporal reasons (their activity participation typically occurs outside of our sampling period) or because they use private access. I have attached the final study plan for this addendum so you will be aware of what's going on in this TWC.

Other than that, things are progressing smoothly. The RMTWC is currently reviewing the Boat Density Study Report (comments are due by Friday) and the Downstream Flows TWC has scheduled the dates of

the recreational flow assessment. All three of these studies should be complete by the end of the summer.

From here, the Recreation Management TWC will be looking at all the information we have and begin to draft a Recreation Plan for the Saluda Project. Once a draft is completed in the TWC, we will distribute to the RCG for their input.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

<<Saluda Recreation Assessment Study Report Executive Summary (FINAL).pdf>> <<Spring Use Addendum Study Plan (2007-04-13;FINAL).pdf>>

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Alan Stuart  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 02, 2007 4:29 PM  
**To:** 'LEAPHART,JR., MALCOLML'; Dave Anderson; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Alan Axson'; Alison Guth; 'Amanda Hill'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; 'Bill Brebner'; 'Bill Marshall'; 'Charlene Coleman'; 'Charlie Rentz'; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie'; 'George Duke'; 'Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers)'; 'Guy Jones'; 'ipitts@scprt.com'; 'Jeff Duncan'; 'Jennifer O'Rourke'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Jim Devereaux'; 'JoAnn Butler'; 'Joy Downs'; 'Karen Kustafik'; 'Keith Ganz-Sarto'; Kelly Maloney; 'turnerle@dhec.sc.gov'; 'Lee Barber'; 'Mark Leao'; Marty Phillips; 'Mike Waddell'; 'Miriam Atria'; 'Norman Ferris'; 'Patricia Wendling'; 'Patrick Moore'; 'Ralph Crafton'; RMAHAN@scana.com; 'rparsons12@alltel.net'; 'Richard Mikell'; 'sjones@imichotels.net'; 'Steve Bell'; 'Suzanne Rhodes'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tom Brooks'; 'Tommy Boozer'; 'Tony Bebbber'  
**Cc:** 'keithcloud@yahoo.com'  
**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Study Report

Hi Malcolm,

I feel the need to provide some input. The point of the focus group is to get opinions from a cross section of river users (i.e. *wading* fishermen) you feel were somehow missed. Further the questions in the survey which will be distributed to TU chapter members will be consistent with those administered during the field study. The purpose is quite simply to obtain information consistent with those other users of the river. The questionnaire will address areas of access, safety use etc just as it did for those folks using the river at the time of the survey. If we were to administer a different survey then the information would bias against the other users. In the FERC relicensing process all user groups should have the opportunity to provide input and that is what we are trying to do. Our job is not to tip the balance of power in any one direction but to ensure all groups are represented and this will be accomplished by the focus group process.

Additionally, you have said on numerous occasions that TU's recommendations contained in your comment ICD letter continue to be the organizations position. I believe this to be the case and believe it to be widely accepted by all of the other stakeholders active in the relicensing process. Therefore, I don't understand your comment regarding "focus meeting with Trout Unlimited leaders for organizational positions". Again, the point of the focus group is not to obtain positions as they have already been clearly defined. We will not be soliciting positions from anyone, simply opinions. We are not looking for positions during the focus group nor will it become a confrontational or adversarial activity (i.e. complaint session). We want to implement the survey as outlined in the study plan and continue to refine the recreational use study.

On last item that requires attention, the focus group is limited to the chapter meeting and does not include the flow evaluation exercise that Mike (representing the TU organization) will be attending in your absence. In the message on the TU website advertising the meeting (which I think is a great idea) the flow evaluation is referenced and it may be interpreted by your members this is open to everyone. Please make sure the message reflects that this flow exercise is limited to the "expert panel" assembled through the TWC and not an open invitation to attend or participate. If your members would like to personally evaluate on their own during those days that is completely up to them and a purely personal decision on their part.

I hope this clarifies a few things I perceive as being misconstrued.

Thanks....Alan

-----Original Message-----

**From:** LEAPHART,JR., MALCOLML [mailto:MALCOLML@mailbox.sc.edu]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 02, 2007 2:29 PM

**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill;

BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; RMAHAN@scana.com; rparsons12@alltel.net; Richard Mikell; sjones@imichotels.net; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber

**Cc:** keithcloud@yahoo.com

**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

We are glad that you will be soliciting member preferences from Trout Unlimited members at their May 14 meeting as that input will supplement the initial survey results where most of those were not included. Mike is working with the Saluda River Chapter President, Keith Cloud, to help coordinate your visit, including an announcement on their website to encourage members to attend. We are assuming that you will have each complete a membership survey after reviewing those with them for maximum input - but that is not clear from the addendum guideline??

And we are glad that you will have a focus meeting with planned in May. Mike Waddell will represent TU at the focus meeting since you have scheduled while I am out of town. The TU position statement that I filed as comments to the ICD in August, 2005 still provides our written organizational requests and recommendations and should provide the framework for the meeting. Mike will be glad to discuss the various issues further, including any new ones raised to help facilitate understanding on both sides. We will develop any additional responses as needed in writing quickly after the meeting and followup reviews with chapter, state council, and national TU leaders.

