

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2005 5:39 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'bill_hulslander@nps.gov'; 'cheetahtrk@yahoo.com'; 'dlandis1@sc.rr.com'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'kayakduke@bellsouth.net'; 'KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov'; 'Bkawasi@sc.rr.com'; 'Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov'; 'Elymay2@aol.com'; 'dvklmass@bellsouth.net'; 'lmichalec@aol.com'; 'parkin@parkinhunter.com'; 'PatrickM@scccl.org'; 'crafton@usit.net'; 'rjernigan@scfbins.com'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; 'suzrhodes@juno.com'; 'truple@sc.rr.com'; 'Stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com'; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'; 'pxanthakos@scana.com'; 'rammarell@scana.com'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; 'msummer@scana.com'; RMAHAN@scana.com; Kristina Massey; 'mark_leao@fws.gov'; 'amanda_hill@fws.gov'; 'BadrB@dnr.sc.gov'; 'tohunter@scbar.org'; 'marshallb@dnr.sc.gov'; 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; 'r1shealy@aol.com'; 'tbebber@scprt.com'
Subject: Operations RCG Agenda

Good Evening Folks,

As promised, I have attached a copy of the meeting agenda for the upcoming Operations RCG meeting on the 6th. Thanks, and please, let me know if you plan on coming if you have not already done so. ~ Alison



operations RCG
Agenda 12605.pd...

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

Kacie Jensen

From: Jernigan, Russ [rjernigan@scfbins.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2005 4:08 PM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Operations RSVP

I will not be able to attend as long as meetings are during the work day. I had hoped that some might be in the evenings but I understand that none are planned. I wish that I could attend but my duties at work have priority.

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2005 10:55 AM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'bill_hulslander@nps.gov'; 'cheetahtrk@yahoo.com'; 'dlandis1@sc.rr.com'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'kayakduke@bellsouth.net'; 'KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov'; 'Bkawasi@sc.rr.com'; 'Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov'; 'Elymay2@aol.com'; 'dvklmass@bellsouth.net'; 'lmichalec@aol.com'; 'parkin@parkinhunter.com'; 'PatrickM@sccl.org'; 'crafton@usit.net'; 'rjernigan@scfbins.com'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; 'suzrhodes@juno.com'; 'truple@sc.rr.com'; 'Stonecypher@isteamconsulting.com'; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'; 'pxanthakos@scana.com'; 'rammarell@scana.com'; 'bargentieri@scana.com'; 'msummer@scana.com'; 'rmahan@scana.com'; Kristina Massey; 'mark_leao@fws.gov'; 'amanda_hill@fws.gov'; 'BadrB@dnr.sc.gov'; 'tohunter@scbar.org'; 'marshallb@dnr.sc.gov'; 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; 'r1shealy@aol.com'; 'tbebber@scprt.com'
Subject: Operations RSVP

Good Morning Operations Group,

Just a reminder that you have a RCG meeting next Tuesday, December 6th at 9:30 am at the Lake Murray Training Center. You will be receiving an agenda for this meeting either later this afternoon or tomorrow morning. I am in the process of scheduling lunch for this meeting so please let me know if you are attending by Friday morning. I would hate to order too few lunches. Thanks so much and hope to see all of you on Tuesday! Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2005 10:55 AM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'bill_hulslander@nps.gov'; 'cheetahtrk@yahoo.com'; 'dlandis1@sc.rr.com'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'kayakduke@bellsouth.net'; 'KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov'; 'Bkawasi@sc.rr.com'; 'Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov'; 'Elymay2@aol.com'; 'dvklmass@bellsouth.net'; 'lmichalec@aol.com'; 'parkin@parkinhunter.com'; 'PatrickM@scccl.org'; 'crafton@usit.net'; 'rjernigan@scfbins.com'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; 'suzrhodes@juno.com'; 'truple@sc.rr.com'; 'Stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com'; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'; 'pxanthakos@scana.com'; 'rammarell@scana.com'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; 'msummer@scana.com'; RMAHAN@scana.com; Kristina Massey; 'mark_leao@fws.gov'; 'amanda_hill@fws.gov'; 'BadrB@dnr.sc.gov'; 'tohunter@scbar.org'; 'marshallb@dnr.sc.gov'; 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; 'r1shealy@aol.com'; 'tbebber@scprt.com'
Subject: Operations RSVP

Good Morning Operations Group,

Just a reminder that you have a RCG meeting next Tuesday, December 6th at 9:30 am at the Lake Murray Training Center. You will be receiving an agenda for this meeting either later this afternoon or tomorrow morning. I am in the process of scheduling lunch for this meeting so please let me know if you are attending by Friday morning. I would hate to order too few lunches. Thanks so much and hope to see all of you on Tuesday! Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

Stacia Hoover

From: kayakduke@bellsouth.net
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2005 9:21 AM
To: Alison Guth
Cc: Steve Bell
Subject: comments

Alison, attached are the comments from the LMHOA
George Duke

Lake Murray Homeowners Coalition

(address)

Additional Comments on the Saluda Hydro Relicensing Operational Procedures

November 20, 2005

Mr. Bill Argentero
South Carolina Electric and Gas Co.
Columbia, S.C. 29218

Re: Draft Operational Procedures

Dear Mr. Argentero:

The Lake Murray Homeowner's Coalition (LMHOC) is made up of 22 homeowner associations and lake communities representing over 4000 lake residents. The Coalition is a Tier I participant in the Saluda Hydro relicensing process.

We have reviewed the draft Operational Procedures document and offer the following comments. The LMHOC endorses the recent comments submitted by the Coastal Conservation League and the additional comments prepared by Dr. Bill Cutler and submitted by the Coastal Conservation League, American Rivers and Lake Murray Watch- with one exception. We recommend that the Saluda Hydro Relicensing Group consider further modifying the Relicensing Mission statement.

The Saluda River Hydro Project was approved and built for the public benefits of hydro generation, recreation, fish and wildlife resources, and other public benefits including aesthetic values. According to the Federal Power Act, the FERC will approve a new license proposal "best adapted to serve the public interest." It is critical that in this relicensing process we do not lose sight of that fact. In simple terms SCE&G is requesting permission from the public (stakeholders) to continue using public water as a free energy source, and to manage other public resources for the next 30 to 50 years. Part of our involvement in this process is to consider everyone's needs including SCE&G's and determine whether those needs will result in public benefits if implemented into a new license plan. Our mission is to work with the relicensing group with the goal of developing a new license application "best adapted to serve the public's interest" as required by Federal law. We recommend the following:

Take out "of those issues that accounts for the needs of SCE&G and the quality of the resource" and replace with "with the ultimate goal of developing a license plan best adapted to serve the public interest".

"SCE&G will manage the Relicensing Process through collaboration with state and federal resource agencies, non-governmental organizations,

special interest groups and other interested stakeholders. This collaborative consultation process will be used to gather as well as disseminate information. The objective will be to learn from, as well as educate, stakeholders on the issues and come to a balanced settlement of **those issues that accounts for the needs of SCE&G and the quality of the resource.** To accomplish this, SCE&G will (1) establish, maintain and improve a solution-discovery process and organization, charged with creating a Relicensing Agreement, and (2) apply the solution-discovery process and organization to create a Relicensing Agreement and get it approved.”

The modified version would read,

“SCE&G will manage the Relicensing Process through collaboration with state and federal resource agencies, non-governmental organizations, special interest groups and other interested stakeholders. This collaborative consultation process will be used to gather as well as disseminate information. The objective will be to learn from, as well as educate, stakeholders on the issues and come to a balanced settlement of those issues **with the ultimate goal of developing a license plan best adapted to serve the public interest.** To accomplish this, SCE&G will (1) establish, maintain and improve a solution-discovery process and organization, charged with creating a Relicensing Agreement, and (2) apply the solution-discovery process and organization to create a Relicensing Agreement and get it approved.”

Respectfully yours,

George Duke
Lake Murray Homeowner’s Coalition
Ph. 803-345-6785

Stacia Hoover

From: Patrick Moore [PatrickM@scccl.org]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2005 9:07 AM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Op. Procd. Comm, 2nd set

[Here you go](#)

Patrick Moore
Water Quality Associate
Coastal Conservation League
1207 Lincoln St. Suite 203-C
Columbia, S.C. 29201
803.771.7102

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

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2005 9:02 AM
To: Patrick Moore
Subject: Op. Procd. Comm, 2nd set

Hey Patrick,

Somehow the second set of comments did not come through on the email you sent to Randy (Randy subsequently forwarded it to Alan and I). I went to post them on the website this morning and realized that they were not attached. Could you re-email them to me? Thanks so much!. And also, please note that Alan's email address is Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com. I know that our email addresses are long and cumbersome, but if the USA part is missing then it does not get to us :). Thanks! Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

Comments on “Operating Procedures for the Relicensing of the Saluda Hydroelectric Project FERC Project 516”

William H. Cutler
November 3, 2005

C1.0 Summary

A review of the “Operating Procedures for the Relicensing of the Saluda Hydroelectric Project FERC Project 516” (subsequently called Op Proc) reveals opportunity for improvement in three areas.

- Clarity of the Mission statement for Op Proc
- Clarity on procedures for effective stakeholder engagement defined within Op Proc
- Clarity regarding the solution-discovery process and organization that will produce the Relicensing Agreement, through development of a Project Plan that lays out tasks and schedule for producing the Relicensing Agreement

Comments are organized in the following topics.

1. Explanation of how to improve the Mission Statement governing Op Proc, and an alternative Mission Statement which embodies the suggested improvements
2. Explanation of what improvements are needed in articulating the stakeholder engagement process, and a brief overview of recommendations
3. Explanation of what improvements are needed in articulating the solution-discovery process and organization, and a brief overview of recommendations
4. Recommendation that a Project Plan be produced and maintained as a tool for collaboration among all project participants, with a brief description of its scope
5. Specific suggestions for amending the Op Proc document that incorporate the above

C2.0 Mission Statement

C2.1 Deriving the Mission Statement

A Mission Statement should consist of two components: (1) a statement of the goal or objective, and (2) a statement of the approach, all expressed in 25 to 50 words (if possible).

The Mission Statement governing the Op Proc should be drafted in the context of the larger mission of the relicensing process. Starting from where we are right now, to reach a state of acceptable stewardship of Lake Murray and the downstream reaches of the Saluda River, the relicensing process must pass through three distinct Phases. Each of these Phases has its own Mission Statement. The three Phases are:

1. Establish a solution-discovery process and organization. This has been done, and presumably will be continually improved throughout the relicensing process.
2. Apply the solution-discovery process and organization to create a Relicensing Agreement and get it approved
3. Operate under the provisions of the Licensing Agreement

Each earlier phase in this sequence is the parent of the one that follows. Each earlier phase must be done well and completely as foundation for the ones that follow. Since our ultimate interest is in the outcome of Phase 3, Operation under the Relicensing Agreement, we may start with a presumed Mission Statement for Phase 3 and then craft the preceding Mission Statements accordingly.

C2.2 Mission Statement for Operation under the Relicensing Agreement.

As a starting point for deriving the Mission Statement that governs the Op Proc, we may presume the following Mission Statement for Operation under the Relicensing Agreement.

“In order to equitably satisfy the interests of all stakeholders, SCE&G will create, maintain and dispose of physical features, and conduct activities, pertinent to Lake Murray and the downstream reaches of Saluda River, under provisions of the Relicensing Agreement.”

This statement is brief, but it implies much. First of all, the goal is “to equitably satisfy the interests of all stakeholders.” That word “equitable” implies that there must have been a preceding process in drafting the Relicensing Agreement that either defines “equitable” in particular situations to the satisfaction of all stakeholders, or sets up a process under the Relicensing Agreement by which “equitable” is defined for situations not already covered. The statement defines the approach, which is to “create, maintain and dispose of physical features, and conduct activities, under provisions of the Relicensing Agreement.” The statement says that SCE&G will do it. The statement defines the scope of the Mission as “Lake Murray and the downstream reaches of Saluda River.”

Therefore the mission of the relicensing process must be to produce a Relicensing Agreement that defines the scope of physical features and activities, tells what SCE&G must do about them, and in particular defines “equitable.”

C2.3 Mission Statement for the Relicensing Process.

The Mission Statement for the Relicensing Process must address the goals of both Phase 1 (set up and maintain process) and Phase 2 (develop the Relicensing Agreement) as described in C2.1. Consequently, the Mission Statement offered to govern the Op Proc document (as well as all other Phase 1 and Phase 2 activity) is as follows.

“SCE&G will manage the Relicensing Process through collaboration with state and federal resource agencies, non-governmental organizations, special interest groups and other interested stakeholders. This collaborative consultation process will be used to gather as well as disseminate information. The objective will be to learn from, as well as educate, stakeholders on the issues and come to a balanced settlement of those issues that accounts for the needs of SCE&G and the quality of the resource. To accomplish this, SCE&G will (1) establish, maintain and

improve a solution-discovery process and organization, charged with creating a Relicensing Agreement, and (2) apply the solution-discovery process and organization to create a Relicensing Agreement and get it approved.”

This Mission statement defines the scope, which is the Relicensing Process. It defines the goal, which is two-fold; (1) set up the process, and (2) employ the process to create and gain approval of the Relicensing Agreement. It defines the approach, which is collaboration among all stakeholders. This concept of collaboration should be spelled out and expanded in sections of the Op Proc dealing with the solution-discovery process/organization and stakeholder engagement.

C3.0 Stakeholder Engagement

The Op Proc document spells out meeting ground rules which are certainly necessary for a collaborative project. However, it is silent on the deeper aspects of effective stakeholder engagement that will lead to a quality product that enjoys consensus support. Suggestions for correcting this are offered.

C3.1 Benefits of Good Stakeholder Engagement

A thoroughly thought out and well-facilitated stakeholder engagement program is of benefit to SCE&G for the following reasons.

- It builds a better quality output. It taps into the resource of situation knowledge, technical expertise, and creativity that is embodied in the stakeholders.
- It results in a more flexible and adaptable, hence more robust Relicensing Agreement, since the Relicensing Agreement is not based on rigid forced compromises or authoritarian dictates. All stakeholders are willing to give when modifications to the Relicensing Agreement become necessary.
- It establishes a basis for automatic buy-in. It eliminates or marginalizes adamant opposition.

C3.2 Qualities of a Good Stakeholder Engagement Program

- It is inclusive. All viewpoints are represented and honored, no matter how seemingly insignificant, far-fetched, or inconvenient.
- It gets at root concerns where agreement is more likely and satisfaction greater. It avoids fixation on superficial positions, looking for the concerns behind the position whenever such a position is taken.
- The product is (1) a complete and concise understanding of stakeholder interests, and (2) validation of every decision made along the path to the final result.

C3.3 Elements of a Good Stakeholder Engagement Program

It is suggested that the Op Proc incorporate the following elements of good stakeholder engagement.

1. Identify all stakeholders, either as general types needing representation, or as specific instances to be included.
2. Recruit them into the process.
3. Empower them through (1) education about the issues and process, and (2) assistance

with organization so each stakeholder type is fully represented and linked into two-way communication with the project for inclusion in all stages of the solution-discovery process.

4. Facilitate dialog which (1) gets at the deeper interests, values and priorities of the stakeholders, and (2) is structured to provide the inputs needed by subsequent stages in the solution-discovery process.
5. Document stakeholder interests in the form of statements which clearly and concisely encapsulate the collective interests of like stakeholders. These interests statements are reworked until all stakeholders are satisfied that the statements effectively articulate their views. They serve as a sound starting point along a clear path to a good solution.
6. At every step along the solution-discovery pathway, validation of every decision is established by feedback with the stakeholders, iterating until stakeholder satisfaction with the product is achieved. Note, satisfaction means “I can live with it if I don’t have to die for it.”

C4.0 Solution-Discovery Process and Organization

C4.1 Principles of Solution-Discovery

The work of developing a Relicensing Agreement involves creation of products that satisfy the two-fold goal of the Mission Statement, above. These products are, in general, quite complex, both within themselves and in the relationships among them. Further, they involve issues which may be contentious. This being the case, a competent solution-discovery procedure is needed. A well-established and proven general solution-discovery procedure is available to do this kind of job. It is based on two very general and universal principles.

C4.1.1 First Principle: the Logical Sequence of Decisions

The first of these principles is that any process for reaching consensus on complex, technical issues must address decisions of certain types that are inherent in the process leading to consensus. These decision types are not optional. The logical sequence of decisions leading to consensus about resolution of an issue may be expressed as a series of questions.

- What is the issue?
- Who are the stakeholders in this issue?
- What are the interests of those stakeholders?
- What is the Definition of Success that depicts the qualities of a good solution?
- How are solution options generated?
- How are solution options evaluated?
- What is the preferred solution?
- Is that selection valid, and why?

To test the validity of this stepwise logical approach, ask the following questions.

- Can any of the questions in the sequence be omitted?
- What if they were addressed in a different order?

C4.1.2 Second Principle: Form Follows Function

The Form Follows Function principle states, “First determine the Functions that a solution must perform, then select a Form which will perform those and only those functions.” The rationale for this principle is discovered by considering the consequences if it is not followed. The functions of a form are inextricably associated with the form. When a form has been selected, all the associated functions, and none other, come with it. If a form is improperly selected, it may not deliver all the necessary functions. Worse, it may deliver undesired functions which cannot be avoided. Therefore it is better to first describe the solution in terms of all its desired functions it must deliver, and all the undesired functions it must avoid. Then select a form (or combination of forms) that does just that.