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

**Sent:** Wed 5/2/2007 1:47 PM

**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; LEAPHART, JR., MALCOLML; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; rparsons12@alltel.net; Richard Mikell; sjones@imichotels.net; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber

**Subject:** Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation RCG Members:

For those of you that are not aware (either by being a member of the Recreation Management TWC or by seeing the presentation a couple of weeks ago), the Recreation Assessment Study Report has been finalized and is posted on the Saluda Hydro Relicensing website. The presentation is also on the website at this time. I have attached an executive summary of the report for you use as well.

The RCG should be aware that, based on comments received from RMTWC members, we will be completing a "spring addendum" to this report to capture spring use at the Project as well as solicit preferences from a couple of groups that TWC members felt were missed either because of temporal reasons (their activity participation typically occurs outside of our sampling period) or because they use private access. I have attached the final study plan for this addendum so you will be aware of what's going on in this TWC.

Other than that, things are progressing smoothly. The RMTWC is currently reviewing the Boat Density Study Report (comments are due by Friday) and the Downstream Flows TWC has scheduled the dates of

the recreational flow assessment. All three of these studies should be complete by the end of the summer.

From here, the Recreation Management TWC will be looking at all the information we have and begin to draft a Recreation Plan for the Saluda Project. Once a draft is completed in the TWC, we will distribute to the RCG for their input.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

<<Saluda Recreation Assessment Study Report Executive Summary (FINAL).pdf>> <<Spring Use Addendum Study Plan (2007-04-13;FINAL).pdf>>

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 02, 2007 1:47 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; 'Ralph Crafton'; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Stan Jones (sjones@imichotels.net); Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation RCG Members:

For those of you that are not aware (either by being a member of the Recreation Management TWC or by seeing the presentation a couple of weeks ago), the Recreation Assessment Study Report has been finalized and is posted on the Saluda Hydro Relicensing website. The presentation is also on the website at this time. I have attached an executive summary of the report for you use as well.

The RCG should be aware that, based on comments received from RMTWC members, we will be completing a "spring addendum" to this report to capture spring use at the Project as well as solicit preferences from a couple of groups that TWC members felt were missed either because of temporal reasons (their activity participation typically occurs outside of our sampling period) or because they use private access. I have attached the final study plan for this addendum so you will be aware of what's going on in this TWC.

Other than that, things are progressing smoothly. The RMTWC is currently reviewing the Boat Density Study Report (comments are due by Friday) and the Downstream Flows TWC has scheduled the dates of the recreational flow assessment. All three of these studies should be complete by the end of the summer.

From here, the Recreation Management TWC will be looking at all the information we have and begin to draft a Recreation Plan for the Saluda Project. Once a draft is completed in the TWC, we will distribute to the RCG for their input.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Saluda Recreation  
Assessment S...



Spring Use  
Idendum Study Plan

**Kacie Jensen**

---

**From:** LEAPHART, JR., MALCOLML [MALCOLML@mailbox.sc.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2007 12:18 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber  
**Cc:** mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

My biggest concern is that the public, either at the meeting Thursday or from a website posting could easily interpret the study report as the 'end all' as you termed it. Just be sure to present the report in the proper context, please, as you indicate below, noting all the documents.

An addendum can easily get separated from the main report so that approach can cause some misconceptions versus including the information in one comprehensive document. But those concerns will be dissuaded if you keep the full range of reports and context and relationship of each prominent as you note.

It's standard operating procedures for any committee or working group with a moderator to go through various reviews and revisions until a finished product is produced. You simply drew the line quicker than anticipated for a document with so many updates made to it since the previous version was distributed. A further review before 'putting it to bed' as a 'final' version should improve the final product and also the buy-in from the stakeholders. And how do you deal with any other additions or revisions that may come out of the presentations and subsequent review now that it is distributed as it is essentially a new document?? Nuff said...

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Tue 4/17/2007 11:43 AM  
**To:** LEAPHART, JR., MALCOLML; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber  
**Cc:** mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Malcolm,

If you will review the study plan, we have said all along that whatever is done for spring use will be covered in an addendum to the report. The final report covers what is included in the original study plan; additional information will be included in the addendum. I want to make sure you don't have the conception that this report is the "end all, be all". We have a number of documents that report on recreation related to the Project (e.g., the ICD, the Recreation Assessment Study Report, the Boat Density Report, etc.). All of these documents will be rolled together for our ultimate goal...the license application to FERC. I encourage you to attend Thursday's presentation as I will cover how the information in the Recreation Assessment Study Report will be used in our planning process.

As for additional reviews, I am not aware that we have a "formal" review process. We sent out the draft, received comments from most TWC members, and responded to the comments either by editing the report or through our written response. I don't think we are jumping out of an orderly process; your comments have been incorporated into the report, or either placed into the public record of the process.

Dave

11/12/2007

-----Original Message-----

**From:** LEAPHART, JR., MALCOLML [mailto:MALCOLML@mailbox.sc.edu]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2007 10:23 AM

**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler

**Cc:** mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com

**Subject:** RE: Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

It could be misleading to post the Recreation Assessment on the relicensing website and to also present it as a 'final' document to the public on April 19 as long as the Safety Addendum is not included, and no further reviews are done by either the Recreation TWC or RCG for the 'final' you just sent out.

Also, it would be less misleading to include ALL input in one comprehensive document, and that a review and comment process be followed for that document before public presentation or website posting. That process should begin with face to face Recreation TWC and RCG meetings for possible additions and revisions prior to 'finalizing' and presenting it to the public.

The approach you outline below suggests that we are jumping out of an orderly process of reviews and comments before finalizing, including presenting an 'incomplete' assessment that does not contain the additional information foreseen for the addendum, or that has not been further reviewed after significant updates before finalizing.

I appreciate you trying to 'move things along'; but, strongly encourage that the process you propose be re-evaluated as there are some apparent 'short cuts' being taken that could undermine the process as to accuracy and credibility.

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

**Sent:** Mon 4/16/2007 9:01 PM

**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; LEAPHART, JR., MALCOLML; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler

**Subject:** Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation Management TWC Members:

We are pleased to announce we have completed the edits to the Recreation Assessment Study Report based on the comments received from TWC members. As you know, we are in the process of completing a "Spring Addendum" to provide a more complete year-round picture of recreation at the Project and to gather opinions and preferences from some user groups that most TWC members felt were not captured during our sampling frame and/or because they use private access sites.

The file size of the complete report is around 11 mb. I have posted it to Kleinschmidt's FTP site here:

[ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda\\_Rec\\_Report/Saluda\\_Recreation\\_Assessment\\_Study\\_Report\\_FINAL](ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Saluda_Recreation_Assessment_Study_Report_FINAL)

You should be able to click on the link and download the report to your hard drive. If any of you have trouble getting it, let me know.

We will be posting the report on the relicensing website in the next couple of days (in sections), but I



wanted y'all to see the final product and how we handled your comments before taking it "public". I have attached a document that lists the comments received and our response to the comment.

<<Responses to Comments (2007-04-16;FINAL).pdf>>

Finally, I will be presenting the results during the Quarterly Public Meeting on Thursday. I encourage you to attend. I will be covering the basic results from the report and discussing "where to from here" as we move forward with drafting the recreation plan.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

**Kacie Jensen**

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2007 11:44 AM  
**To:** 'LEAPHART,JR., MALCOLML'; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Bill Marshall'; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie'; 'George Duke'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Joy Downs'; Kelly Maloney; 'Lee Barber'; Marty Phillips; 'Patrick Moore'; 'Steve Bell'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tommy Boozer'; 'Tony Bebber'  
**Cc:** 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Malcolm,

If you will review the study plan, we have said all along that whatever is done for spring use will be covered in an addendum to the report. The final report covers what is included in the original study plan; additional information will be included in the addendum. I want to make sure you don't have the conception that this report is the "end all, be all". We have a number of documents that report on recreation related to the Project (e.g., the ICD, the Recreation Assessment Study Report, the Boat Density Report, etc.). All of these documents will be rolled together for our ultimate goal...the license application to FERC. I encourage you to attend Thursday's presentation as I will cover how the information in the Recreation Assessment Study Report will be used in our planning process.

As for additional reviews, I am not aware that we have a "formal" review process. We sent out the draft, received comments from most TWC members, and responded to the comments either by editing the report or through our written response. I don't think we are jumping out of an orderly process; your comments have been incorporated into the report, or either placed into the public record of the process.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

**From:** LEAPHART,JR., MALCOLML [mailto:MALCOLML@mailbox.sc.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2007 10:23 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

It could be misleading to post the Recreation Assessment on the relicensing website and to also present it as a 'final' document to the public on April 19 as long as the Safety Addendum is not included, and no further reviews are done by either the Recreation TWC or RCG for the 'final' you just sent out.

Also, it would be less misleading to include ALL input in one comprehensive document, and that a review and comment process be followed for that document before public presentation or website posting. That process should begin with face to face Recreation TWC and RCG meetings for possible additions and revisions prior to 'finalizing' and presenting it to the public.

The approach you outline below suggests that we are jumping out of an orderly process of reviews and comments before finalizing, including presenting an 'incomplete' assessment that does not contain the additional information foreseen for the addendum, or that has not been further reviewed after significant updates before finalizing.

I appreciate you trying to 'move things along'; but, strongly encourage that the process you propose be re-

evaluated as there are some apparent 'short cuts' being taken that could undermine the process as to accuracy and credibility.

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

**Sent:** Mon 4/16/2007 9:01 PM

**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; LEAPHART,JR., MALCOLML; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber

**Subject:** Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation Management TWC Members:

We are pleased to announce we have completed the edits to the Recreation Assessment Study Report based on the comments received from TWC members. As you know, we are in the process of completing a "Spring Addendum" to provide a more complete year-round picture of recreation at the Project and to gather opinions and preferences from some user groups that most TWC members felt were not captured during our sampling frame and/or because they use private access sites.

The file size of the complete report is around 11 mb. I have posted it to Kleinschmidt's FTP site here:

[ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda\\_Rec\\_Report/Saluda\\_Recreation\\_Assessment\\_Study\\_Report\\_FINAL](ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Saluda_Recreation_Assessment_Study_Report_FINAL).

You should be able to click on the link and download the report to your hard drive. If any of you have trouble getting it, let me know.

We will be posting the report on the relicensing website in the next couple of days (in sections), but I wanted y'all to see the final product and how we handled your comments before taking it "public". I have attached a document that lists the comments received and our response to the comment.

<<Responses to Comments (2007-04-16;FINAL).pdf>>

Finally, I will be presenting the results during the Quarterly Public Meeting on Thursday. I encourage you to attend. I will be covering the basic results from the report and discussing "where to from here" as we move forward with drafting the recreation plan.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

**Kacie Jensen**

---

**From:** LEAPHART,JR., MALCOLML [MALCOLML@mailbox.sc.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2007 11:23 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

It could be misleading to post the Recreation Assessment on the relicensing website and to also present it as a 'final' document to the public on April 19 as long as the Safety Addendum is not included, and no further reviews are done by either the Recreation TWC or RCG for the 'final' you just sent out.