C4.2 Stages of the Solution-Discovery Process

The stages of the solution-discovery process define a rather formal approach, starting with stakeholder input and concluding with a solution that enjoys consensus support of all stakeholders. In this relicensing project, such formality is necessary, first to help us keep our heads straight as we navigate the thicket of complexity, and second as a tool for supporting the collaborative spirit among the large community of stakeholders with contending interests.

To be done well, solution-discovery proceeds through stages as described briefly below. These stages are inherent in the general flow of solution discovery for any complex problem, and are not a matter of choice. Ignoring or giving mere lip service to any of them imperils the outcome.

In reading this description of the solution-discovery procedure, consider how these stages apply to (1) development of process and organization used to develop the Relicensing Agreement, and (2) development of the Relicensing Agreement itself through use of such procedures. In other words, the solution-discovery procedure is a general tool, used in both to create process, and then as a part of that process, to create the Relicensing Agreement.

Of course, these stages of solution-discovery are not intended to be carried out unthinkingly by rote. They are laid out here in a general and fairly complete form as a template which may be modified, using good judgment, to fit particular situations. In some cases, the fully formal approach is best. In other cases, these stages may be applied informally, but with due consideration that nothing of importance is overlooked.

The general stages of the solution-discover procedure, as applicable to a particular issue, are described below. The implement the general questions in C4.1.1 and the Form Follows Function principle in C4.1.2.

1. Determine the interests, values and priorities of the stakeholders (for more on this see Stakeholder Engagement). Document this information. Working with the stakeholders, continue revising this document until all stakeholders are satisfied that their views are adequately articulated. This activity of revision continues throughout the process as later stages expose additional concerns of stakeholders. Note: it is not yet the time to resolve

conflicts among stakeholders, but such conflicts should be clearly articulated for resolution at later stages.

2. Convert this document of stakeholder interests into a Definition of Success in terms of the Qualities of a successful outcome, with measures that define satisfaction. Avoid declaring any solution features which might be intended to deliver the desired outcome Qualities. Validate this with the stakeholders, revisiting as later stages may indicate appropriate.

3. Identify the Output Functions which the solution must perform to deliver the Definition of Success. Avoid declaring any solution features which might be intended to deliver the Outcome Functions. This is an important step in establishing the foundation for a good solution, in accordance with the Form Follows Function principle, and should be done prior to the design of a solution. Validate with stakeholders and revisit as necessary.

4. Set up the process for searching for solution options. This process should be reasonably exhaustive, so that good solutions are not missed, and expeditious so it arrives quickly at a short list of options for serious evaluation. Validate with stakeholders and revisit as necessary.

5. Set up the evaluation process, including screening criteria and methods of analysis for scoring options against the criteria, that will be used to make the selection of the preferred solution. Validate with stakeholders and revisit as necessary.

6. Design and select the Solution. Use the search process (stage 4) to generate solution options. Use the evaluation process (stage 5) to make the selection. Revisit the entire process to be sure the result is sound, and validate with stakeholders.

Throughout this process, give particular attention to interdependencies. Seek to maximize synergy and minimize conflict. Carry out tradeoffs and compromises to resolve remaining conflicts. More comments on this issue are provided in section C4.3 below.

C4.3 Solution-Discovery Methods and Tools

There are well established and proven methods and tools for doing solution-discovery for complex and contentious problems (such as this relicensing project). They exist in many versions, associated with professions such as systems engineering and architecture, to mention just two. Their purpose is to

- Structure the path that the project will find through the thicket of complexity
- Keep track of, integrate and render useful the vast amount of information that is pertinent
- Support the technical tasks involved in characterizing the problem, devising and assessing solutions

To be consistent with the spirit of stakeholder engagement, the project should consult

with stakeholders on the selection and implementation of a set of such tools to support the project. Dr. Cutler would be more than happy to assist in the selection of this toolset.

C4.4 The Solution-Discovery Organization

The Op Proc tells us that the solution-discovery process will be implemented through an organization consisting of the SHRG, RGCs and TWCs. Because of interdependencies among the issues (as defined by stakeholder interests plus professional expertise), interdependencies within the solution as defined in the Relicensing Agreement, and a complex mapping between issues and solution-elements (each issue may require contributions from several solution elements, each solution element may contribute to several issues), an integrated approach to developing the Relicensing Agreement is necessary. However, the structure and functions of the SHRG, RGCs and TWCs presents the risk that the approach will be fragmented along lines defined by the various RGC issues, and the integrated approach will be lost. This can be fixed.

Amend the Op Proc document to charge the SHRG with responsibility for attending to interdependencies. This means specifically:

- The SHRG shall develop (1) an integrated problem definition which combines all the issues pertinent to the relicensing with interdependencies described, (2) an integrated architecture for the system of physical features and activities that will operate under provisions of the Relicensing Agreement to address the issues, and (3) a mapping between problem and solution architecture. These shall be used to support the following task.
- In allocating issues to the RGCs and TWCs, the SHRG shall ensure that the integrity of the collective issues does not become fragmented, that problem definitions and solutions developed by the RGCs and TWCs are coordinated, compatible, and when assembled into the overall system architecture, constitute an integrated whole.

Methods and tools as mentioned in C4.2 are available to support the SHRG in these responsibilities.

C5.0 Project Plan

Presumably the Mission Statement would spawn a Project Plan. The Project Plan in initial version should be produced as quickly as possible as a tool for collaboration among stakeholders. The Op Proc document would be subordinate to the Project Plan.

The Project Plan might be divided broadly into Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 1 would operate in solo until the process and organization for Phase 2 are set up and launched. At that point the emphasis shifts to Phase 2, leading to production and approval of the Relicensing Agreement. Phase 1 would continue in parallel, at a lower level, performing process maintenance and improvement in support of Phase 2. The elements of the Project Plan might be:

- Project Organization, in terms of organizational elements, roles and responsibilities of each element, relationships among elements, and identification of who should be assigned to each element

- Project Task Network, consisting of all Tasks necessary to do the job, expressed in input-process-output format, linked together in a network. The network must be complete so that all necessary Final Products are delivered, all Tasks are linked by Internal Products (outputs of earlier tasks providing all needed inputs to later tasks), and all initial Inputs are identified
- Definition of the Information Structure that supports the project, consisting of all Inputs, significant Internal Products and Final Products, in terms of content and quality
- Allocation of Tasks to Organization Elements
- Timeline

Note that the Project Plan is a living, evolving document. At the beginning and throughout, the explicit nature of future Plan elements cannot always be known, but the existence of these unknowns can be anticipated. Consequently, a part of the Plan will be continual looking ahead to identify and define such elements as they emerge.

C6.0 Recommendations for Amending the Op Proc Document

In the following, paragraph numbers starting with “P” (as P1.1) refer to the Op Proc, and those starting with “C” (as C2.2) refer to this comments document.

In P1.1, substitute the Mission Statement from C2.3.

In P2.2 and P2.3, reference the solution-discovery process in C4.2 as the method to be used to develop recommendations for resolving issues and to develop the package for SCE&G management. Also reference the use of appropriate tools as described in C4.3.

In P2.3, add the bulleted items from the end of C4.4.

Add a new section P2.7 Stakeholder Engagement after P2.6 Team and Group Composition... The new P2.7 includes the bulleted items from C3.2 as the goal, and items 1 through 3 from C3.3 as the method. Consider allocating this responsibility to appropriate groups within the stakeholders, i. e., the stakeholders can assist the project by recruiting additional stakeholders and preparing them to participate constructively.

Renumber P2.7 and P2.8 as P2.8 and P2.9.

In P2.8 (renumbered):

- Add material from C3.2 as a statement of goals of facilitation.
- Add items 4 through 6 from C3.3 to the responsibilities of the facilitator.

In P2.9, define provisions for conducting the work of the SHRG, RCGs and TWCs on-line, thereby avoiding meetings and accelerating the pace. Numerous tools are available to support this, which automate the process of disseminating information, conducting discussions, reaching decisions, and documenting results.

Finally, it is strongly recommend that SCE&G/Klienschmidt prepare a Project Plan with

concurrence of the stakeholders as soon as possible, as described in C5.0. The Op Proc document should be included as subordinate to the Project Plan.

Stacia Hoover

From: Mary [rkelly1@sc.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2005 2:49 PM
To: BARGENTIERI@scana.com
Cc: Alison Guth
Subject: Comments re Op.Proc. Saluda Hydro

Attached please find comments from the League of Women Voters of the Columbia Area.

November 19, 2005

William R. Argentieri
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
West Columbia, SC 29170

Comments on “Operating Procedure for the Relicensing of the Saluda Hydroelectric Project FERC Project 516” submitted by the League of Women Voters of the Columbia Area.

Dar Mr. Argentieri:

This letter is to express our support for the comments submitted by the SC Coastal Conservation League, American Rivers, and Lake Murray Watch.

The League of Women Voters, as an organization dedicated to an open and accountable governmental process as well as to the full participation of the public in that process would like to see the Operating Procedures reflect these concerns. We believe that time spent on the front end in ensuring that the operating process incorporate these principles will save time in the long run and avoid a lot of back end second guessing.

As we have said before, Lake Murray is an invaluable resource for the people of the Columbia area and indeed for the whole state from a recreational standpoint and as a source of water for human consumption as well as for industrial and recreational uses.

We request that this letter be posted on the web site.

We wish SCE@G and all the participating stakeholders well as this process proceeds and look forward to participating in it.

Sincerely,

Mary T. Kelly, Representative
League of Women Voters of the Columbia Area
4018 Sandwood Drive
Columbia, SC 29206
803-782-841
rkelly1@sc.rr.com

copy: Alison Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com

Stacia Hoover

From: Jenn O'Rourke [jenno@scwf.org]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2005 4:31 PM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: Comments on Operating Procedures FERC Project 516

Hi,
Attached are the South Carolina Wildlife Federation Official Comments on Operating Procedures for the Relicensing of the Saluda Hydroelectric Project FERC Project 516
Jenn

Jennifer O'Rourke
Community Organizer
South Carolina Wildlife Federation
2711 Middleburg Drive, Ste 104
Columbia, SC 29204

www.scwf.org / email: jenno@scwf.org
Phone: **803-256-0670** / Fax: 803-256-0690



SOUTH CAROLINA WILDLIFE FEDERATION

An affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation

November 21, 2005

William R. Argentieri
Kleinschmidt Associates #21A
101 Trade Zone Drive
West Columbia, SC 29170

Re: South Carolina Wildlife Federation Official Comments on Operating Procedures for the Relicensing of the Saluda Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project 516

Dear Mr. Argentieri:

The South Carolina Wildlife Federation wishes to officially support the comments submitted by the Coastal Conservation League, American Rivers, and Lake Murray Watch regarding Operating Procedures. We request that this support be posted on the web site.

The Operating Procedures drafted by the Project managers do not support the FERC goal that the process improve the quality of the final relicensing product.

The Federation intends to assist in developing strategies to protect the habitat of the wildlife and people which depend upon the natural areas of the project lands, as well as downstream.

Federation experience with other relicensing efforts in South Carolina indicates that a true collaborative process is necessary to meet relicensing objectives that better meet the needs of Lake users.

We appreciate the opportunity to support these important comments.

Sincerely,

Angela Viney
Executive Director

c: Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com
Suzrhodes@juno.com
jenno@scwf.org

Stacia Hoover

From: AMMARELL, RAYMOND R [RAMMARELL@scana.com]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2005 1:37 PM
To: RMAHAN@scana.com; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; LANDRETH, JAMES M; BOOZER, THOMAS C; HOFFMAN, VAN B; YANITY, ROBERT; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; bjmcmanus@jonesday.com; HAMILTON, J. HAGOOD JR
Subject: RE: OPERATIONS RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP.doc

Here are a few suggested edits, included in "track changes" mode.

Ray Ammarell

*SCE&G - Saluda Dam Field Office
2112 North Lake Drive (MC P03)
Columbia, SC 29212
803-217-7322 Phone
803-206-3710 Cell
803-217-6501 Fax
rammarell@scana.com*

From: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2005 3:47 PM
To: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; LANDRETH, JAMES M; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; BOOZER, THOMAS C; HOFFMAN, VAN B; YANITY, ROBERT; alan.stuart@kleinschmidtUSA.com; Alison Guth; bjmcmanus@jonesday.com; HAMILTON, J. HAGOOD JR
Subject: OPERATIONS RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP.doc

It seems to me we pretty much concluded that the Operations RCG function and intended output is really support for the other RCG's in dealing with their issues. And I have drawn upon the latest Mission Statement template to develop a Mission Statement for the ORCG. What d'ya think? We are in no hurry for this one, as they do not expect one. But I think they'll appreciate having one. It also makes it pretty clear that this is one of the more technical RCG's. It may even be that it could end up being a technical working committee function under one of the other RCGs. Any ideas?

OPERATIONS RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP

MISSION STATEMENT

The Mission of the Operations Resource Conservation Group (ORCG) is, through full and open good-faith cooperation, to gather or develop data relevant to Saluda Hydroelectric project, operations related stakeholders' interests/issues, to understand those interests/issues and that data, and to consider all such interests/issues and data relevant to and materially impacting both Lake Murray and the downstream environs affected by Saluda operations. A primary goal of the ORCG is to develop a robust hydraulic model for the Saluda Project which 1) will establish a baseline of current hydrologic, hydraulic, and operational conditions, and 2) aid in analyzing the potential upstream and downstream impacts of changes to project operations that might be suggested by or be based on input data/factors provided by SCE&G or other resource conservation groups within the Saluda Hydro Relicensing Framework. Results from this model will be presented in readily understandable terms and format. The objective of this process is to assist in developing consensus-based recommendations for inclusion in the FERC license application and consideration by FERC as it drafts license conditions, relative to actions responsive to those interests/issues, which reasonably can be taken by SCE&G, in support of the missions and goals of the other RCGs. One measure of success in achieving the mission and goals will be a published Water Quality Resource Conservation Group (WQRCG) Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement (PM&E) Agreement.

Deleted: generation

Deleted: -

Deleted: upon

Deleted: materially

Deleted: as it embarks upon its mission

Deleted: and present in readily understandable terms and format,

Comment: Is this a measure for all RCG's, or was it left in from the WQRCG mission statement?

Kacie Jensen

From: Chris Page [PageC@dnr.sc.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2005 5:02 PM
To: Alison Guth
Cc: Steve DeKozlowski; Bill Marshall
Subject: Lake and Land Management -- Wednesday November 2 at 9:30 am

Ms. Guth, it was brought to my attention that I might need to represent the SCDNR Aquatic Nuisance Species Program as a member on the Lake and Land Management Committee. If I could be added to that committee list it would be greatly appreciated. I also left a telephone message at your office stating the same. My cell number is 803-600-7541 and my office number is 803-755-2836.

Thanks,

Chris Page
Program Coordinator
Aquatic Nuisance Species Program
South Carolina Department of Natural Resources

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2005 2:09 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'bill_hulslander@nps.gov'; 'cheetahtrk@yahoo.com'; 'dlandis1@sc.rr.com'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'kayakduke@bellsouth.net'; 'KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov'; 'Bkawasi@sc.rr.com'; 'Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov'; 'Elymay2@aol.com'; 'dvklmass@bellsouth.net'; 'lmichalec@aol.com'; 'parkin@parkinhunter.com'; 'PatrickM@scccl.org'; 'crafton@usit.net'; 'rjernigan@scfbins.com'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; 'suzrhodes@juno.com'; 'truple@sc.rr.com'; 'Stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com'; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'; 'lxanthakos@scana.com'; 'rammarell@scana.com'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Shane Boring
Subject: Operations Group Agenda

Good Afternoon,

As I am sure know by now, the Operations Resource Conservation Group will be convening next Tuesday, November 1st, at 9:30am. Attached to this email you will find the agenda for this upcoming meeting. If you are a member of multiple Resource Groups you will be receiving agendas for those meetings soon. As always, let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks,
Alison



Operations RCG
Agenda 11105.pd...

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

**Saluda Hydro Relicensing
Operations Resource Conservation Group**

Meeting Agenda

November 1, 2005

9:30 AM

Lake Murray Training Center

- **9:35 to 9:45** Introduction
 - SCE&G and KA Staff
 - Resource Agency Representatives
 - NGO Representatives
 - Individuals

 - **9:45 to 10:00** Purpose of Resource Groups

 - **10:00 to 11:00** **Presentation – Saluda Hydro Operations – Lee Xanthakos
SCANA Services**

 - **11:00 to 11:45** Develop Operations RCG Mission Statement

 - **11:45 to 12:45** Lunch

 - **1:00 to 2:00** Discuss Operation RCG procedures

 - **2:00 to 2:30** Develop List of Homework Assignments

 - **2:30 to 2:45** Develop an Agenda for Next Meeting

 - **2:45 to 3:00** Set Next Meeting Date
- Adjourn

Saluda
HYDRO
RELICENSING

Danielle Fitzpatrick

From: Alan Stuart
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2005 11:59 AM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: FW: Comments on Operating Procedures for relicensing Saluda hydro

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

From: Bill Marshall [mailto:MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2005 10:42 AM
To: Alan Stuart; Randy Mahan; Bill Argentieri
Cc: Dick Christie; Ann Jennings; Charlene Coleman; Dan Wells; Ed Diebold; Gerrit Jobsis; Guy Jones; Jeanette Wells; Kustafik, Karen; Larry Jones; Malcolm Leaphart; Norm Ferris; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Rick Wilson; Steve Dennis; Tom Stonecypher; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler
Subject: Comments on Operating Procedures for relicensing Saluda hydro

Alan, Randy and Bill;

For your consideration, I have attached comments from the Lower Saluda Scenic River Advisory Council to address the proposed Operating Procedures for the Saluda hydro relicensing process. If you have any questions about our comments please let me know. Thank you for the opportunity to provide our input.