Also, it would be less misleading to include ALL input in one comprehensive document, and that a review and comment process be followed for that document before public presentation or website posting. That process should begin with face to face Recreation TWC and RCG meetings for possible additions and revisions prior to 'finalizing' and presenting it to the public.

The approach you outline below suggests that we are jumping out of an orderly process of reviews and comments before finalizing, including presenting an 'incomplete' assessment that does not contain the additional information foreseen for the addendum, or that has not been further reviewed after significant updates before finalizing.

I appreciate you trying to 'move things along'; but, strongly encourage that the process you propose be re-evaluated as there are some apparent 'short cuts' being taken that could undermine the process as to accuracy and credibility.

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Mon 4/16/2007 9:01 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; LEAPHART,JR., MALCOLML; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Subject:** Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation Management TWC Members:

We are pleased to announce we have completed the edits to the Recreation Assessment Study Report based on the comments received from TWC members. As you know, we are in the process of completing a "Spring Addendum" to provide a more complete year-round picture of recreation at the Project and to gather opinions and preferences from some user groups that most TWC members felt were not captured during our sampling frame and/or because they use private access sites.

The file size of the complete report is around 11 mb. I have posted it to Kleinschmidt's FTP site here:

[ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda\\_Rec\\_Report/Saluda\\_Recreation\\_Assessment\\_Study\\_Report\\_FINAL.pdf](ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Saluda_Recreation_Assessment_Study_Report_FINAL.pdf)

You should be able to click on the link and download the report to your hard drive. If any of you have trouble getting it, let me know.

11/12/2007

We will be posting the report on the relicensing website in the next couple of days (in sections), but I wanted y'all to see the final product and how we handled your comments before taking it "public". I have attached a document that lists the comments received and our response to the comment.

<<Responses to Comments (2007-04-16;FINAL).pdf>>

Finally, I will be presenting the results during the Quarterly Public Meeting on Thursday. I encourage you to attend. I will be covering the basic results from the report and discussing "where to from here" as we move forward with drafting the recreation plan.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2007 9:02 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Subject:** Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation Management TWC Members:

We are pleased to announce we have completed the edits to the Recreation Assessment Study Report based on the comments received from TWC members. As you know, we are in the process of completing a "Spring Addendum" to provide a more complete year-round picture of recreation at the Project and to gather opinions and preferences from some user groups that most TWC members felt were not captured during our sampling frame and/or because they use private access sites.

The file size of the complete report is around 11 mb. I have posted it to Kleinschmidt's FTP site here:

[ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda\\_Rec\\_Report/Saluda\\_Recreation\\_Assessment\\_Study\\_Report\\_FINAL.pdf](ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Saluda_Recreation_Assessment_Study_Report_FINAL.pdf)

You should be able to click on the link and download the report to your hard drive. If any of you have trouble getting it, let me know.

We will be posting the report on the relicensing website in the next couple of days (in sections), but I wanted y'all to see the final product and how we handled your comments before taking it "public". I have attached a document that lists the comments received and our response to the comment.



Responses to  
omments (2007-04.

Finally, I will be presenting the results during the Quarterly Public Meeting on Thursday. I encourage you to attend. I will be covering the basic results from the report and discussing "where to from here" as we move forward with drafting the recreation plan.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Tony Bebber [tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2007 3:16 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Draft Boat Density Report

My "track changes" comments are attached.

### Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042  
[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)

### Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2007 12:38 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri  
**Subject:** Draft Boat Density Report

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

I am pleased to inform you that the draft of the Boating Density Report is ready for your review. A Word version is attached.

You can submit comments via the "track changes" tool in Word. Or, if you wish, you can submit your comments some other way (FAX, e-mail, etc.), please include the page number at the bottom of the report with your comment/edit so we may locate it in the original document.

Due dates for comments will be May 4 (three weeks).

After May 4, I will schedule another meeting, if necessary, to go over the comments and any edits made to the report with the intention of finalizing the report by the end of May.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

<<Boating Density Report (2007-04-12;DRAFT).doc>>



## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2007 11:32 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** 'Bill Argentieri'; Alan Stuart  
**Subject:** Final Spring Use Addendum Study Plan

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

Attached is the final version of the Spring Use At The Saluda Project And Recreation Needs On The Lower Saluda River Study Plan (Spring Addendum). We have edited the study plan based on comments received; our responses to these comments are also attached.

If you have any questions, I will be in town next week and am willing to get together the afternoon of the 18th after the Safety RCG meeting, or after the morning Quarterly Public Meeting on Thursday. I can also answer any questions one on one if needed.

Dave



Spring Use  
Addendum Study Plan



Response to  
Comments on Spring  
Use Addendum

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2007 12:38 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; 'Bill Argentieri'  
**Subject:** Draft Boat Density Report

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

I am pleased to inform you that the draft of the Boating Density Report is ready for your review. A Word version is attached.

You can submit comments via the "track changes" tool in Word. Or, if you wish, you can submit your comments some other way (FAX, e-mail, etc.), please include the page number at the bottom of the report with your comment/edit so we may locate it in the original document.

Due dates for comments will be May 4 (three weeks).

After May 4, I will schedule another meeting, if necessary, to go over the comments and any edits made to the report with the intention of finalizing the report by the end of May.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Boating Density  
Report (2007-0...