Sincerely,

Bill Marshall
Lower Saluda Scenic River Advisory Council
803-734-9096



Lower Saluda Scenic River

Advisory Council

c/o South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
1000 Assembly Street, Suite 354, Columbia, SC 29201 ~ 803/734-9096

October 21, 2005

To: Alan Stuart, Randy Mahan, and Bill Argentieri

From: Bill Marshall, Chairman

Subject: Comments on Operating Procedures for the Relicensing of the Saluda Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project 516

The Lower Saluda Scenic River Advisory Council has reviewed the Operating Procedures prepared by South Carolina Electric and Gas Company (SCE&G) for the relicensing of the Saluda Hydroelectric Project. We understand that the Operating Procedures have the intended purpose to establish structure for the relicensing process and provide guidelines to facilitate communications and cooperation among the various committees to promote an orderly, efficient and effective process. To support that purpose, we offer the following comments and recommendation for your consideration.

We recommend establishing a procedural group. Because the relicensing process will be complex, lengthy, and to some extent, evolving through time, we think it is essential that the Operating Procedures (which are general in nature) provide a means to address and resolve the details of procedural questions and problems in a timely, responsive, and consensus-based manner. It seems to us that a reasonable and constructive approach to addressing this need is to form a group that is representative of the process participants, and has the purpose of assisting SCE&G in resolving procedural/process issues. Formation of a procedural group is an idea being advocated by other participants in the Saluda hydro relicensing process and we support the concept.

A procedural group could provide SCE&G with more proactive input from agencies and stakeholder groups as the communication protocol is drafted. A procedural group could serve as the forum for participants of the relicensing process to resolve questions and problems and assist SCE&G in amending (improving) the process as it moves forward. Already there are questions and concerns being raised about choosing participants for technical committees, appropriate persons to act as facilitators, the number of absences allowed from RCG meetings, the timing of meetings to allow more public participation, communications with the media, and who can move issues in or out of the "parking lot." These are only a few examples of issues that a procedural group could assist SCE&G to resolve more effectively.

By establishing a procedural group, one that represents a cross-section of process participants, SCE&G can well serve its interest in conducting the relicensing process in a collaborative manner with stakeholders. Without such a group there appears to be minimal provision of procedure to facilitate effective communication and resolution of problems among participants within the general framework provided by the Operating Procedures.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input and for your consideration of our recommendation. Please contact me at 803/734-9096 or by email at marshallb@dnr.sc.gov if you have questions about comments from the Lower Saluda Scenic River Advisory Council.

Kacie Jensen

From: Jeff_Duncan@nps.gov
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2005 3:43 PM
To: Malcolm Leaphart
Cc: ahler@scdnr.gov; bill_hulslander@nps.gov; Bkawasi@sc.rr.com; bseibels@riverbanks.org; cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net; cheetahtrk@yahoo.com; dchristie@infoave.net; eschnepel@sc.rr.com; flyhotair@greenwood.net; gjobsis@americanrivers.org; guyjones@sc.rr.com; jbutler@scana.com; Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov; kakustafik@columbiasc.net; Keith_Ganz_Sarto@hotmail.com; lmichalec@aol.com; Lucky8Lady@aol.com; mark_a_cantrell@fws.gov; marshallb@dnr.sc.gov; millerca@dhec.sc.gov; moellerf@msn.com; network@scpronet.com; Norm@sc.rr.com; RESKKEENER@PBTCOMM.Net; rkidder@pbtcomm.net; royparker38@earthlink.net; Stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com; tbrooks@newberrycounty.net; truple@sc.rr.com; tufford@sc.edu; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda_Hill@fws.gov; 'ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R'; Hal Beard; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; 'Elymay2@aol.com'; 'ipitts@scprt.com'; Gina Kirkland; 'leachs@dnr.sc.gov'; 'mdavis@scprt.com'; 'PatrickM@sccl.org'; 'pgaines@scprt.com'; 'Prescott.Brownell@NOAA.gov'; 'Tony Bebber'
Subject: Re: Saluda Relicensing

Alison--

The two primary contacts for the National Park Service (Bill Hulslander and Jeff Duncan) are also unable to attend the September 22 and 26 (operations) meetings due to scheduling conflicts and end of fiscal year (Sept 30) travel restrictions. Beyond that, we remain committed to participating in the relicensing effort and plan to participate in subsequent meetings within our realm of interest. We appreciate the efforts of SCE&G to provide notice well in advance for some resource groups, but we regret that due to the short notice, we will not be able to participate in the 22nd and 26th meetings.

Thanks, Jeff Duncan

Jeffrey R. Duncan, Ph.D.
National Park Service--RTCA
175 Hamm Rd. Suite C, Chattanooga, TN 37405
Ph. (423) 266-1150 Fax. (423) 266-2558

```
|-----|
|               |
|               | Malcolm Leaphart |
|               | <malcolml@mailbox |
|               | .sc.edu>         |
|               |               |
|               | 09/19/2005 02:21 |
|               | PM AST           |
|               |               |
|-----|
```

```
>-----|
|
|
| To:      Amanda_Hill@fws.gov
|
| cc:      Alison Guth <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>, 'ahler@scdnr.gov',
| 'bill_hulslander@nps.gov',
| 'Bkawasi@sc.rr.com', 'bseibels@riverbanks.org', 'cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net',
| 'cheetahtrk@yahoo.com',
| 'dchristie@infoave.net', 'eschnepel@sc.rr.com', 'flyhotair@greenwood.net',
| 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org',
| 'guyjones@sc.rr.com', 'jbutler@scana.com', 'Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov',
```

'kakustafik@columbiasc.net',
|
| 'Keith_Ganz_Sarto@hotmail.com', 'lmichalec@aol.com', 'Lucky8Lady@aol.com',
'mark_a_cantrell@fws.gov',
|
| 'marshallb@dnr.sc.gov', 'millerca@dhec.sc.gov', 'moellerf@msn.com',
'network@scpronet.com', 'Norm@sc.rr.com',
|
| 'RESKKEENER@PBTComm.Net', 'rkidder@pbtcomm.net', 'royparker38@earthlink.net',
'Stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com',
|
| 'tbrooks@newberrycounty.net', 'truple@sc.rr.com', 'tufford@sc.edu', Alan Stuart
<Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com>,
|
| "'ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R'" <BARGENTIERI@scana.com>, Hal Beard
<BeardH@scdnr.state.sc.us>,
|
| "'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'" <bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net>, "'Elymay2
@aol.com'" <Elymay2@aol.com>,
|
| "'ipitts@scprt.com'" <ipitts@scprt.com>, Gina Kirkland <KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov>,
"'leachs@dnr.sc.gov'"
|
| <leachs@dnr.sc.gov>, "'mdavis@scprt.com'" <mdavis@scprt.com>,
"'PatrickM@scccl.org'" <PatrickM@scccl.org>,
|
| "'pgaines@scprt.com'" <pgaines@scprt.com>, "'Prescott.Brownell@NOAA.gov'"
<Prescott.Brownell@NOAA.gov>, "'Tony
|
| Bebber'" <Tbebber@scprt.com>, (bcc: Jeff Duncan/Atlanta/NPS)
|
|
| Subject: Re: Saluda Relicensing
|

>-----

This date conflict for USF&WS is a serious problem, and is likely to be the
same problem for SC DNR and PRT and others involved with the Catawba or other projects...
I would strongly support rescheduling the Saluda meetings with an eye to the Catawba
meetings - especially as we are far enough out for all to be able to readjust their
calendars.

Quoting Amanda_Hill@fws.gov:

> Hi Allison,
>
> Thank you for sending the meeting schedules for the Resource
> Conservation Groups for the Saluda Hydropower Relicensing Process. As
> you may know, several relicensings on major projects in South and
> North Carolina are currently ongoing, each with demanding meeting
> schedules. There are several dates below that I am not available due
> to other meeting obligations (this may be the case with several other
> agency representatives). I was curious if SCEG had considered if the
> proposed dates would be convenient for agency personnel? Is it
> possible to
change
> any of these dates? If not, FWS will not be able to attend on Sept. 26,
> 30, and Oct. 14, 26.
>
>
> Amanda Hill
> Fisheries Biologist
> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
> 176 Croghan Spur Rd., Suite 200
> Charleston, SC 29407
> 843-727-4707 ext. 303
> 843-727-4218 fax
> amanda_hill@fws.gov
>
> *NOTE NEW PHONE EXTENSION*
>
> "Our mission is working with others to conserve, protect, and enhance

fish,
> wildlife and plants and their habitats for the continuing benefit of
> the American people."
>
>
>

> Alison Guth
> <Alison.Guth@Klei
> nschmidtUSA.com>
To
>

> 09/16/2005 12:09 PM 'Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov',
> 'Keith_Ganz_Sarto@hotmail.com',
> 'gjjobsis@americanrivers.org',
> 'cheetahtrk@yahoo.com',
> 'Bkawasi@sc.rr.com',
> 'flyhotair@greenwood.net',
> 'lmichalec@aol.com',
> 'tufford@sc.edu',
> 'truple@sc.rr.com',
> 'royparker38@earthlink.net',
> 'marshallb@dnr.sc.gov',
> 'ahler@scdnr.gov',
> 'bill_hulslander@nps.gov',
> 'bseibels@riverbanks.org',
> 'Norm@sc.rr.com',
> 'millerca@dhec.sc.gov',
> 'Stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com',
> , 'jbutler@scana.com',
> 'moellerf@msn.com',
> 'kakustafik@columbiasc.net',
> 'cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net',
> 'guyjones@sc.rr.com', 'Amanda
Hill'
> <amanda_hill@fws.gov>, Gina
> Kirkland
> <KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov>,
> Hal Beard
> <BeardH@scdnr.state.sc.us>,
>

> " 'Elymay2@aol.com' "
> <Elymay2@aol.com> ,
> 'mark_a_cantrell@fws.gov' ,
> " 'Prescott.Brownell@NOAA.gov' "
> <Prescott.Brownell@NOAA.gov> ,
> 'Tony
> Bebber' <Tbebber@SCPRT.com> ,
> 'dchristie@infoave.net' ,
> " 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net' "
> <bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net> ,
> 'RESKKEENER@PBTCOMM.Net' ,
> 'rkidder@pbtcomm.net' ,
> 'tbrooks@newberrycounty.net' ,
> 'Lucky8Lady@aol.com' ,
> 'network@scpronet.com' ,
> 'eschnepel@sc.rr.com' ,
> " 'malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu' "
> <malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu> ,
> " 'PatrickM@scccl.org' "
> <PatrickM@scccl.org> ,
> " 'pgaines@scprt.com' "
> <pgaines@scprt.com> ,
> " 'ipitts@scprt.com' "
> <ipitts@scprt.com> ,
> " 'mdavis@scprt.com' "
> <mdavis@scprt.com> ,
> " 'leachs@dnr.sc.gov' "
> <leachs@dnr.sc.gov>
>
> cc
> Alan Stuart
>
> <Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com> ,
>
> " 'ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R' "
> <BARGENTIERI@scana.com>
>

Danielle Fitzpatrick

From: Alan Stuart
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2005 1:38 PM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: FW: Protocol Comments

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

From: Patrick Moore [mailto:PatrickM@scccl.org]
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2005 2:25 PM
To: rmahan@scana.com; alan.stuart@kleinschmidtusa.com; bargentieri@scana.com
Cc: jrgrego@mindspring.com; kakustafik@columbiasc.net; kirklagl@dhec.sc.gov; malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu; norm@sc.rr.com; ahler@dnr.sc.gov; MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; so4us@att.net; gjobsis@americanrivers.org; rkelly1@sc.rr.com; angela@scwf.org; cheetahtk@hotmail.com; dchristie@infoave.net; eppsbq@dhec.sc.gov; rmikell@adventurecarolina.com; suzrhodes@juno.com; DLANDIS1@SC.RR.COM; rkidder@pbtcomm.net; lbarber@sc.rr.com; reskkeener@pbtcomm.net; Elymay2@aol.com; KAYAKDUKE@BELLSOUTH.NET; tbebber@scprt.com; Patrick Moore; gjobsis@americanrivers.org; LMichalec0953@aol.com; so4us@worldnet.att.com; johned44@earthlink.net; CAMLITTLEJOHN@yahoo.com; BBULL@sc.rr.com; jenko@SCWF.org; gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: Protocol Comments

Alan, Randy, and Bill,

Attached are stakeholder comments on the Draft Protocol Document produced by SCE&G. These comments are not exhaustive and are offered as a first step to improving communication between stakeholders. The signatory stakeholders appreciate the chance to weigh in on this document and look forward to more in depth discussion in the coming days.

Please feel free to call with any questions,

Sincerely,

Patrick Moore
Water Quality Associate
Coastal Conservation League
1207 Lincoln St. Suite 203-C
Columbia, S.C. 29201
803.771.7102

To: Alan Stuart

CC: Randy Mahan, Bill Argentieri

10/21/05

**Comments on “Operating Procedures for the Relicensing of the Saluda
Hydroelectric Project FERC Projects 516”**

The following comments on the Operating Procedures for the Relicensing of the Saluda Hydroelectric Project FERC Projects 516 are offered with the goal of insuring that the atmosphere of collaboration initiated by SCE&G effectively continues throughout the process. Pursuant to our belief that the formation of ground rules governing the actions of stakeholders is a critical step that affects the substantive rights of all parties, we respectfully offer the following comments:

General Comments:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the protocol document. In fact, it is a document with relatively few substantive issues. Much of the confusion arises from the absence of a definition section and lack of clarity in drafting the initial protocol. When the request to comment on the protocol was made, the response from Kleinshmidt & Associates was positive. However, the lack of a framework to handle the comments, the refusal to form a group to handle procedural concerns, and the lack of stakeholder involvement in the initial drafting of the protocol raises concerns that collaborative drafting was abandoned for the sake of convenience. More meetings are not ideal but

may be necessary to do what it takes to do the job correctly, regardless of time or energy expenditure. We are recommending a Procedural Resource Conservation Group aimed at handling procedural concerns with a representative from each Resource Conservation Group (RCG), resource agency, and SCE&G. While this is another meeting, the Procedural RCG will only meet as necessary, most likely a few times toward the beginning of the process to address items such as the communications protocol. This structure would actually be more efficient because each representative could report on process developments to the individual RCG groups; enabling the groups to be proactive instead of reactive to protocol document drafting.

The introduction to the protocol states “These procedures provide a framework, which can be amended as the process evolves, when there is consensus among the team to make changes”. It can sometimes be difficult to ascertain what effects certain protocol provisions will have on the process in the future and the protocol explicitly recognizes the need for the flexibility to amend. A Procedural RCG will be the forum for establishing consensus among all RCGs as called for in the protocol. This forum currently does not exist. The stakeholders were told at the September 22, 2005 meeting that these concerns would be handled informally between some stakeholders, possibly over the phone. Any process concerns arising in the RCGs will undoubtedly involve discussions that are currently underway and issues in need of quick resolution. The notion that informal consultation between dozens of stakeholders is less burdensome than a small group of people regularly in contact seems counterintuitive.

Section 1:

Fundamentally, the mission statement should not be unilaterally created as it is the guiding document of all the parties. Other relicensings involving the traditional licensing process have taken months to formulate the initial protocol and mission statement. While no one is suggesting this sort of delay (or any delay at all), Saluda stakeholders were offered no chance to input until they requested it. This demonstrates the need for a dependable way of addressing procedural questions to avoid confusion.

Section 1.1:

The mission statement should reflect the collaborative intent of the parties to reach a settlement and refer to a balanced result for the utility and the resource, much like the RCG mission statement does. This is possible with only minor modifications and serves the stated goal of the mission statement being a “guidepost” for everyone:

SCE&G will manage the process through collaboration with state and federal resource agencies, non-governmental organizations, special interest groups, and other interested stakeholders. This collaborative consultation process will be used to gather as well as disseminate information. The objective will be to learn from, as well as educate, stakeholders on the issues and come to a balanced settlement of those issues that accounts for the reasonable needs of SCE&G, maintains and enhances the quality of the resource, and accounts for the reasonable needs of the stakeholders.

Section 2.6:

This section should make clear that the knowledge requirement to serve on the Technical Working Committee (TWC) is not limited to formal training in respective areas of expertise but also considers practical knowledge and experience and the insights that informed lay people can make to analysis and decision making. The protocol should establish how the members of the TWC are selected in a manner that all stakeholders have a reasonable opportunity to participate in or be represented on the TWC.

Section 2.8:

This section should say that the communications protocol will contain specifics on when contact with the press is allowed. What appears to be a total prohibition on press releases in section 5.0 should be addressed in these communication protocols. In other proceedings there is a confidentiality agreement between stakeholders regarding settlement discussions or certain proprietary information that may come out in the operations RCG. The protocol should make clear that no confidentiality agreements will be required that attempt to (1) protect information that is accessible to the public, whether as public documents or through any applicable legal process or (2) that are designed to withhold information from certain stakeholders.

Section 4.3:

#4- Who has to agree to the inclusion/exclusion of a parking lot item should be specifically identified.

#5- “SCE&G invites and encourages, at anytime during this process, all interested parties to participate on any level of the relicensing of the Saluda Hydro Project.” The stakeholders appreciate SCE&G’s acknowledgement of the stakeholders’ rights to participate in the relicensing process that will ultimately control many aspects of SCE&G’s use of the water and other resources in the project boundary that belong to the public. We believe the current meeting schedule is insufficient in that all meetings are scheduled Monday through Friday during business hours. Many stakeholders are taking personal and vacation leave to participate in this process. We recognize the important role that agencies play, how hard they work, and how thinly their efforts are often stretched. Their absence at an occasional evening meeting does not mean no progress can be made without them. An added benefit to occasional evening and weekend meetings is increased public involvement, something SCE&G has strived for from the beginning.

Section 5.0:

“All news releases to the media will be coordinated through the SHRG and RCG.” As discussed above, this topic should be covered in detail in the communications protocol. The protocol must be clear that stakeholders may communicate with their constituencies, individually and through the press, without restriction or any sort of preclearance, provided that the communications are not covered by any applicable confidentiality agreements and do not purport to speak for the Saluda Hydro Relicensing Group. Stakeholders, including SCE&G, have constituencies to which they are

committed to updating, occasionally, the most effective way of doing this could be through use of the press.

Conclusion

As you can see our substantive concerns are few. Before the last public meeting, the document distributed with the notation of “final protocol” and the 10 days of ensuing confusion clearly demonstrate the need for a more effective way of identifying and handling procedural concerns. When the first rounds of RCG meetings were scheduled without any agency or stakeholder consultation, it became immediately apparent that many of the dates would not work. As a result, the entire process has been delayed while everyone’s schedule is coordinated. This is another example of the inherent problems of unilateral action in a public process and the need for a procedural group. The undersigned stakeholders respectfully request a Procedural RCG:

- 1) American Rivers
- 2) Coastal Conservation League
- 3) Columbia Audubon Society
- 4) Lake Murray Association- *See Attached*
- 5) Lake Murray Homeowner’s Coalition
- 6) Lake Watch
- 7) Midlands Striper Club
- 8) South Carolina League of Women Voters
- 9) South Carolina Wildlife Federation
- 10) Trout Unlimited- Saluda Chapter

Signatories reserve may submit individual comments as they see fit



The Lake Murray Association, Inc

Telephone :

(803)749-3888

P. O. Box 495
South Carolina 29002

Ballentine,

October 20, 2005

Memo : Alan Stuart, Kleinschmidt

Randy Mahan and Bill Argentieri, SCE&G

The Lake Murray Association sees a need to clarify the protocol document in several areas before the RCG meetings can become productive. We are not suggesting that a protocol RCG be established to function indefinitely as we think one more committee may be counterproductive. We do however believe that a committee appointed from the various stakeholders to work with SCE&G to clarify various items in the current protocol before the work begins is appropriate.

The introduction to the protocol states “These procedures provide a framework, which can be amended as the process evolves, when there is consensus among the team to make changes”. The stakeholders were told at the September 22, 2005 meeting that these concerns would be handled informally between some stakeholders, possibly over the phone. There needs to be a method to amend the protocol process when the need arises. We believe decision should be made in the RCG’s only and no decision should be made between stakeholders in a parking lot or over the phone. There needs to be a method established from the beginning to make these adjustments. This needs to be made clear in the current document.

Consensus needs to be defined and a percentage attached to it and clearly written in the protocol document.

Section 1:

Fundamentally, the mission statement should not be unilaterally created as it is the guiding document of all the parties. We agree with other stakeholders that the mission statement needs to be amended as follows:

The mission statement should reflect the collaborative intent of the parties to reach a settlement and refer to a balanced result for the utility and the resource, much like the RCG mission statement does:

SCE&G will manage the process through collaboration with state and federal resource agencies, non-governmental organizations, special interest groups, and other interested stakeholders. This collaborative consultation process will be used to gather as well as disseminate information. The objective will be to learn from, as well as educate, stakeholders on the issues and come to a balanced settlement of those issues that accounts for the needs of SCE&G and the quality of the resource.

Section 2.6:

This section should make clear that the TWC committee requirement of knowledge also includes practical knowledge, to what extent practical knowledge is sufficient, and who ultimately makes that decision.

LMA believes the protocol document should indicate the RCG's with the help of recognized experts should decide if the person in question has enough experience to be useful. The **consensus rule** whatever it turns out to be should prevail.

The last paragraph in 2.1 is convoluted and gives the impression that RCG's work for TWC's . This is not the case according to SCE&G. It is our understanding that the RCG's will actually decide the issues and the TWC's will conduct the test and suggest alternatives. The language, perform necessary studies under the direction of TWC's should be pointed out and eliminated. The relationship between the two committees needs to be clearly defined.

This section also states each group/organization should select a primary spokesperson or rep and alternate that is authorized to speak for the group/organization . This appears to limit an organization with more than 1 person on the committee from more than one member expressing an opinion. We do not agree this should be the case and needs clarification and modification.

Section 2.8:

Stacia Hoover

From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R [BARGENTIERI@scana.com]
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2006 4:07 PM
To: Alison Guth; Winward point Yacht Club ; Aaron Small; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Amanda Hill; Andy Miller; Bertina Floyd; Bill Brebner ; Bill Cutler; Bill East; BGreen@smeinc.com; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bill Mathias; Bob Olsen; bseibels@yahoo.com; STUTTS, BRANDON G; Bret Hoffman; Brett Bursey; TRUMP, BETH W; Bud Badr; Buddy Baker ; Charlene Coleman; Charles Floyd; Charlie Compton; Charlie Rentz; Chris Judge; Chris Page; Daniel Tufford; Dave Anderson; Dave Landis; David Allen; HANCOCK, DAVID E; David Jones; David Price; Dick Christie; Don Tyler; Donald Eng; Ed Diebold; duncane@mrd.dnr.state.sc.us; Ed Fetner; Edward Schnepel; aregaf@dnr.sc.gov; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Guy Jones; Hal Beard; Hank McKellar; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Price ; Jennifer Summerlin; Jerry Wise; DEVEREAUX, JAMES; Jim Glover; Jim Goller; Jim Ruane ; BUTLER, JO A; Joe Logan; Joel Huggins ; John and Rob Altenberg; johned44@bellsouth.net; jsfrick@mindspring.com; Jon Leader; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Ken Styer ; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Kim Westbury; Kristina Massey; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Linda Lester ; Malcolm Leaphart; Marianne Zajac; Mary Kelly; Michael Murrell; Mike Duffy; Mike Sloan; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norm Nicholson; Norman Ferris; Parkin Hunter; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Phil Hamby ; Prescott Brownell; Randal Shealy; RMAHAN@scana.com; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Rebekah Dobrasko; rbull@davisfloyd.com; Rhett Bickley; Richard Kidder; Richard Mikell; SKEENER@sc.rr.com; Robert Lavisky; Roger Hovis ; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; Russell Jernigan; YANITY, ROBERT; Sam Drake; Sandra Reinhardt; Sean Norris; Shane Boring; Skeet Mills ; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; SUMMER, STEPHEN E; Suzanne Rhodes; tpowers@newberrycounty.net; Theresa Thom; Tim Vinson; BOWLES, THOMAS M; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; BOOZER, THOMAS C; Tony Bebbler; Valerie Marcil; HOFFMAN, VAN B; balesw@dnr.sc.gov; Wenonah Haire; Mike Schimpff; FITTS, MARY R; LANDRETH, JAMES M
Subject: Saluda Hydro Flow Releases and Potential Low DO

To all Saluda Hydro Relicensing RCG and TWC Members:

Please be advised that turbine venting testing is scheduled for the week of September 24, 2006. Saluda Hydro Units 2, 3, and 4 will be tested 9/25 - 9/27. On 9/28, the effect of the McMeekin cooling water bypass valve discharge on DO in the tailrace will be measured. This test will require that Saluda Hydro discharge 2,500 CFS during the period of the bypass operation, in compliance with McMeekin Station's NPDES permit. ***Please note that during these tests, the Saluda Hydro units will be operated in several combinations and at various loads, with vents closed and open, in order to evaluate the effect on downstream DO of the hub baffles which were installed last year.

These tests are likely to produce short duration impacts on DO in the lower Saluda River for some distance downstream of the plant (essentially zero at times, in particular in the upper reaches of the river).

SCE&G is conducting these tests to gather information which will be used when dispatching the Saluda Hydro units during low DO periods.

[William R. Argentieri](#)
 South Carolina Electric & Gas Company

111 Research Drive
Columbia, SC 29203

Phone - (803) 217-9162
Fax - (803) 933-7849
Cell - (803) 331-0179

Stacia Hoover

From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R [BARGENTIERI@scana.com]**Sent:** Monday, September 11, 2006 3:32 PM**To:** Alison Guth; Winward point Yacht Club ; Aaron Small; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Amanda Hill; Andy Miller; Bertina Floyd; Bill Brebner ; Bill Cutler; Bill East; BGreen@smeinc.com; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bill Mathias; Bob Olsen; bseibels@yahoo.com; STUTTS, BRANDON G; Bret Hoffman; Brett Bursey; TRUMP, BETH W; Bud Badr; Buddy Baker ; Charlene Coleman; Charles Floyd; Charlie Compton; Charlie Rentz; Chris Judge; Chris Page; Daniel Tufford; Dave Anderson; Dave Landis; David Allen; HANCOCK, DAVID E; David Jones; David Price; Dick Christie; Don Tyler; Donald Eng; Ed Diebold; duncane@mrd.dnr.state.sc.us; Ed Fetner; Edward Schnepel; aregaf@dnr.sc.gov; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Guy Jones; Hal Beard; Hank McKellar; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Price ; Jennifer Summerlin; Jerry Wise; DEVEREAUX, JAMES; Jim Glover; Jim Goller; Jim Ruane ; BUTLER, JO A; Joe Logan; Joel Huggins ; John and Rob Altenberg; johned44@bellsouth.net; jsfrick@mindspring.com; Jon Leader; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Ken Styer ; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Kim Westbury; Kristina Massey; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Linda Lester ; Malcolm Leaphart; Marianne Zajac; Mary Kelly; Michael Murrell; Mike Duffy; Mike Sloan; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norm Nicholson; Norman Ferris; Parkin Hunter; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Phil Hamby ; Prescott Brownell; Randal Shealy; RMAHAN@scana.com; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Rebekah Dobrasko; rbull@davisfloyd.com; Rhett Bickley; Richard Kidder; Richard Mikell; SKEENER@sc.rr.com; Robert Lavisky; Roger Hovis ; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; Russell Jernigan; YANITY, ROBERT; Sam Drake; Sandra Reinhardt; Sean Norris; Shane Boring; Skeet Mills ; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; SUMMER, STEPHEN E; Suzanne Rhodes; tpowers@newberrycounty.net; Theresa Thom; Tim Vinson; BOWLES, THOMAS M; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; BOOZER, THOMAS C; Tony Bebbler; Valerie Marcil; HOFFMAN, VAN B; balesw@dnr.sc.gov; Wenonah Haire; Mike Schimpff**Subject:** 12 MW of Generation from Saluda Hydro for 9/12 and 9/14 from 8am to 1pm

To all Saluda Hydro Relicensing RCG and TWC Members:

Please be advised that DNR has requested flow on the Saluda River equivalent of 12 MW for the above referenced time and dates (9/12 and 9/14 from 8am to 1pm each day).

[William R. Argentieri](#)
 South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
 111 Research Drive
 Columbia, SC 29203

Phone - (803) 217-9162
 Fax - (803) 933-7849
 Cell - (803) 331-0179

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2006 3:33 PM
To: Winward point Yacht Club ; Aaron Small; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Andy Miller; Bertina Floyd; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Cutler; Bill East; Bill Green (BGreen@smeinc.com); Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bill Mathias; Bob Olsen; Bob Seibels (bseibels@yahoo.com); Brandon Stutts ; Bret Hoffman; Brett Bursey; btrump@scana.com; Bud Badr; Buddy Baker ; Charlene Coleman; Charles Floyd; Charlie Compton; Charlie Rentz; Chris Judge; Chris Page; Daniel Tufford; Dave Anderson; Dave Landis; David Allen; David Hancock; David Jones; David Price; Dick Christie; Don Tyler; Donald Eng; Ed Diebold; Ed Duncan (duncane@mrd.dnr.state.sc.us); Ed Fetner; Edward Schnepel; Feleke Arega (aregaf@dnr.sc.gov); George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Guy Jones; Hal Beard; Hank McKellar; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Price ; Jennifer Summerlin; Jerry Wise; Jim Devereaux; Jim Glover; Jim Goller; Jim Ruane ; JoAnn Butler; Joe Logan; Joel Huggins ; John and Rob Altenberg; John Davis (johned44@bellsouth.net); John Frick (jsfrick@mindspring.com); Jon Leader; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Ken Styer ; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Kim Westbury; Kristina Massey; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Linda Lester ; Malcolm Leaphart; Marianne Zajac; Mary Kelly; Michael Murrell; Mike Duffy; Mike Sloan; Mike Summer (msummer@scana.com); Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norm Nicholson; Norman Ferris; Parkin Hunter; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Phil Hamby ; Prescott Brownell; Randal Shealy; Randy Mahan; Ray Ammarell; Rebekah Dobrasko; Reed Bull (rbull@davisfloyd.com); Rhett Bickley; Richard Kidder; Richard Mikell; Robert Keener (SKEENER@sc.rr.com); Robert Lavisky; Roger Hovis ; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; Russell Jernigan; ryanity@scana.com; Sam Drake; Sandra Reinhardt; Sean Norris; Shane Boring; Skeet Mills ; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Steve Summer; Suzanne Rhodes; Theresa Powers (tpowers@newberrycounty.net); Theresa Thom; Tim Vinson; Tom Bowles (tbowles@scana.com); Tom Eppink; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Valerie Marcil; Van Hoffman; Wade Bales (balesw@dnr.sc.gov); Wenonah Haire; Mike Schimpff

Subject: FW: Saluda Hydro Generation on September 7

[TO ALL SALUDA HYDRO RELICENSING RCG AND TWC MEMBERS ON BEHALF OF BILL ARGENTIERI:](#)

The Saluda Hydro Unit 2 head cover seal work was completed at 2:45 pm and the McMeekin bypass valve was closed at 2:50 pm today. Today was a very good day for maintenance work on Saluda Hydro and if you get a chance you should thank any of the Saluda Hydro plant personnel for a job well done.

As part of the head cover seal work we performed today, tomorrow SCE&G will need to conduct a few tests to verify the seals are working properly on Units 1 through 4. In order to verify the seals are holding a vacuum we will operate each unit for approximately ½ hour. Generation of each unit will be from minimum load to full load (approximately 3,000 cfs) and back to minimum load over that time period. **This work will not require the McMeekin bypass valve to be opened.** It is anticipated that testing of all four units will take approximately two hours. The first unit is expected to start generating around 8:00 am tomorrow (Thursday, September 7). Keep in mind that this schedule could change if we run into any problems.