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Kelly Maloney  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2007 3:16 PM  
**To:** 'Tony Bebber'; 'Bill Argentieri'; 'Bill Marshall'; 'Charlene Coleman'; Dave Anderson; 'Guy Jones'; 'J. Hamilton Hagood'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Karen Kustafik'; Kelly Maloney; 'Malcolm Leaphart'; 'Patrick Moore'  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart  
**Subject:** Downstream Flows Study Update

Downstream Flows TWC,

Good afternoon. I hope this email finds you well. As several of you have posed questions and inquiries as to the status of the Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment, we thought we would provide a progress report. I have provided an update below on the various phases outlined in the Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan:

### Phase I - Literature Review and Desktop Analysis

This component of the study is ongoing and will continue through the duration. So far, we have compiled a fair amount of literature pertaining to recreation on the lower Saluda River including the Three Rivers Greenway Plan, South Carolina Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), the Lower Saluda Scenic River Corridor Plan and Update, the Draft 2006 Saluda Recreation Assessment, and lower Saluda River creel surveys. In addition, we have collected hydrologic data from the USGS.

### Phase II – Focus Group and Field Reconnaissance

Expert Panel Focus Group - We would like to schedule this fairly soon as input received during the focus group will help us to determine what flows should be evaluated during the on-site reconnaissance. The members of the Downstream Flows TWC, and additional experienced recreational users and resources experts, as needed, will comprise the focus group. Please provide information regarding your availability for a focus group meeting on the afternoon or evening of April 17, the afternoon or evening of April 18 or the morning of April 20. Please also provide any suggestions you may have for additional individuals who should be invited to participate in the focus group panel.

Expert Panel On-site Evaluation – We would also like to schedule this effort soon. We are tentatively looking at the week of May 14 through May 20. We anticipate that this will be a combination of a land and water-based reconnaissance whereby participants will engage in a variety of activities (paddling, angling) or observe recreation sites with specific activities in mind (swimming, rock hopping) to provide input on the appropriateness of each flow level for the specific activity in which that individual is participating or observing. There will be three flows provided which will be discussed and finalized during the expert panel focus group. Tentatively, we anticipate requesting a flow of 1,000 cfs or less (indicated in TWC meeting notes as being most appropriate for boating, swimming, rock hopping and wade angling), a flow of 2,500 cfs (indicated in TWC meeting notes as being most appropriate for boating, tubing and bank angling), and a flow of 5,000 cfs (indicated in TWC meeting notes and American Whitewater as most appropriate for whitewater paddling).

Rate of Change Video Documentation - A high flow rate of change event (18,000 cfs) was video documented on January 31, 2007. The surveyor was stationed at Mill Race rapids from approximately 7:00 am to about 12:30 pm to capture both the water rise and a duration of maximum stage

### Phase III – Field Data Collection

Level Logger Deployment and Data Collection - The level loggers, which record the stage (in feet) and temperature every minute, were deployed at the 8 sites detailed in the study plan. The level loggers were installed during the week of January 15 and removed during the week of February 19. Data was collected from January 22 through February 22 and includes the following flow events:

Monday, January 22 – 12,000 cfs – 5:49 AM  
Tuesday, January 23 – 10,000 cfs – 5:56 AM  
Wednesday, January 24 – 8,000 cfs – 5:49 AM  
Tuesday, January 30 – 14,000 cfs – 6:11 AM  
Wednesday, January 31 – 18,000 cfs – 6:10 AM  
Thursday, February 1 – 16,000 cfs – 6:10 AM  
Tuesday, February 6 – 14,000 cfs – 5:00 AM  
Tuesday, February 6 – 1,000 cfs – 6:00 PM  
Wednesday, February 7 – 2,000 cfs – 5:55 PM  
Thursday, February 8 – 3,000 cfs – 3:55 AM

Tuesday, February 13 – 4,000 cfs – 6:03 AM  
Wednesday, February 14 – 5,000 cfs – 5:00 PM  
Thursday, February 15 – 6,000 cfs – 4:00 AM

Level Logger Analysis - Analysis of the level logger data, in conjunction with USGS hydrologic data, as per the study plan is ongoing.

We hope that this helps to clarify the status of the Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Study Plan. If you have any additional questions or concerns, do not hesitate to contact me or Dave Anderson.

Thank you,  
Kelly Maloney

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Tony Bebber [tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 23, 2007 10:25 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Addendum Study Plan

After reviewing this proposal a little more thoroughly and reading other comments, I offer my concerns:

1. Scheduling a concurrent session while there is another public meeting to attend seems to negate the reason for one or the other of the meetings. It would preclude an interested party from attending at least one of the meetings. If you want specific users to attend and provide input for the assessment, I suggest going to the source.
  - a. For "students", I recommend interviewing them (using similar questions) on-site (do some Thursday, Friday, Saturday, & Sunday interviews in the Month of April, early May). If that is not possible then I would consider some kind of public meeting on campus, widely publicized in the student newspaper. I think on-site interviews would be best because we don't really know where users are from (several colleges, high schools, etc. to choose from).
  - b. For river anglers, I suggest convening a special meeting with the Saluda River Chapter of Trout Unlimited/Federation of Fly Fishers. Ask them for a special meeting, since they may already have April and May meetings planned.
2. If your goal is to identify patterns/types of use "only at SCE&G sites" and you are not concerned with "all recreational use" of the project, the above recommendations may help meet that goal. As I have noted before, I think that goal is limited. Most sailing participants dock at private/commercial facilities and have been missed by focusing only on public sites. Other users of the project that access the project through private land, the 9,000 private docks, and other private or commercial docks/ramps have been missed as well.
3. I remain concerned that most, if not all, of the conclusions we must reach will be skewed by partial year data, data from only a portion of the users, and very limited data from residents of the surrounding area.

### Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042  
[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)

### Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 16, 2007 3:13 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri  
**Subject:** Addendum Study Plan

Recreation Management TWC,

Attached is a study plan intended to address comments received on the Recreation Assessment regarding spring use and facility and access needs on the lower Saluda River. You will have two weeks to comment on the study plan (due March 30); however, I would appreciate any comments, either positive or negative, prior to then if at all possible. One of the main efforts of this addendum will be a facilitated meeting to coincide with the next Quarterly Public Meetings on April 19. We will make a special effort to ensure wade anglers, whitewater interests, and college students are present to state their views on access and facility needs on the lower Saluda River. Therefore, if I can, I would like to finalize this plan as soon as possible.

On a related note, if anyone has any ideas on how to contact students to make them aware of this meeting, I would be interested in hearing them. Right now, I am planning on passing out fliers at the Mill Race area and contacting any "outdoor" clubs at the University of South Carolina, but if anyone has any other ideas, I would love to hear them.

Dave

<<Spring Use Addendum Study Plan (2007-03-16;DRAFT).doc>>

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Friday, March 16, 2007 2:13 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; 'Bill Argentieri'  
**Subject:** Addendum Study Plan

Recreation Management TWC,

Attached is a study plan intended to address comments received on the Recreation Assessment regarding spring use and facility and access needs on the lower Saluda River. You will have two weeks to comment on the study plan (due March 30); however, I would appreciate any comments, either positive or negative, prior to then if at all possible. One of the main efforts of this addendum will be a facilitated meeting to coincide with the next Quarterly Public Meetings on April 19. We will make a special effort to ensure wade anglers, whitewater interests, and college students are present to state their views on access and facility needs on the lower Saluda River. Therefore, if I can, I would like to finalize this plan as soon as possible.

On a related note, if anyone has any ideas on how to contact students to make them aware of this meeting, I would be interested in hearing them. Right now, I am planning on passing out fliers at the Mill Race area and contacting any "outdoor" clubs at the University of South Carolina, but if anyone has any other ideas, I would love to hear them.

Dave



Spring Use  
Addendum Study Plan

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Tony Bebber [tbebbber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 02, 2007 9:59 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report



RecAssessDraft3-1-  
07.doc (51 K...

Dave,  
Attached are my comments. Sorry I didn't get them in by 5pm.

Tony Bebber

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Thu 3/1/2007 9:34 AM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

There will not be a call tomorrow. Again, I only heard back from a few people and two of them couldn't make it. Comments are still due by Friday (March 2). Let's try and reschedule the conference call for early next week; I'll throw out Tuesday at 10 AM EST. Please reply back either yes, no, or your not interested in discussing the spring sampling issue. Conference call instructions will follow once we have a definitive date, time, and number of attendees.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Patrick Moore [mailto:PatrickM@sccl.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 01, 2007 8:26 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Tony Bebber; Van Hoffman; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com  
**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

Dave,  
Have you sent out a call in number for this call that I have missed?

Thanks,

Patrick Moore  
Project Manager  
Coastal Conservation League  
2231 Devine St. Suite 100  
Columbia, S.C. 29205  
803.771.7750

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 23, 2007 1:40 PM  
**To:** Tony Bebber; Van Hoffman; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer



Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer

Cc: Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

Considering this, why don't we just plan on next Friday, March 2 at 10:30 AM EST? This is the date comments are due, so it should stick out in everyone's mind.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]

Sent: Friday, February 23, 2007 10:04 AM

To: Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer

Cc: Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

I'm sorry I missed that note about responding, but just started reviewing it this morning. Monday and Tuesday are booked with LLM meetings.

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism

1205 Pendleton Street

Columbia, SC 29201

Phone 803-734-0189

Fax 803-734-1042

tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com)

<<http://www.discoverouthcarolina.com/>> [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com)

<<http://www.southcarolinaparks.com/>> [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net) <<http://www.sctrails.net/>>

---

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 5:43 PM

To: Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber

Cc: Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

I have only heard from three people about my proposed meeting time tomorrow, so we are not going to meet. How about next Monday at 10 AM EST?

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson

Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2007 2:49 PM

To: Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber

Cc: Alan Stuart; 'Bill Argentieri'

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

I have distributed the report to most people on the TWC, but have not heard from some of you. I would suggest you secure a copy of the report, as the due date of March 2 for comments is approaching.

I have not heard from any of you about what day works best this week to have a conference call to discuss the issue of spring sampling. Is Friday at 10 AM EST a good time for everybody?

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson

Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2007 3:23 PM

To: Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber

Cc: Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri

Subject: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

I am pleased to tell you that the draft of the Recreation Assessment Study Report is ready for your review. However, due to the large file size (10.6 mb), I have not attached it to this e-mail. If your e-mail is capable of handling this large of a file, please respond and I will send it under separate cover. The entire report (with appendices) is a PDF file.

I also have available a Microsoft Word version of the main body of the report that you can use if you wish to submit comments via the "track changes" tool. If you wish to submit your comments some other way (FAX, e-mail, etc.), please include the page number at the bottom of the report with your comment/edit so we may locate it in the original document. The Word version (without appendices) is 3.2 mb.