[William R. Argentieri](#)
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
111 Research Drive

Columbia, SC 29203

Phone - (803) 217-9162

Fax - (803) 933-7849

Cell - (803) 331-0179

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2006 3:33 PM
To: Winward point Yacht Club ; Aaron Small; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Andy Miller; Bertina Floyd; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Cutler; Bill East; Bill Green (BGreen@smeinc.com); Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bill Mathias; Bob Olsen; Bob Seibels (bseibels@yahoo.com); Brandon Stutts ; Bret Hoffman; Brett Bursey; btrump@scana.com; Bud Badr; Buddy Baker ; Charlene Coleman; Charles Floyd; Charlie Compton; Charlie Rentz; Chris Judge; Chris Page; Daniel Tufford; Dave Anderson; Dave Landis; David Allen; David Hancock; David Jones; David Price; Dick Christie; Don Tyler; Donald Eng; Ed Diebold; Ed Duncan (duncane@mrd.dnr.state.sc.us); Ed Fetner; Edward Schnepel; Feleke Arega (aregaf@dnr.sc.gov); George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Guy Jones; Hal Beard; Hank McKellar; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Price ; Jennifer Summerlin; Jerry Wise; Jim Devereaux; Jim Glover; Jim Goller; Jim Ruane ; JoAnn Butler; Joe Logan; Joel Huggins ; John and Rob Altenberg; John Davis (johned44@bellsouth.net); John Frick (jsfrick@mindspring.com); Jon Leader; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Ken Styer ; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Kim Westbury; Kristina Massey; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Linda Lester ; Malcolm Leaphart; Marianne Zajac; Mary Kelly; Michael Murrell; Mike Duffy; Mike Sloan; Mike Summer (msummer@scana.com); Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norm Nicholson; Norman Ferris; Parkin Hunter; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Phil Hamby ; Prescott Brownell; Randal Shealy; Randy Mahan; Ray Ammarell; Rebekah Dobrasko; Reed Bull (rbull@davisfloyd.com); Rhett Bickley; Richard Kidder; Richard Mikell; Robert Keener (SKEENER@sc.rr.com); Robert Lavisky; Roger Hovis ; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; Russell Jernigan; ryanity@scana.com; Sam Drake; Sandra Reinhardt; Sean Norris; Shane Boring; Skeet Mills ; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Steve Summer; Suzanne Rhodes; Theresa Powers (tpowers@newberrycounty.net); Theresa Thom; Tim Vinson; Tom Bowles (tbowles@scana.com); Tom Eppink; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Valerie Marcil; Van Hoffman; Wade Bales (balesw@dnr.sc.gov); Wenonah Haire; Mike Schimpff

Subject: FW: Saluda Hydro Generation on September 7

[TO ALL SALUDA HYDRO RELICENSING RCG AND TWC MEMBERS ON BEHALF OF BILL ARGENTIERI:](#)

The Saluda Hydro Unit 2 head cover seal work was completed at 2:45 pm and the McMeekin bypass valve was closed at 2:50 pm today. Today was a very good day for maintenance work on Saluda Hydro and if you get a chance you should thank any of the Saluda Hydro plant personnel for a job well done.

As part of the head cover seal work we performed today, tomorrow SCE&G will need to conduct a few tests to verify the seals are working properly on Units 1 through 4. In order to verify the seals are holding a vacuum we will operate each unit for approximately ½ hour. Generation of each unit will be from minimum load to full load (approximately 3,000 cfs) and back to minimum load over that time period. **This work will not require the McMeekin bypass valve to be opened.** It is anticipated that testing of all four units will take approximately two hours. The first unit is expected to start generating around 8:00 am tomorrow (Thursday, September 7). Keep in mind that this schedule could change if we run into any problems.

[William R. Argentieri](#)
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
111 Research Drive

Columbia, SC 29203

Phone - (803) 217-9162

Fax - (803) 933-7849

Cell - (803) 331-0179

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth**Sent:** Tuesday, September 05, 2006 5:01 PM**To:** Winward point Yacht Club ; Aaron Small; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Andy Miller; Bertina Floyd; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Cutler; Bill East; Bill Green (BGreen@smeinc.com); Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bill Mathias; Bob Olsen; Bob Seibels (bseibels@yahoo.com); Brandon Stutts ; Bret Hoffman; Brett Bursey; btrump@scana.com; Bud Badr; Buddy Baker ; Chad Long; Charlene Coleman; Charles Floyd; Charlie Compton; Charlie Rentz; Chris Judge; Chris Page; Craig Stow; Daniel Tufford; Dave Anderson; Dave Landis; David Allen; David Hancock; David Jones; David Price; Dell Isham; Dick Christie; Don Tyler; Donald Eng; Ed Diebold; Ed Duncan (duncane@mrd.dnr.state.sc.us); Ed Fetner; Edward Schnepel; Feleke Arega (aregaf@dnr.sc.gov); George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Guy Jones; Hal Beard; Hank McKellar; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Price ; Jennifer Summerlin; Jerry Wise; Jim Devereaux; Jim Glover; Jim Goller; Jim Ruane ; JoAnn Butler; Joe Logan; Joel Huggins ; John and Rob Altenberg; John Davis (johned44@bellsouth.net); John Frick (jsfrick@mindspring.com); Jon Leader; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Kim Westbury; Kristina Massey; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Linda Lester ; Malcolm Leaphart; Marianne Zajac; Mary Kelly; Michael Murrell; Mike Duffy; Mike Sloan; Mike Summer (msummer@scana.com); Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norm Nicholson; Norman Ferris; Parkin Hunter; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Phil Hamby ; Prescott Brownell; Randal Shealy; Randy Mahan; Ray Ammarell; Rebekah Dobrasko; Reed Bull (rbull@davisfloyd.com); Rhett Bickley; Richard Kidder; Richard Mikell; Robert Keener (SKEENER@sc.rr.com); Robert Lavisky; Roger Hovis ; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; Russell Jernigan; ryanity@scana.com; Sam Drake; Sandra Reinhardt; Sean Norris; Shane Boring; Skeet Mills ; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Steve Summer; Suzanne Rhodes; Theresa Powers (tpowers@newberrycounty.net); Theresa Thom; Tim Vinson; Tom Bowles (tbowles@scana.com); Tom Eppink; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Van Hoffman; Wade Bales (balesw@dnr.sc.gov); Wenonah Haire; Mike Schimpff; Brandon Kulik; Jon Quebbeman**Subject:** FW: Saluda Hydro Generation on September 6**TO ALL RCG AND TWC MEMBERS ON BEHALF OF BILL ARGENTIERI:**

On Wednesday, September 6, SCE&G is scheduled to operate Saluda Hydro in an effort to repair the Unit 2 turbine seal which was damaged during the installation of hub baffles last year. The hub baffles were installed to improve the water quality in the lower Saluda River during times of plant generation. SCE&G plans to start generation of approximately 30 MW (between 2,500 cfs and 3,500 cfs) prior to opening the McMeekin Station circulating water by-pass valve at 6:30 am. The McMeekin Station circulating water by-pass valve discharges hot water directly into the lower Saluda River. SCE&G is required by the McMeekin DHEC permit to discharge at least 2,500 cfs when this valve is operated. At 6:30 am, SCE&G will close the intake tower head gates to seal the unit, partially dewater the unit for access to the turbine seal, and repair the seal. IF EVERYTHING GOES RIGHT (AS PLANNED) THIS SHOULD BE A ONE DAY MAINTENANCE ACTIVITY. After the repair work, the McMeekin Station by-pass valve will be closed and Saluda will stop generating in support of this maintenance activity. It is anticipated this whole operation will be completed by early evening of September 6. If SCE&G encounters problems with sealing the intake tower head gates this repair could extend into another day, which will require Saluda Hydro to continue to generate while the McMeekin Station by-pass valve is open. SCE&G is taking extra precautions with sealing the intake tower head gates. In addition to the standard several hundred pounds of cinders to help create a seal, SCE&G will also have a contractor, which specializes in sealing high pressure

water leaks, on site during the head gate closing operation to provide assistance as necessary to help with this process. SCE&G is doing everything it can in order to limit this to a one day maintenance activity.

[William R. Argentieri](#)
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
111 Research Drive
Columbia, SC 29203

Phone - (803) 217-9162
Fax - (803) 933-7849
Cell - (803) 331-0179

Danielle Fitzpatrick

From: Alison Guth**Sent:** Tuesday, September 05, 2006 5:01 PM**To:** Winward point Yacht Club ; Aaron Small; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Andy Miller; Bertina Floyd; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Cutler; Bill East; Bill Green (BGreen@smeinc.com); Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bill Mathias; Bob Olsen; Bob Seibels (bseibels@yahoo.com); Brandon Stutts ; Bret Hoffman; Brett Bursey; btrump@scana.com; Bud Badr; Buddy Baker ; Chad Long; Charlene Coleman; Charles Floyd; Charlie Compton; Charlie Rentz; Chris Judge; Chris Page; Craig Stow; Daniel Tufford; Dave Anderson; Dave Landis; David Allen; David Hancock; David Jones; David Price; Dell Isham; Dick Christie; Don Tyler; Donald Eng; Ed Diebold; Ed Duncan (duncane@mrd.dnr.state.sc.us); Ed Fetner; Edward Schnepel; Feleke Arega (aregaf@dnr.sc.gov); George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Guy Jones; Hal Beard; Hank McKellar; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scrpt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Price ; Jennifer Summerlin; Jerry Wise; Jim Devereaux; Jim Glover; Jim Goller; Jim Ruane ; JoAnn Butler; Joe Logan; Joel Huggins ; John and Rob Altenberg; John Davis (johned44@bellsouth.net); John Frick (jsfrick@mindspring.com); Jon Leader; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Kim Westbury; Kristina Massey; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Linda Lester ; Malcolm Leaphart; Marianne Zajac; Mary Kelly; Michael Murrell; Mike Duffy; Mike Sloan; Mike Summer (msummer@scana.com); Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norm Nicholson; Norman Ferris; Parkin Hunter; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Phil Hamby ; Prescott Brownell; Randal Shealy; Randy Mahan; Ray Ammarell; Rebekah Dobrasko; Reed Bull (rbull@davisfloyd.com); Rhett Bickley; Richard Kidder; Richard Mikell; Robert Keener (SKEENER@sc.rr.com); Robert Lavisky; Roger Hovis ; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; Russell Jernigan; ryanity@scana.com; Sam Drake; Sandra Reinhardt; Sean Norris; Shane Boring; Skeet Mills ; Stanley Yalicki; Steve Bell; Steve Summer; Suzanne Rhodes; Theresa Powers (tpowers@newberrycounty.net); Theresa Thom; Tim Vinson; Tom Bowles (tbowles@scana.com); Tom Eppink; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Van Hoffman; Wade Bales (balesw@dnr.sc.gov); Wenonah Haire; Mike Schimpff; Brandon Kulik; Jon Quebbeman**Subject:** FW: Saluda Hydro Generation on September 6**TO ALL RCG AND TWC MEMBERS ON BEHALF OF BILL ARGENTIERI:**

On Wednesday, September 6, SCE&G is scheduled to operate Saluda Hydro in an effort to repair the Unit 2 turbine seal which was damaged during the installation of hub baffles last year. The hub baffles were installed to improve the water quality in the lower Saluda River during times of plant generation. SCE&G plans to start generation of approximately 30 MW (between 2,500 cfs and 3,500 cfs) prior to opening the McMeekin Station circulating water by-pass valve at 6:30 am. The McMeekin Station circulating water by-pass valve discharges hot water directly into the lower Saluda River. SCE&G is required by the McMeekin DHEC permit to discharge at least 2,500 cfs when this valve is operated. At 6:30 am, SCE&G will close the intake tower head gates to seal the unit, partially dewater the unit for access to the turbine seal, and repair the seal. IF EVERYTHING GOES RIGHT (AS PLANNED) THIS SHOULD BE A ONE DAY MAINTENANCE ACTIVITY. After the repair work, the McMeekin Station by-pass valve will be closed and Saluda will stop generating in support of this maintenance activity. It is anticipated this whole operation will be completed by early evening of September 6. If SCE&G encounters problems with sealing the intake tower head gates this repair could extend into another day, which will require Saluda Hydro to continue to generate while the McMeekin Station by-pass valve is open. SCE&G is taking extra precautions with sealing the intake tower head gates. In addition to the standard several hundred pounds of cinders to help create a seal, SCE&G will also have a contractor, which specializes in sealing high pressure

water leaks, on site during the head gate closing operation to provide assistance as necessary to help with this process. SCE&G is doing everything it can in order to limit this to a one day maintenance activity.

[William R. Argentieri](#)
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
111 Research Drive
Columbia, SC 29203

Phone - (803) 217-9162
Fax - (803) 933-7849
Cell - (803) 331-0179

Stacia Hoover

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Friday, September 01, 2006 12:08 PM
To: Dave Anderson; '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'
Subject: RE: Request for names of waterfowl hunters

I just wanted to remind everyone that Marty would like any names by September 8th.

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

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2006 1:54 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
Subject: Request for names of waterfowl hunters

Please see the attached memo from Marty Phillips. The deadline for submitting any names to her is September 8th.

<< File: Request for Names.doc >>

Stacia Hoover

From: pavhamby@earthlink.net
Sent: Monday, August 28, 2006 10:42 AM
To: Alison Guth
Cc: Vicki Hamby (work)
Subject: Re: All RCG's Meeting - Saluda Operations Model Discussion

Alison:

Thanks for the heads-up. I'm scheduled to be out of town that day.

Also, I know we've mentioned in passing that "the system isn't perfect," but can you document that meetings would work better during an evening timeframe and not during regular business hours for the average homeowner. I hope FERC would understand the disconnect between regulations, rules and guidelines being determined without a reasonable accomodation for public input from the average homeowner (those of whom could be affected most by the decisions put forth). I would also hope that FERC would understand that one organization of homeowners (e.g. Lake Murray Association) should not act as the sole representation of all lakeside residents and their wishes/wants. (It would be as if their were only one political party and that one political party -whether Democrat or Republican - was considered the authority of public issues.) While there are public meetings available on occasion, the meetings seem to be more of a report of decided actions by the RCGs & TWGs (who meet during regular workings hours). As has been relayed, it does seem that the RCG and TWC meetings are where the momentum of decisions are made - by the time it makes it to the evening public meetings, things seem to be pretty firmed up.

Thanks,
Phil Hamby

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

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Aug 25, 2006 4:18 PM
To: Winward point Yacht Club , Aaron Small , Alan Axson , Alan Stuart , Alison Guth , Amanda Hill , Andy Miller , Bertina Floyd , Bill Argentieri , Bill Brebner , Bill Cutler , Bill East , BGreen@smeinc.com, Bill Hulslander , Bill Marshall , Bill Mathias , Bob Olsen , bseibels@yahoo.com, Brandon Stutts , Bret Hoffman , Brett Bursey , btrump@scana.com, Bud Badr , Buddy Baker , Chad Long , Charlene Coleman , Charles Floyd , Charlie Compton , Charlie Rentz , Chris Judge , Chris Page , Craig Stow , Daniel Tufford , Dave Anderson , Dave Landis , David Allen , David Hancock , David Jones , David Price , Dell Isham , Dick Christie , Don Tyler , Donald Eng , Ed Diebold , duncane@mrd.dnr.state.sc.us, Ed Fetner , Edward Schnepel , aregaf@dnr.sc.gov, George Duke , "Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers)" , Gina Kirkland , Guy Jones , Hal Beard , Hank McKellar , ipitts@scprt.com, Jeff Duncan , Jennifer O'Rourke , Jennifer Price , Jennifer Summerlin , Jerry Wise , Jim Devereaux , Jim Glover , Jim Goller , Jim Ruane , JoAnn Butler , Joe Logan , Joel Huggins , John and Rob Altenberg , johned44@bellsouth.net, jsfrick@mindspring.com, Jon Leader , Joy Downs , Karen Kustafik , Keith Ganz-Sarto , Ken Uschelbec , Kenneth Fox , Kim Westbury , Kristina Massey , turnerle@dhec.sc.gov, Lee Barber , Linda Lester , Malcolm Leaphart , Marianne Zajac , Mary Kelly , Michael Murrell , Mike Duffy , Mike Sloan , msummer@scana.com, Mike Waddell , Miriam Atria , Norm Nicholson , Norman Ferris , Parkin Hunter , Patricia Wendling , Patrick Moore , Phil Hamby , Prescott Brownell , Randal Shealy , Randy Mahan , Ray Ammarell ,

Rebekah Dobrasko , rbull@davisfloyd.com, Rhett Bickley , Richard Kidder , Richard Mikell , SKEENER@sc.rr.com, Robert Lavisky , Roger Hovis , Ron Ahle , Ronald Scott , Roy Parker , Russell Jernigan , ryanity@scana.com, Sam Drake , Sandra Reinhardt , Sean Norris , Shane Boring , Skeet Mills , Stanley Yalicki , Steve Bell , Steve Summer , Suzanne Rhodes , tpowers@newberrycounty.net, Theresa Thom , Tim Vinson , tbowles@scana.com, Tom Eppink , Tom Ruple , Tom Stonecypher , Tommy Boozer , Tony Bebber , Van Hoffman , balesw@dnr.sc.gov, Wenonah Haire , Mike Schimpff , Brandon Kulik , Jon Quebbeman
Subject: All RCG's Meeting - Saluda Operations Model Discussion

When: Thursday, October 12, 2006 9:30 AM-3:00 PM (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: Saluda Shoals Park - Environmental Center Auditorium

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

Hello All,

We are looking to set up a meeting for all of the RCG's to review the Saluda Operations Model, as well as the Alternative Energy Source Analysis. I have set up a tentative date of October 12th, and would like to know what everyone's availability for that date will be. Please send me your RSVP's by next Wednesday and I will issue a final meeting date accordingly. Thanks, Alison

Stacia Hoover

Subject: All RCG's Meeting - Saluda Operations Model Discussion
Location: Saluda Shoals Park - Environmental Center Auditorium
Start: Thu 10/12/2006 9:30 AM
End: Thu 10/12/2006 3:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Not yet responded
Required Attendees: All RCG & TWC Members

Hello All,

We are looking to set up a meeting for all of the RCG's to review the Saluda Operations Model, as well as the Alternative Energy Source Analysis. I have set up a tentative date of October 12th, and would like to know what everyone's availability for that date will be. Please send me your RSVP's by next Wednesday and I will issue a final meeting date accordingly.
Thanks, Alison

Stacia Hoover

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2006 9:48 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; Van Hoffman; Bill Brebner ; Charlie Rentz; David Hancock; Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer Summerlin; JoAnn Butler; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Michalec; Marty Phillips; Patricia Wendling; Ralph Crafton; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Stanley Yalicki; Tim Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tony Bebber
Subject: Article in State

Apologies to those of you that receive this twice (if your on the Safety and Recreation RCGs).

<http://www.thestate.com/mld/thestate/2006/08/13/news/local/15262844.htm>

Stacia Hoover

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2006 10:43 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 Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber
Subject: 2005 Recreation Participation & Preference Study

Tony Bebber asked me to forward this to the group:

South Carolina Recreation Participation & Preference Study, 2005, Technical Report was prepared for the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism by the University of South Carolina, Institute of Public Service and Policy Research. It provides the results of statewide telephone survey of residents age 12 and older, using a random sample of households

Copies or a summary may be downloaded from the website at: <http://www.scprt.com/our-partners/tourismstatistics/researchreports.aspx>
or are available by contacting Alesha Cushman at SCPRT, 1205 Pendleton Street, Columbia, SC 29201, 803-734-0185, acushman@scprt.com.

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
websites: www.discoversouthcarolina.com
www.SouthCarolinaParks.com
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.

Stacia Hoover

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 4:48 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 Vinson; Tom Brooks; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber
Subject: Special Presentation on Three Rivers Greenway

I wanted to invite those of you that aren't in the Safety RCG to attend a presentation by Mike Dawson on the Three Rivers Greenway Plan on Thursday, July 20 at 9:30 am. The presentation should last about an hour.

Also, as a result of writing this e-mail I discovered that I put the wrong date in previous e-mails for our Recreation RCG meeting. Our meeting is on July 21 at 9:30 am, as noted on the last set of meeting notes.

If you plan on attending the presentation (and are not in the Safety RCG), please let Alison G. know so that we may make appropriate arrangements for seating.

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2006 2:36 PM
To: RMAHAN@scana.com; 'Tom Eppink'; Theresa Thom; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bill Cutler; Bill Marshall; Jennifer O'Rourke; Karen Kustafik; Mike Waddell; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell
Subject: Saluda Generation Review TWC

Hello All,

Just a reminder that we have a Saluda Generation Review TWC meeting next Tuesday (7-11-06) at 9:30. This meeting will occur at the Lake Murray Training Center and there is currently no formal agenda for this meeting. As requested, we will be reviewing the report that Bill distributed on June 14th. I am not currently making any plans for lunch, as I do not anticipate this meeting running past noon. Nevertheless, please RSVP for this meeting so that I can get your names to the guard at the gate (if you have not yet done so). If you need directions or any other information, please feel free to email me. Thanks, Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

Stacia Hoover

From: Prescott Brownell [Prescott.Brownell@noaa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 8:22 AM
To: Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Amanda Hill (Amanda_Hill@fws.gov)'; 'Dick Christie (dchristie@infoave.net)'; 'Hal Beard'; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'; 'Patrick Moore'; 'Gina Kirkland - DHEC'; 'cdwood@usgs.gov'; 'Sarah W Ellisor'; 'Richard Roos-Collins'; 'Julie Gantenbein'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; 'Jim Ruane'; RMAHAN@scana.com; 'Ray Ammarell (RAmmarell@scana.com)'; 'Steve Summer'; 'Tom Eppink'; 'Brian J. McManus'; 'BOWLES, THOMAS M'; Alison Guth
Subject: Re: 2006 Draft Operations Guidelines



prescott.brownell.v
cf (415 B)

Based on our review of the attached report, the draft operating guidelines for 2006 should provide for adequate maintenance of dissolved oxygen levels in the Saluda River. The considerable effort put forth by S.C. Electric & Gas Company and Kleinschmidt Associates is appreciated.

regards

P. Brownell, National Marine Fisheries Service

Alan Stuart wrote:

>
> Good evening all,
>
> Attached for your review is the draft report on the 2006 Operations
> Guidelines during the low dissolved oxygen season for Saluda Hydro.
> Please review the report and provide any comments you may have by June
> 26, 2006. The Operating guidelines incorporate updated Look-up Tables
> based on the findings of the turbine testing work conducted on Units 1
> and 5 last October.
>
> A friendly reminder, to date I have not received any comments on the
> turbine testing report. Comments on that report are due by June 17,
> 2006.
>
> Don't forget that SCE&G must file the 2006 Operating Guidelines with
> the FERC by June 30, 2006. This date is established per the
> Settlement Agreement.
>
> Thank you for your efforts and patience. If you have questions please
> give me a call.
>
> Regards,
> Alan
>
> <<2006 Draft Aeration Operations Guidelines.doc>>
>

Full Name: Prescott Brownell
Last Name: Brownell
First Name: Prescott
Job Title: Fishery Biologist
Department: South Atlantic Branch Office
Company: National Marine Fisheries Service

Other Address: 217 Fort Johnson Road
Charleston, SC 29412
USA

Business: 843-953-7204
Business Fax: 843-953-7205

E-mail: prescott.brownell@noaa.gov
E-mail Display As: prescott.brownell@noaa.gov

Stacia Hoover

Subject: Updated: June 26th Cancelled, New Date
Location: Lake Murray Training Center

Start: Tue 7/11/2006 9:30 AM
End: Tue 7/11/2006 12:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Required Attendees: Saluda Generation Review TWC; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; Tom Eppink

Hello all,

Disregard the previous email, accidentally sent out a duplicate of my initial meeting notice. However, I do have news regarding our meeting date. It has been requested that we wait a week or so to give a few individuals time to review the data. Subsequently, the **June 26th meeting has been cancelled** and due to the holiday the **new meeting date will be July 11th**. This will occur at the Lake Murray Training Center. Please, again, let me know if you are coming by July 5th. Thank you and email me with any questions. Alison

Stacia Hoover

From: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Sent: Monday, June 19, 2006 6:01 PM
To: Alison Guth; Theresa Thom; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bill Cutler; Bill Marshall; Jennifer O'Rourke; Karen Kustafik; Mike Waddell; Patrick Moore
Subject: Re: Saluda Generation Review TWC Meeting

Alison- I have talked with several of the TWC members and feel it would be better if the meeting were delayed at least one week to give those who have been away on vacation to absorb the info and discuss in order to be better prepared to make the meeting more productive. Please advise. Steve Bell Lake Watch 803-730-8121

>
> From: Alison Guth <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>
> Date: 2006/06/19 Mon AM 10:57:34 EDT
> To: Theresa Thom <theresa_thom@nps.gov>, Alan Stuart
> <alan.stuart@kleinschmidtusa.com>, Alison Guth
> <alison.guth@kleinschmidtusa.com>, Bill Argentieri
> <bargentieri@scana.com>, Bill Cutler <bigbillcutler@aol.com>,
> Bill Marshall <marshallb@dnr.sc.gov>, Jennifer O'Rourke <jenno@scwf.org>,
> Karen Kustafik <kakustafik@columbiasc.net>, Mike Waddell
> <mwaddell@esri.sc.edu>, Patrick Moore <patrickm@scccl.org>, Steve Bell
> <bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net>
> Subject: Saluda Generation Review TWC Meeting
>
> When: Monday, June 26, 2006 9:30 AM-3:00 PM (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time
> (US & Canada).
> Where: Lake Murray Training Center
>
> *****
>
> Hello All,
>
> In light of the recent emails and distribution of information, we have
> scheduled a meeting Monday, June 26th at the Lake Murray Training
> Center. The focus of this meeting will be to discuss the Generation
> Information that was distributed by Bill on June 14th. Please RSVP by
> Wednesday, June 21, if you plan on attending. Thank you, Alison
>
>

Stacia Hoover

From: Patrick Moore [PatrickM@sccl.org]
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2006 11:03 AM
To: BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Bill Cutler; Bill Marshall; Jennifer O'Rourke; Kustafik, Karen; Mike Waddell; Steve Bell; Theresa Thom; gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: SCE&G Response to Operations Questions

Alan, others,

I think it would be good to schedule another meeting of the Operations TWC in the near future to discuss the report that was distributed recently. As you probably know, the level of detail being sought by the stakeholders is not present in those documents.

I know we can find ways to protect the proprietary interests of SCE&G while gleaning useful information from available records.

When is the best date to convene? I suggest June 26.

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

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

From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R [mailto:BARGENTIERI@scana.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 5:21 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth ; Bill Cutler; Bill Marshall; Jennifer O'Rourke; Kustafik, Karen; Mike Waddell; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Theresa Thom
Subject: SCE&G Response to Operations Questions

To all,

Attached is a report with an attachment that addresses and answers the questions that were presented to SCE&G at the April 6 Generation Review TWC meeting. I hope you find this information useful in understanding how we operate Saluda and the other plants within the SCE&G system. Once you have reviewed the information let Alan Stuart, our TWC facilitator, know if you are interested in having another meeting review these responses or address any additional issues.

William R. Argentieri
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
111 Research Drive
Columbia, SC 29203

Phone - (803) 217-9162
Fax - (803) 933-7849

Cell - (803) 331-0179

Stacia Hoover

From: BARGENTIERI@scana.com
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 5:21 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Bill Cutler; Bill Marshall; Jennifer O'Rourke; Kustafik, Karen; Mike Waddell; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Theresa Thom
Subject: SCE&G Response to Operations Questions

To all,

Attached is a report with an attachment that addresses and answers the questions that were presented to SCE&G at the April 6 Generation Review TWC meeting. I hope you find this information useful in understanding how we operate Saluda and the other plants within the SCE&G system. Once you have reviewed the information let Alan Stuart, our TWC facilitator, know if you are interested in having another meeting review these responses or address any additional issues.

[William R. Argentieri](#)
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
111 Research Drive
Columbia, SC 29203

Phone - (803) 217-9162
Fax - (803) 933-7849
Cell - (803) 331-0179

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of <u>2005/Q4</u>
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants)

1. Report data for plant in Service only. 2. Large plants are steam plants with installed capacity (name plate rating) of 25,000 Kw or more. Report in this page gas-turbine and internal combustion plants of 10,000 Kw or more, and nuclear plants. 3. Indicate by a footnote any plant leased or operated as a joint facility. 4. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give data which is available, specifying period. 5. If any employees attend more than one plant, report on line 11 the approximate average number of employees assignable to each plant. 6. If gas is used and purchased on a therm basis report the Btu content of the gas and the quantity of fuel burned converted to Mct. 7. Quantities of fuel burned (Line 38) and average cost per unit of fuel burned (Line 41) must be consistent with charges to expense accounts 501 and 547 (Line 42) as show on Line 20. 8. If more than one fuel is burned in a plant furnish only the composite heat rate for all fuels burned.

Line No.	Item (a)	Plant Name: V.C. Summer (2/3) (b)	Plant Name: Urquhart (c)
1	Kind of Plant (Internal Comb, Gas Turb, Nuclear)	Nuclear	Steam
2	Type of Constr (Conventional, Outdoor, Boiler, etc)	PWR	Conventional
3	Year Originally Constructed	1984	1953
4	Year Last Unit was Installed	1984	1955
5	Total Installed Cap (Max Gen Name Plate Ratings-MW)	644.00	100.00
6	Net Peak Demand on Plant - MW (60 minutes)	662	100
7	Plant Hours Connected to Load	7748	7391
8	Net Continuous Plant Capability (Megawatts)	0	0
9	When Not Limited by Condenser Water	653	94
10	When Limited by Condenser Water	644	94
11	Average Number of Employees	620	72
12	Net Generation, Exclusive of Plant Use - KWh	4979604000	602974000
13	Cost of Plant: Land and Land Rights	852850	2568878
14	Structures and Improvements	253256197	15548735
15	Equipment Costs	700776758	68700909
16	Asset Retirement Costs	40292592	597304
17	Total Cost	995178397	87415826
18	Cost per KW of Installed Capacity (line 17/5) Including	1545.3081	874.1583
19	Production Expenses: Oper, Supv, & Engr	8592594	127876
20	Fuel	22927541	13824663
21	Coolants and Water (Nuclear Plants Only)	1728818	0
22	Steam Expenses	5446592	337495
23	Steam From Other Sources	0	0
24	Steam Transferred (Cr)	0	0
25	Electric Expenses	1152921	867003
26	Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Power Expenses	22187480	542346
27	Rents	0	0
28	Allowances	0	211488
29	Maintenance Supervision and Engineering	460077	31434
30	Maintenance of Structures	3505478	108001
31	Maintenance of Boiler (or reactor) Plant	4498960	1391566
32	Maintenance of Electric Plant	2080609	334477
33	Maintenance of Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Plant	14055361	83437
34	Total Production Expenses	86636431	17859786
35	Expenses per Net KWh	0.0174	0.0296
36	Fuel: Kind (Coal, Gas, Oil, or Nuclear)	Nuclear	Coal Gas Oil
37	Unit (Coal-tons/Oil-barrel/Gas-mcf/Nuclear-indicate)	Grams	Tons MCF Barrels
38	Quantity (Units) of Fuel Burned	785352 0 0	230837 3031 109
39	Avg Heat Cont - Fuel Burned (btu/indicate if nuclear)	63750 0 0	12782 1037 140820
40	Avg Cost of Fuel/unit, as Delvd f.o.b. during year	0.000 0.000 0.000	61.290 10.590 86.100
41	Average Cost of Fuel per Unit Burned	29.194 0.000 0.000	59.720 10.590 54.950
42	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per Million BTU	0.458 0.000 0.000	2.340 10.210 9.290
43	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per KWh Net Gen	0.005 0.000 0.000	0.023 0.000 0.000
44	Average BTU per KWh Net Generation	10054.000 0.000 0.000	9795.000 0.000 0.000

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

9. Items under Cost of Plant are based on U. S. of A. Accounts. Production expenses do not include Purchased Power, System Control and Load Dispatching, and Other Expenses Classified as Other Power Supply Expenses. 10. For IC and GT plants, report Operating Expenses, Account Nos. 547 and 549 on Line 25 "Electric Expenses," and Maintenance Account Nos. 553 and 554 on Line 32, "Maintenance of Electric Plant." Indicate plants designed for peak load service. Designate automatically operated plants. 11. For a plant equipped with combinations of fossil fuel steam, nuclear steam, hydro, internal combustion or gas-turbine equipment, report each as a separate plant. However, if a gas-turbine unit functions in a combined cycle operation with a conventional steam unit, include the gas-turbine with the steam plant. 12. If a nuclear power generating plant, briefly explain by footnote (a) accounting method for cost of power generated including any excess costs attributed to research and development; (b) types of cost units used for the various components of fuel cost; and (c) any other informative data concerning plant type fuel used, fuel enrichment type and quantity for the report period and other physical and operating characteristics of plant.

Plant Name: Wateree (d)	Plant Name: McMeekin (e)	Plant Name: Canadys (f)	Line No.						
Steam	Steam	Steam	1						
Outdoor Boiler	Semi-Outdoor	Outdoor-Boiler	2						
1970	1958	1962	3						
1971	1959	1967	4						
771.80	293.60	489.60	5						
717	249	425	6						
8760	8584	8	7						
0	0	0	8						
710	250	416	9						
700	250	416	10						
100	70	84	11						
5190798000	1791603000	2198619000	12						
2454029	20741	1490017	13						
47198637	21598269	26879487	14						
367812430	137711284	194203208	15						
12021871	356682	6439911	16						
429486967	159686976	229012623	17						
556.4744	543.8930	467.7545	18						
968593	212137	1005065	19						
118923319	40992928	58096015	20						
0	0	0	21						
1104509	1658991	2364846	22						
0	0	0	23						
0	0	0	24						
2340872	719358	1215666	25						
973420	921796	1076099	26						
0	0	0	27						
1365314	524932	711274	28						
36356	13829	198391	29						
37458	67267	108477	30						
3766284	2381487	4778097	31						
527355	102967	838766	32						
321791	212176	590829	33						
130365271	47807868	70983525	34						
0.0251	0.0267	0.0323	35						
Coal	Oil	Coal	Oil	Coal	Gas	Oil			
Tons	Barrels	Tons	Barrels	Tons	MCF	Barrels			
2045767	0	22673	698973	0	1523	899763	32159	18526	38
12535	0	139359	12295	0	138961	12243	1038	139644	39
60.580	0.000	76.870	57.800	0.000	71.540	65.420	10.690	71.820	40
57.360	0.000	68.840	58.560	0.000	43.470	62.810	10.690	66.810	41
2.290	0.000	11.760	2.380	0.000	7.450	2.570	10.310	16.390	42
0.023	0.000	0.000	0.023	0.000	0.000	0.026	0.000	0.000	43
9898.000	0.000	0.000	9624.000	0.000	0.000	10085.000	0.000	0.000	44

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

1. Report data for plant in Service only. 2. Large plants are steam plants with installed capacity (name plate rating) of 25,000 Kw or more. Report in this page gas-turbine and internal combustion plants of 10,000 Kw or more, and nuclear plants. 3. Indicate by a footnote any plant leased or operated as a joint facility. 4. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give data which is available, specifying period. 5. If any employees attend more than one plant, report on line 11 the approximate average number of employees assignable to each plant. 6. If gas is used and purchased on a therm basis report the Btu content of the gas and the quantity of fuel burned converted to Mct. 7. Quantities of fuel burned (Line 38) and average cost per unit of fuel burned (Line 41) must be consistent with charges to expense accounts 501 and 547 (Line 42) as show on Line 20. 8. If more than one fuel is burned in a plant furnish only the composite heat rate for all fuels burned.