If you can't receive such a large file(s), please let me know as soon as possible and I can send you either a CD with the files, or we can post it to an FTP site where you can download them at your leisure.

Due dates for comments will be March 2 (two and a half weeks). However, I would like to have a conference call by next Friday, Feb. 23, to make a decision on whether additional sampling in the spring will be necessary. Please let me know by the end of the day tomorrow what date and time work best for you toward the end of next week (either Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday).

After March 2, I will schedule another meeting to go over the comments and any edits made to the report with the intention of finalizing the report by the end of March.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dick Christie [dchristie@InfoAve.Net]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 02, 2007 1:51 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Cc:** Bill Marshall; Tim Vinson; Ed Duncan  
**Subject:** DNR comments regarding the draft Recreational Assessment study report



DNR comments  
draft recreationa...

Dave - attached are SCDNR comments for the Recreational Assessment Study Report. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

## South Carolina Department of **Natural Resources**



March 2, 2007

Mr. Dave Anderson  
Kleinschmidt Associates  
4958 Valleydale Rd. Suite 250  
Birmingham, Alabama 35242

John E. Frampton  
Director  
Breck Carmichael  
Deputy Director for  
**Wildlife and  
Freshwater Fisheries**

Dear Dave;

Thank you for providing the SCDNR with an opportunity to review and comment on the draft Recreation Assessment Study report for the Saluda project. Overall, we believe that the report provides a good description and assessment of existing recreational facilities, and will provide guidance in planning for future recreational needs. Our comments and recommendations follow:

Comments:

Goal Ii: 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.

Goal Iii: the study does identify patterns but the limited duration of the study does not allow complete characterization of use 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.

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.

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.

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.

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

The appendices were not included in the draft report!

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!

Recommendations:

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.

We recommend that the recreational site summary (Table 3.1-1) include a column to designate the presence or absence of ADA facilities.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding this report. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please let me know.

Sincerely,

*Dick*

Richard W. Christie  
FERC Relicensing Coordinator,  
SCDNR

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** LEAPHART, JR., MALCOLML [MALCOLML@mailbox.sc.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 28, 2007 3:29 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com; dchristie@infoave.net; marshallb@dnr.sc.gov; tbeber@scprt.com; jenko@scwf.org; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; amanda\_hill@fws.gov; balesw@dnr.sc.gov; beasleyb@dnr.sc.gov; ahler@dnr.sc.gov; beardh@dnr.sc.gov  
**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

Dave, Comments as you requested by March 2 on the Recreation Assessment Draft Report on behalf of Trout Unlimited:

1) 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.

2) In further reference to point 1), no zip mailings as requested by Tony Bebber of SC PRT, the most knowledgeable of the stakeholders because of the SCOPR plans he has conducted for over 20 years for that agency. 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 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.***

3) Wade fishing was not included in the use category (only boat fishing, bank fishing, dock/pier fishing) - *unless that use was included as 'bank' fishing since no boat or dock is used)???* 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.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 20, 2007 2:49 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; 'Bill Argentieri'  
**Subject:** RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

I have distributed the report to most people on the TWC, but have not heard from some of you. I would suggest you secure a copy of the report, as the due date of March 2 for comments is approaching.

I have not heard from any of you about what day works best this week to have a conference call to discuss the issue of spring sampling. Is Friday at 10 AM EST a good time for everybody?

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Dave Anderson

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 13, 2007 3:23 PM

**To:** Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber

**Cc:** Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri

**Subject:** Recreation Assessment Draft Report

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

I am pleased to tell you that the draft of the Recreation Assessment Study Report is ready for your review. However, due to the large file size (10.6 mb), I have not attached it to this e-mail. If your e-mail is capable of handling this large of a file, please respond and I will send it under separate cover. The entire report (with appendices) is a PDF file.

I also have available a Microsoft Word version of the main body of the report that you can use if you wish to submit comments via the "track changes" tool. If you wish to submit your comments some other way (FAX, e-mail, etc.), please include the page number at the bottom of the report with your comment/edit so we may locate it in the original document. The Word version (without appendices) is 3.2 mb.

If you can't receive such a large file(s), please let me know as soon as possible and I can send you either a CD with the files, or we can post it to an FTP site where you can download them at your leisure.

Due dates for comments will be March 2 (two and a half weeks). However, I would like to have a conference call by next Friday, Feb. 23, to make a decision on whether additional sampling in the spring will be necessary. Please let me know by the end of the day tomorrow what date and time work best for you toward the end of next week (either Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday).

After March 2, I will schedule another meeting to go over the comments and any edits made to the report with the intention of finalizing the report by the end of March.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Patrick Moore [PatrickM@ccccl.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:47 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Subject:** Rec Assessment

Dave,  
Attached are my comments. There is great information here.

Once 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 info 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 rec assessment runs counter to stakeholder experience, i.e. that everything is generally in good shape.

Thanks,

Patrick Moore  
Project Manager  
Coastal Conservation League  
2231 Devine St. Suite 100  
Columbia, S.C. 29205  
803.771.7750



## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 13, 2007 4:23 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler  
**Cc:** Alan Stuart; 'Bill Argentieri'  
**Subject:** Recreation Assessment Draft Report

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

I am pleased to tell you that the draft of the Recreation Assessment Study Report is ready for your review. However, due to the large file size (10.6 mb), I have not attached it to this e-mail. If your e-mail is capable of handling this large of a file, please respond and I will send it under separate cover. The entire report (with appendices) is a PDF file.