Line No.	Item (a)	Plant Name: <i>Cope</i> (b)	Plant Name: <i>USDOE Savannah River</i> (c)				
1	Kind of Plant (Internal Comb, Gas Turb, Nuclear)	Steam	Steam				
2	Type of Constr (Conventional, Outdoor, Boiler, etc)	Outdoor - Boiler	Outdoor-Boiler				
3	Year Originally Constructed	1996					
4	Year Last Unit was Installed	1996					
5	Total Installed Cap (Max Gen Name Plate Ratings-MW)	417.30	63.50				
6	Net Peak Demand on Plant - MW (60 minutes)	435	46				
7	Plant Hours Connected to Load	7366	0				
8	Net Continuous Plant Capability (Megawatts)	0	0				
9	When Not Limited by Condenser Water	420	20				
10	When Limited by Condenser Water	420	35				
11	Average Number of Employees	71	2				
12	Net Generation, Exclusive of Plant Use - KWh	2990506000	192456000				
13	Cost of Plant: Land and Land Rights	3042069	0				
14	Structures and Improvements	61368042	277999				
15	Equipment Costs	372775660	2652182				
16	Asset Retirement Costs	2512489	0				
17	Total Cost	439698260	2930181				
18	Cost per KW of Installed Capacity (line 17/5) Including	1053.6742	46.1446				
19	Production Expenses: Oper, Supv, & Engr	92285	2452503				
20	Fuel	66997490	9220799				
21	Coolants and Water (Nuclear Plants Only)	0	0				
22	Steam Expenses	238964	1246776				
23	Steam From Other Sources	0	0				
24	Steam Transferred (Cr)	0	-1924334				
25	Electric Expenses	1591924	583919				
26	Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Power Expenses	3958544	843541				
27	Rents	0	307190				
28	Allowances	81501	0				
29	Maintenance Supervision and Engineering	23236	116590				
30	Maintenance of Structures	299203	28417				
31	Maintenance of Boiler (or reactor) Plant	5835119	353971				
32	Maintenance of Electric Plant	1849948	710379				
33	Maintenance of Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Plant	2640437	1160836				
34	Total Production Expenses	83608651	15100587				
35	Expenses per Net KWh	0.0280	0.0785				
36	Fuel: Kind (Coal, Gas, Oil, or Nuclear)	Coal	Oil	Coal	Oil		
37	Unit (Coal-tons/Oil-barrel/Gas-mcf/Nuclear-indicate)	Tons	Barrels	Tons	Barrels		
38	Quantity (Units) of Fuel Burned	1123658	0	7324	178914	0	1148
39	Avg Heat Cont - Fuel Burned (btu/indicate if nuclear)	12286	0	139497	12111	0	138000
40	Avg Cost of Fuel/unit, as Delvd f.o.b. during year	59.090	0.000	69.950	66.620	0.000	80.960
41	Average Cost of Fuel per Unit Burned	59.240	0.000	59.790	65.990	0.000	74.040
42	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per Million BTU	2.410	0.000	10.200	2.720	0.000	12.780
43	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per KWh Net Gen	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.062	0.000	0.000
44	Average BTU per KWh Net Generation	9247.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

9. Items under Cost of Plant are based on U. S. of A. Accounts. Production expenses do not include Purchased Power, System Control and Load Dispatching, and Other Expenses Classified as Other Power Supply Expenses. 10. For IC and GT plants, report Operating Expenses, Account Nos. 547 and 549 on Line 25 "Electric Expenses," and Maintenance Account Nos. 553 and 554 on Line 32, "Maintenance of Electric Plant." Indicate plants designed for peak load service. Designate automatically operated plants. 11. For a plant equipped with combinations of fossil fuel steam, nuclear steam, hydro, internal combustion or gas-turbine equipment, report each as a separate plant. However, if a gas-turbine unit functions in a combined cycle operation with a conventional steam unit, include the gas-turbine with the steam plant. 12. If a nuclear power generating plant, briefly explain by footnote (a) accounting method for cost of power generated including any excess costs attributed to research and development; (b) types of cost units used for the various components of fuel cost; and (c) any other informative data concerning plant type fuel used, fuel enrichment type and quantity for the report period and other physical and operating characteristics of plant.

Plant Name: Parr #1 & 2 (d)	Plant Name: Parr #3 & 4 (e)	Plant Name: Parr Combined (f)	Line No.					
Gas Turbine	Gas Turbine	Gas Turbine	1					
Package	Package	Combination	2					
1970	1971		3					
1970	1971		4					
35.00	39.00	74.00	5					
34	42	76	6					
55	56	111	7					
0	0	0	8					
37	44	81	9					
31	38	69	10					
0	0	0	11					
926000	1109000	2035000	12					
9166	6685	15851	13					
252332	420461	672793	14					
4018796	2694783	6713579	15					
6624	4832	11456	16					
4286918	3126761	7413679	17					
122.4834	80.1734	100.1849	18					
0	0	18985	19					
0	0	320540	20					
0	0	0	21					
0	0	0	22					
0	0	0	23					
0	0	0	24					
0	0	46538	25					
0	0	15786	26					
0	0	0	27					
0	0	9932	28					
0	0	144	29					
0	0	0	30					
0	0	145271	31					
0	0	-2792	32					
0	0	0	33					
0	0	554404	34					
0.0000	0.0000	0.2724	35					
		Gas	#2 Oil	36				
		MCF	Barrels	37				
0	0	0	0	0	0	23520	2209	38
0	0	0	0	0	0	1037	158000	39
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	9.900	78.000	40
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	9.900	39.740	41
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	9.540	6.860	42
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.189	0.109	43
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	44

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

1. Report data for plant in Service only. 2. Large plants are steam plants with installed capacity (name plate rating) of 25,000 Kw or more. Report in this page gas-turbine and internal combustion plants of 10,000 Kw or more, and nuclear plants. 3. Indicate by a footnote any plant leased or operated as a joint facility. 4. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give data which is available, specifying period. 5. If any employees attend more than one plant, report on line 11 the approximate average number of employees assignable to each plant. 6. If gas is used and purchased on a term basis report the Btu content of the gas and the quantity of fuel burned converted to Mct. 7. Quantities of fuel burned (Line 38) and average cost per unit of fuel burned (Line 41) must be consistent with charges to expense accounts 501 and 547 (Line 42) as show on Line 20. 8. If more than one fuel is burned in a plant furnish only the composite heat rate for all fuels burned.

Line No.	Item (a)	Plant Name: <i>Burton #1 Peaking</i> (b)			Plant Name: <i>Burton #2 Peaking</i> (c)		
1	Kind of Plant (Internal Comb, Gas Turb, Nuclear)	Gas Turbine			Gas Turbine		
2	Type of Constr (Conventional, Outdoor, Boiler, etc)	Package			Package		
3	Year Originally Constructed	1961			1962		
4	Year Last Unit was Installed	1961			1962		
5	Total Installed Cap (Max Gen Name Plate Ratings-MW)	11.50			11.50		
6	Net Peak Demand on Plant - MW (60 minutes)	8			11		
7	Plant Hours Connected to Load	11			14		
8	Net Continuous Plant Capability (Megawatts)	0			0		
9	When Not Limited by Condenser Water	10			10		
10	When Limited by Condenser Water	9			9		
11	Average Number of Employees	0			0		
12	Net Generation, Exclusive of Plant Use - KWh	42000			77000		
13	Cost of Plant: Land and Land Rights	29076			0		
14	Structures and Improvements	116409			101813		
15	Equipment Costs	1485090			1317986		
16	Asset Retirement Costs	1844			1606		
17	Total Cost	1632419			1421405		
18	Cost per KW of Installed Capacity (line 17/5) Including	141.9495			123.6004		
19	Production Expenses: Oper, Supv, & Engr	0			0		
20	Fuel	0			0		
21	Coolants and Water (Nuclear Plants Only)	0			0		
22	Steam Expenses	0			0		
23	Steam From Other Sources	0			0		
24	Steam Transferred (Cr)	0			0		
25	Electric Expenses	0			0		
26	Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Power Expenses	0			0		
27	Rents	0			0		
28	Allowances	0			0		
29	Maintenance Supervision and Engineering	0			0		
30	Maintenance of Structures	0			0		
31	Maintenance of Boiler (or reactor) Plant	0			0		
32	Maintenance of Electric Plant	0			0		
33	Maintenance of Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Plant	0			0		
34	Total Production Expenses	0			0		
35	Expenses per Net KWh	0.0000			0.0000		
36	Fuel: Kind (Coal, Gas, Oil, or Nuclear)						
37	Unit (Coal-tons/Oil-barrel/Gas-mcf/Nuclear-indicate)						
38	Quantity (Units) of Fuel Burned	0	0	0	0	0	
39	Avg Heat Cont - Fuel Burned (btu/indicate if nuclear)	0	0	0	0	0	
40	Avg Cost of Fuel/unit, as Delvd f.o.b. during year	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
41	Average Cost of Fuel per Unit Burned	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
42	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per Million BTU	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
43	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per KWh Net Gen	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
44	Average BTU per KWh Net Generation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

9. Items under Cost of Plant are based on U. S. of A. Accounts. Production expenses do not include Purchased Power, System Control and Load Dispatching, and Other Expenses Classified as Other Power Supply Expenses. 10. For IC and GT plants, report Operating Expenses, Account Nos. 547 and 549 on Line 25 "Electric Expenses," and Maintenance Account Nos. 553 and 554 on Line 32, "Maintenance of Electric Plant." Indicate plants designed for peak load service. Designate automatically operated plants. 11. For a plant equipped with combinations of fossil fuel steam, nuclear steam, hydro, internal combustion or gas-turbine equipment, report each as a separate plant. However, if a gas-turbine unit functions in a combined cycle operation with a conventional steam unit, include the gas-turbine with the steam plant. 12. If a nuclear power generating plant, briefly explain by footnote (a) accounting method for cost of power generated including any excess costs attributed to research and development; (b) types of cost units used for the various components of fuel cost; and (c) any other informative data concerning plant type fuel used, fuel enrichment type and quantity for the report period and other physical and operating characteristics of plant.

Plant Name: <i>Burton #3 Peaking</i> (d)	Plant Name: <i>Burton Combined</i> (e)	Plant Name: <i>Hardeeville Peaking</i> (f)	Line No.
		Gas Turbine	1
		Package	2
		1963	3
		1963	4
11.50	34.50	16.30	5
7	26	4	6
8	33	1	7
0	0	0	8
10	30	15	9
9	27	12	10
0	0	0	11
37000	156000	4000	12
0	29076	5261	13
107239	325461	57556	14
1621857	4424933	2213479	15
1956	5406	2183	16
1731052	4784876	2278479	17
150.5263	138.6921	139.7840	18
0	0	0	19
0	41450	1173	20
0	0	0	21
0	0	0	22
0	0	0	23
0	0	0	24
0	60081	1513	25
0	100185	1897	26
0	0	0	27
0	0	0	28
0	16074	0	29
0	20562	67	30
0	0	0	31
0	106596	1521	32
0	3529	5459	33
0	348477	11630	34
0.0000	2.2338	2.9075	35
	Gas	#2 Oil	
	MCF	Barrels	
0	0	0	36
0	2534	215	37
0	1036	138000	38
0.000	0.000	0.000	39
0.000	0.000	0.000	40
0.000	0.000	0.000	41
0.000	0.000	0.000	42
0.000	0.000	0.000	43
0.000	0.000	0.000	44

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

1. Report data for plant in Service only. 2. Large plants are steam plants with installed capacity (name plate rating) of 25,000 Kw or more. Report in this page gas-turbine and internal combustion plants of 10,000 Kw or more, and nuclear plants. 3. Indicate by a footnote any plant leased or operated as a joint facility. 4. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give data which is available, specifying period. 5. If any employees attend more than one plant, report on line 11 the approximate average number of employees assignable to each plant. 6. If gas is used and purchased on a therm basis report the Btu content of the gas and the quantity of fuel burned converted to Mct. 7. Quantities of fuel burned (Line 38) and average cost per unit of fuel burned (Line 41) must be consistent with charges to expense accounts 501 and 547 (Line 42) as show on Line 20. 8. If more than one fuel is burned in a plant furnish only the composite heat rate for all fuels burned.

Line No.	Item (a)	Plant Name: <i>Urquhart #1 Peaking</i> (b)	Plant Name: <i>Urquhart #2 Peaking</i> (c)
1	Kind of Plant (Internal Comb, Gas Turb, Nuclear)	Gas Turbine	Gas Turbine
2	Type of Constr (Conventional, Outdoor, Boiler, etc)	Package	Package
3	Year Originally Constructed	1969	1969
4	Year Last Unit was Installed	1969	1969
5	Total Installed Cap (Max Gen Name Plate Ratings-MW)	19.60	16.30
6	Net Peak Demand on Plant - MW (60 minutes)	14	12
7	Plant Hours Connected to Load	11	9
8	Net Continuous Plant Capability (Megawatts)	0	0
9	When Not Limited by Condenser Water	20	17
10	When Limited by Condenser Water	15	14
11	Average Number of Employees	0	0
12	Net Generation, Exclusive of Plant Use - KWh	72000	63000
13	Cost of Plant: Land and Land Rights	0	0
14	Structures and Improvements	14798	12888
15	Equipment Costs	1756876	1579790
16	Asset Retirement Costs	0	0
17	Total Cost	1771674	1592678
18	Cost per KW of Installed Capacity (line 17/5) Including	90.3915	97.7103
19	Production Expenses: Oper, Supv, & Engr	0	0
20	Fuel	0	0
21	Coolants and Water (Nuclear Plants Only)	0	0
22	Steam Expenses	0	0
23	Steam From Other Sources	0	0
24	Steam Transferred (Cr)	0	0
25	Electric Expenses	0	0
26	Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Power Expenses	0	0
27	Rents	0	0
28	Allowances	0	0
29	Maintenance Supervision and Engineering	0	0
30	Maintenance of Structures	0	0
31	Maintenance of Boiler (or reactor) Plant	0	0
32	Maintenance of Electric Plant	0	0
33	Maintenance of Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Plant	0	0
34	Total Production Expenses	0	0
35	Expenses per Net KWh	0.0000	0.0000
36	Fuel: Kind (Coal, Gas, Oil, or Nuclear)		
37	Unit (Coal-tons/Oil-barrel/Gas-mcf/Nuclear-indicate)		
38	Quantity (Units) of Fuel Burned	0	0
39	Avg Heat Cont - Fuel Burned (btu/indicate if nuclear)	0	0
40	Avg Cost of Fuel/unit, as Delvd f.o.b. during year	0.000	0.000
41	Average Cost of Fuel per Unit Burned	0.000	0.000
42	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per Million BTU	0.000	0.000
43	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per KWh Net Gen	0.000	0.000
44	Average BTU per KWh Net Generation	0.000	0.000

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

9. Items under Cost of Plant are based on U. S. of A. Accounts. Production expenses do not include Purchased Power, System Control and Load Dispatching, and Other Expenses Classified as Other Power Supply Expenses. 10. For IC and GT plants, report Operating Expenses, Account Nos. 547 and 549 on Line 25 "Electric Expenses," and Maintenance Account Nos. 553 and 554 on Line 32, "Maintenance of Electric Plant." Indicate plants designed for peak load service. Designate automatically operated plants. 11. For a plant equipped with combinations of fossil fuel steam, nuclear steam, hydro, internal combustion or gas-turbine equipment, report each as a separate plant. However, if a gas-turbine unit functions in a combined cycle operation with a conventional steam unit, include the gas-turbine with the steam plant. 12. If a nuclear power generating plant, briefly explain by footnote (a) accounting method for cost of power generated including any excess costs attributed to research and development; (b) types of cost units used for the various components of fuel cost; and (c) any other informative data concerning plant type fuel used, fuel enrichment type and quantity for the report period and other physical and operating characteristics of plant.

Plant Name: Urquhart #3 Peaking (d)	Plant Name: Urquhart #4 (e)	Plant Name: Urquhart Comb 1-4 (f)	Line No.						
Gas Turbine	Gas Turbine		1						
Package			2						
1969	1999		3						
1969	1999		4						
16.30	48.80	101.00	5						
18	54	98	6						
7	308	335	7						
0	0	0	8						
15	51	103	9						
11	51	91	10						
0	0	0	11						
63000	11262000	11460000	12						
0	0	0	13						
14519	387291	429496	14						
1417089	22533816	27287571	15						
0	0	0	16						
1431608	22921107	27717067	17						
87.8287	469.6948	274.4264	18						
0	0	333519	19						
0	0	1008185	20						
0	0	0	21						
0	0	0	22						
0	0	0	23						
0	0	0	24						
0	0	110940	25						
0	0	243755	26						
0	0	0	27						
0	0	-130	28						
0	0	289439	29						
0	0	154238	30						
0	0	0	31						
0	0	426452	32						
0	0	388924	33						
0	0	2955322	34						
0.0000	0.0000	0.2579	35						
		Gas	#2 Oil						
		MCF	Barrels						
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96090	3116	38
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1037	139737	39
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	9.110	0.000	40
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	9.110	42.630	41
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	8.790	7.260	42
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.088	43
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	44

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

1. Report data for plant in Service only. 2. Large plants are steam plants with installed capacity (name plate rating) of 25,000 Kw or more. Report in this page gas-turbine and internal combustion plants of 10,000 Kw or more, and nuclear plants. 3. Indicate by a footnote any plant leased or operated as a joint facility. 4. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give data which is available, specifying period. 5. If any employees attend more than one plant, report on line 11 the approximate average number of employees assignable to each plant. 6. If gas is used and purchased on a therm basis report the Btu content of the gas and the quantity of fuel burned converted to Mct. 7. Quantities of fuel burned (Line 38) and average cost per unit of fuel burned (Line 41) must be consistent with charges to expense accounts 501 and 547 (Line 42) as show on Line 20. 8. If more than one fuel is burned in a plant furnish only the composite heat rate for all fuels burned.