I also have available a Microsoft Word version of the main body of the report that you can use if you wish to submit comments via the "track changes" tool. If you wish to submit your comments some other way (FAX, e-mail, etc.), please include the page number at the bottom of the report with your comment/edit so we may locate it in the original document. The Word version (without appendices) is 3.2 mb.

If you can't receive such a large file(s), please let me know as soon as possible and I can send you either a CD with the files, or we can post it to an FTP site where you can download them at your leisure.

Due dates for comments will be March 2 (two and a half weeks). However, I would like to have a conference call by next Friday, Feb. 23, to make a decision on whether additional sampling in the spring will be necessary. Please let me know by the end of the day tomorrow what date and time work best for you toward the end of next week (either Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday).

After March 2, I will schedule another meeting to go over the comments and any edits made to the report with the intention of finalizing the report by the end of March.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

**Kacie Jensen**

---

**From:** Tony Bebber [tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 12, 2007 2:54 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Subject:** RE: Reminder: Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

Dave, if it will open, it appears to have "accepted" most or all of the previous edits from the Dec. 5 version and left out the color distinctions. Most of my few Jan. 9 comments are still shown in green but some are not so I highlighted them in yellow and inserted a comment that I added them on 1-9-07.

Hope this works for you.

**Tony Bebber, AICP**

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042  
[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)

**Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina**

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 12, 2007 2:03 PM  
**To:** Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** RE: Reminder: Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

I'm getting the same error on that one.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 12, 2007 1:04 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson  
**Subject:** RE: Reminder: Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

Try this – but for some reason I had trouble opening the one I forwarded to you. But I think this was the file I sent.

**Tony Bebber, AICP**

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042  
[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)

**Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina**

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 12, 2007 12:23 PM  
**To:** Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** RE: Reminder: Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

Do you still have a copy of this? I can't open this copy up for some reason.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 09, 2007 1:21 PM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; RMAHAN@scana.com; rparsons12@alltel.net; Richard Mikell; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer  
**Subject:** RE: Reminder: Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

Attached are my suggested edits (in track changes mode).

Thanks,

**Tony Bebber**, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office  
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone 803-734-0189  
Fax 803-734-1042  
[tbebber@scprt.com](mailto:tbebber@scprt.com)

### Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: [www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com](http://www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com) [www.SouthCarolinaParks.com](http://www.SouthCarolinaParks.com) [www.SCTrails.net](http://www.SCTrails.net)

---

**From:** Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 09, 2007 11:13 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; rparsons12@alltel.net; Richard Mikell; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Reminder: Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 05, 2006 4:25 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall;

Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber

**Subject:** Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

I have gone through and accepted the changes we worked on in our last meeting to Questions 1 - 5. I am sending this around one more time and then plan to finalize these questions. We didn't have much opportunity to discuss the questions on reservoir levels (Questions 16 - 22), so I would like everyone to start taking a look at these questions. If you remember, Bill A. provided the answers that are currently in the document.

With the holidays approaching, I would like to receive any written comments on these two sections **only** by January 12, 2007. Please remember that the answers for Question Three and Question Five are not open for discussion; they are merely copied and pasted from other parts of the working documents that we have thoroughly discussed. If you see anything in the reservoir level section that you have a question about, then send in the question and we will get it answered.

I'll send a reminder after the new year about this, so don't worry if you forget during the holidays.

Dave

<<Recreation RCG Working Documents (2006-12-05).doc>>

## Kacie Jensen

---

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 09, 2007 11:13 AM  
**To:** Dave Anderson; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Alan Axson'; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'Amanda Hill'; 'Bill Argentieri'; 'Bill Brebner'; 'Bill Marshall'; 'Charlene Coleman'; 'Charlie Rentz'; Dave Anderson; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie'; 'George Duke'; 'Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers)'; 'Guy Jones'; 'Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com)'; 'Jeff Duncan'; 'Jennifer O'Rourke'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Jim Devereaux'; 'JoAnn Butler'; 'Joy Downs'; 'Karen Kustafik'; 'Keith Ganz-Sarto'; Kelly Maloney; 'Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov)'; 'Lee Barber'; 'Malcolm Leaphart'; 'Mark Leao'; Marty Phillips; 'Mike Waddell'; 'Miriam Atria'; 'Norman Ferris'; 'Patricia Wendling'; 'Patrick Moore'; 'Ralph Crafton'; 'Randy Mahan'; 'Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net)'; 'Richard Mikell'; 'Steve Bell'; 'Suzanne Rhodes'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tom Brooks'; 'Tommy Boozer'; 'Tony Bebber'  
**Subject:** Reminder: Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Dave Anderson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 05, 2006 4:25 PM  
**To:** Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber  
**Subject:** Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

I have gone through and accepted the changes we worked on in our last meeting to Questions 1 - 5. I am sending this around one more time and then plan to finalize these questions. We didn't have much opportunity to discuss the questions on reservoir levels (Questions 16 - 22), so I would like everyone to start taking a look at these questions. If you remember, Bill A. provided the answers that are currently in the document.

With the holidays approaching, I would like to receive any written comments on these two section **only** by January 12, 2007. Please remember that the answers for Question Three and Question Five are not open for discussion; they are merely copied and pasted from other parts of the working documents that we have thoroughly discussed. If you see anything in the reservoir level section that you have a question about, then send in the question and we will get it answered.

I'll send a reminder after the new year about this, so don't worry if you forget during the holidays.

Dave



Recreation RCG  
Working Documen...