Line No.	Item (a)	Plant Name: <i>Urquhart Comb Cycle</i> (b)	Plant Name: <i>Coit #1 Peaking Unit</i> (c)				
1	Kind of Plant (Internal Comb, Gas Turb, Nuclear)	Combined Cycle	Gas Turbine				
2	Type of Constr (Conventional, Outdoor, Boiler, etc)	Package	Package				
3	Year Originally Constructed	2002	1969				
4	Year Last Unit was Installed	2002	1969				
5	Total Installed Cap (Max Gen Name Plate Ratings-MW)	547.80	19.60				
6	Net Peak Demand on Plant - MW (60 minutes)	499	20				
7	Plant Hours Connected to Load	2325	28				
8	Net Continuous Plant Capability (Megawatts)	0	0				
9	When Not Limited by Condenser Water	506	20				
10	When Limited by Condenser Water	474	16				
11	Average Number of Employees	0	0				
12	Net Generation, Exclusive of Plant Use - KWh	370197000	193000				
13	Cost of Plant: Land and Land Rights	755048	36017				
14	Structures and Improvements	4428069	93790				
15	Equipment Costs	263330875	3010706				
16	Asset Retirement Costs	0	5863				
17	Total Cost	268513992	3146376				
18	Cost per KW of Installed Capacity (line 17/5) Including	490.1679	160.5294				
19	Production Expenses: Oper, Supv, & Engr	0	0				
20	Fuel	35116515	0				
21	Coolants and Water (Nuclear Plants Only)	0	0				
22	Steam Expenses	0	0				
23	Steam From Other Sources	0	0				
24	Steam Transferred (Cr)	0	0				
25	Electric Expenses	1836076	0				
26	Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Power Expenses	0	0				
27	Rents	0	0				
28	Allowances	-2011	0				
29	Maintenance Supervision and Engineering	0	0				
30	Maintenance of Structures	0	0				
31	Maintenance of Boiler (or reactor) Plant	0	0				
32	Maintenance of Electric Plant	987708	0				
33	Maintenance of Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Plant	0	0				
34	Total Production Expenses	37938288	0				
35	Expenses per Net KWh	0.1025	0.0000				
36	Fuel: Kind (Coal, Gas, Oil, or Nuclear)	Gas	#2 Oil				
37	Unit (Coal-tons/Oil-barrel/Gas-mcf/Nuclear-indicate)	MCF	Barrels				
38	Quantity (Units) of Fuel Burned	0	2638675	51310	0	0	0
39	Avg Heat Cont - Fuel Burned (btu/indicate if nuclear)	0	1036	139553	0	0	0
40	Avg Cost of Fuel/unit, as Delvd f.o.b. during year	0.000	11.240	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
41	Average Cost of Fuel per Unit Burned	0.000	11.240	53.620	0.000	0.000	0.000
42	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per Million BTU	0.000	11.820	9.150	0.000	0.000	0.000
43	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per KWh Net Gen	0.000	0.000	0.095	0.000	0.000	0.000
44	Average BTU per KWh Net Generation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

9. Items under Cost of Plant are based on U. S. of A. Accounts. Production expenses do not include Purchased Power, System Control and Load Dispatching, and Other Expenses Classified as Other Power Supply Expenses. 10. For IC and GT plants, report Operating Expenses, Account Nos. 547 and 549 on Line 25 "Electric Expenses," and Maintenance Account Nos. 553 and 554 on Line 32, "Maintenance of Electric Plant." Indicate plants designed for peak load service. Designate automatically operated plants. 11. For a plant equipped with combinations of fossil fuel steam, nuclear steam, hydro, internal combustion or gas-turbine equipment, report each as a separate plant. However, if a gas-turbine unit functions in a combined cycle operation with a conventional steam unit, include the gas-turbine with the steam plant. 12. If a nuclear power generating plant, briefly explain by footnote (a) accounting method for cost of power generated including any excess costs attributed to research and development; (b) types of cost units used for the various components of fuel cost; and (c) any other informative data concerning plant type fuel used, fuel enrichment type and quantity for the report period and other physical and operating characteristics of plant.

Plant Name: Coit #2 Peaking Unit (d)	Plant Name: Coit Combined (e)	Plant Name: Williams #1 Peaking (f)	Line No.
		Gas Turbine	1
		Package	2
1969		1972	3
1969		1972	4
19.60	39.20	27.00	5
17	37	27	6
26	54	46	7
0	0	0	8
20	40	26	9
16	32	20	10
0	0	0	11
129000	322000	575000	12
27742	63759	0	13
81148	174938	265378	14
2310134	5320840	3199059	15
4517	10380	0	16
2423541	5569917	3464437	17
123.6501	142.0897	128.3125	18
0	10717	0	19
0	59530	0	20
0	0	0	21
0	0	0	22
0	0	0	23
0	0	0	24
0	26785	0	25
0	100701	0	26
0	0	0	27
0	0	0	28
0	2447	0	29
0	0	0	30
0	0	0	31
0	12403	0	32
0	3586	0	33
0	216169	0	34
0.0000	0.6713	0.0000	35
	Gas	#2 Oil	
	MCF	Barrels	
0	0	0	36
0	0	0	37
0	0	0	38
0	0	0	39
0.000	0.000	0.000	40
0.000	0.000	0.000	41
0.000	0.000	0.000	42
0.000	0.000	0.000	43
0.000	0.000	0.000	44
0.000	0.000	0.000	44

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of <u>2005/Q4</u>
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

1. Report data for plant in Service only. 2. Large plants are steam plants with installed capacity (name plate rating) of 25,000 Kw or more. Report in this page gas-turbine and internal combustion plants of 10,000 Kw or more, and nuclear plants. 3. Indicate by a footnote any plant leased or operated as a joint facility. 4. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give data which is available, specifying period. 5. If any employees attend more than one plant, report on line 11 the approximate average number of employees assignable to each plant. 6. If gas is used and purchased on a therm basis report the Btu content of the gas and the quantity of fuel burned converted to Mct. 7. Quantities of fuel burned (Line 38) and average cost per unit of fuel burned (Line 41) must be consistent with charges to expense accounts 501 and 547 (Line 42) as show on Line 20. 8. If more than one fuel is burned in a plant furnish only the composite heat rate for all fuels burned.

Line No.	Item (a)	Plant Name: Williams #2 Peaking (b)	Plant Name: Williams Combined (c)			
1	Kind of Plant (Internal Comb, Gas Turb, Nuclear)	Gas Turbine				
2	Type of Constr (Conventional, Outdoor, Boiler, etc)	Package				
3	Year Originally Constructed	1972				
4	Year Last Unit was Installed	1972				
5	Total Installed Cap (Max Gen Name Plate Ratings-MW)	27.00	54.00			
6	Net Peak Demand on Plant - MW (60 minutes)	0	27			
7	Plant Hours Connected to Load	0	46			
8	Net Continuous Plant Capability (Megawatts)	0	0			
9	When Not Limited by Condenser Water	26	52			
10	When Limited by Condenser Water	20	40			
11	Average Number of Employees	0	0			
12	Net Generation, Exclusive of Plant Use - KWh	0	575000			
13	Cost of Plant: Land and Land Rights	0	0			
14	Structures and Improvements	55401	320779			
15	Equipment Costs	2164526	5363585			
16	Asset Retirement Costs	0	0			
17	Total Cost	2219927	5684364			
18	Cost per KW of Installed Capacity (line 17/5) Including	82.2195	105.2660			
19	Production Expenses: Oper, Supv, & Engr	0	0			
20	Fuel	0	108776			
21	Coolants and Water (Nuclear Plants Only)	0	0			
22	Steam Expenses	0	0			
23	Steam From Other Sources	0	0			
24	Steam Transferred (Cr)	0	0			
25	Electric Expenses	0	50361			
26	Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Power Expenses	0	12804			
27	Rents	0	0			
28	Allowances	0	0			
29	Maintenance Supervision and Engineering	0	4785			
30	Maintenance of Structures	0	1564			
31	Maintenance of Boiler (or reactor) Plant	0	0			
32	Maintenance of Electric Plant	0	21461			
33	Maintenance of Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Plant	0	13268			
34	Total Production Expenses	0	213019			
35	Expenses per Net KWh	0.0000	0.3705			
36	Fuel: Kind (Coal, Gas, Oil, or Nuclear)	Gas	#2 Oil			
37	Unit (Coal-tons/Oil-barrel/Gas-mcf/Nuclear-indicate)	MCF	Barrels			
38	Quantity (Units) of Fuel Burned	0	9084	301	0	0
39	Avg Heat Cont - Fuel Burned (btu/indicate if nuclear)	0	1038	138000	0	0
40	Avg Cost of Fuel/unit, as Delvd f.o.b. during year	0.000	9.960	0.000	0.000	0.000
41	Average Cost of Fuel per Unit Burned	0.000	9.960	60.910	0.000	0.000
42	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per Million BTU	0.000	9.590	10.510	0.000	0.000
43	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per KWh Net Gen	0.000	0.192	0.176	0.000	0.000
44	Average BTU per KWh Net Generation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

9. Items under Cost of Plant are based on U. S. of A. Accounts. Production expenses do not include Purchased Power, System Control and Load Dispatching, and Other Expenses Classified as Other Power Supply Expenses. 10. For IC and GT plants, report Operating Expenses, Account Nos. 547 and 549 on Line 25 "Electric Expenses," and Maintenance Account Nos. 553 and 554 on Line 32, "Maintenance of Electric Plant." Indicate plants designed for peak load service. Designate automatically operated plants. 11. For a plant equipped with combinations of fossil fuel steam, nuclear steam, hydro, internal combustion or gas-turbine equipment, report each as a separate plant. However, if a gas-turbine unit functions in a combined cycle operation with a conventional steam unit, include the gas-turbine with the steam plant. 12. If a nuclear power generating plant, briefly explain by footnote (a) accounting method for cost of power generated including any excess costs attributed to research and development; (b) types of cost units used for the various components of fuel cost; and (c) any other informative data concerning plant type fuel used, fuel enrichment type and quantity for the report period and other physical and operating characteristics of plant.

Plant Name: <i>Hagood</i> (d)	Plant Name: <i>Faber Place Peaking</i> (e)	Plant Name: <i>Cogen South</i> (f)	Line No.
		Steam	1
Gas Turbine conventional	Gas Turbine Package		2
1991	1961	1999	3
1991	1961	1999	4
121.80	11.50	99.30	5
107	5	97	6
170	10	8137	7
0	0	0	8
99	9	90	9
86	8	90	10
0	0	0	11
11832000	29000	512725706	12
96047	5151	0	13
3375072	85925	0	14
34372563	1108493	8443624	15
11590813	1414	0	16
49434495	1200983	8443624	17
405.8661	104.4333	85.0315	18
15668	0	0	19
1597135	5869	4629040	20
0	0	0	21
0	0	19410181	22
0	0	0	23
0	0	0	24
111678	10076	0	25
73922	33827	812	26
0	0	0	27
-1197	0	0	28
7503	7643	0	29
52099	3893	0	30
0	0	0	31
9580	66805	0	32
733	2536	0	33
1867121	130649	24040033	34
0.1578	4.5051	0.0469	35
			36
			37
			38
			39
			40
			41
			42
			43
			44

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

1. Report data for plant in Service only. 2. Large plants are steam plants with installed capacity (name plate rating) of 25,000 Kw or more. Report in this page gas-turbine and internal combustion plants of 10,000 Kw or more, and nuclear plants. 3. Indicate by a footnote any plant leased or operated as a joint facility. 4. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give data which is available, specifying period. 5. If any employees attend more than one plant, report on line 11 the approximate average number of employees assignable to each plant. 6. If gas is used and purchased on a therm basis report the Btu content of the gas and the quantity of fuel burned converted to Mct. 7. Quantities of fuel burned (Line 38) and average cost per unit of fuel burned (Line 41) must be consistent with charges to expense accounts 501 and 547 (Line 42) as show on Line 20. 8. If more than one fuel is burned in a plant furnish only the composite heat rate for all fuels burned.

Line No.	Item (a)	Plant Name: Jasper (b)	Plant Name: Major Maint. Accrual (c)			
1	Kind of Plant (Internal Comb, Gas Turb, Nuclear)	Combined Cycle				
2	Type of Constr (Conventional, Outdoor, Boiler, etc)	Package				
3	Year Originally Constructed	2004				
4	Year Last Unit was Installed	2004				
5	Total Installed Cap (Max Gen Name Plate Ratings-MW)	1107.00		0.00		
6	Net Peak Demand on Plant - MW (60 minutes)	932		0		
7	Plant Hours Connected to Load	0		0		
8	Net Continuous Plant Capability (Megawatts)	0		0		
9	When Not Limited by Condenser Water	931		0		
10	When Limited by Condenser Water	880		0		
11	Average Number of Employees	38		0		
12	Net Generation, Exclusive of Plant Use - KWh	1666944000		0		
13	Cost of Plant: Land and Land Rights	2641933		0		
14	Structures and Improvements	26340765		0		
15	Equipment Costs	479962358		0		
16	Asset Retirement Costs	88238		0		
17	Total Cost	509033294		0		
18	Cost per KW of Installed Capacity (line 17/5) Including	459.8313		0.0000		
19	Production Expenses: Oper, Supv, & Engr	661502		-191		
20	Fuel	129609410		0		
21	Coolants and Water (Nuclear Plants Only)	0		0		
22	Steam Expenses	0		0		
23	Steam From Other Sources	0		0		
24	Steam Transferred (Cr)	0		0		
25	Electric Expenses	1792860		5867044		
26	Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Power Expenses	676019		-3152		
27	Rents	127264		0		
28	Allowances	-1215		0		
29	Maintenance Supervision and Engineering	530549		-56		
30	Maintenance of Structures	4559		0		
31	Maintenance of Boiler (or reactor) Plant	0		-87174		
32	Maintenance of Electric Plant	1915258		-2185019		
33	Maintenance of Misc Steam (or Nuclear) Plant	51067		-24752		
34	Total Production Expenses	135367273		3566700		
35	Expenses per Net KWh	0.0812		0.0000		
36	Fuel: Kind (Coal, Gas, Oil, or Nuclear)		Gas	Oil		
37	Unit (Coal-tons/Oil-barrel/Gas-mcf/Nuclear-indicate)		MCF	Barrels		
38	Quantity (Units) of Fuel Burned	0	12010400	32979	0	0
39	Avg Heat Cont - Fuel Burned (btu/indicate if nuclear)	0	1041	139704	0	0
40	Avg Cost of Fuel/unit, as Delvd f.o.b. during year	0.000	10.640	71.880	0.000	0.000
41	Average Cost of Fuel per Unit Burned	0.000	10.640	55.820	0.000	0.000
42	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per Million BTU	0.000	10.220	9.510	0.000	0.000
43	Average Cost of Fuel Burned per KWh Net Gen	0.000	0.078	0.000	0.000	0.000
44	Average BTU per KWh Net Generation	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Name of Respondent	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2005/Q4
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company			
FOOTNOTE DATA			

Schedule Page: 402 Line No.: 1 Column: b

SCE&G's portion (2/3) of jointly owned plant.

Instruction 12 - V. C. Summer Nuclear Station

- (a) Nuclear fuel amortization, which is included in Production Expenses, is recorded using the units-of-production method and includes amounts necessary to satisfy obligations to the United States Department of Energy under a contract for disposal of spent nuclear fuel. Normal operation and maintenance costs are charged to expenses as incurred, with appropriate application of the accrual method of accounting. Pursuant to an order issued by the South Carolina Public Service Commission, refueling outage operation and maintenance costs are accrued over an 18 month period.
- (b) Cost is recorded for nuclear fuel on the batch basis. At reload, the number of new assemblies required to complete the core requirement of 157 assemblies is designated as the new batch. All costs for this new batch are reported according to classification of component by batch number. Each batch consists of costs for U308, conversion, enrichment, fabrication, and allowance for funds used during construction.
- (c) The V. C. Summer Nuclear Station is a Westinghouse PWR Nuclear Power Plant. Fuel material is UO2 contained in Zircaloy tube cladding. The equilibrium cycle has approximately 65.5 metric tons of Uranium metal with a nominal U-235 enrichment of 4.6% to 4.8%. The reactor is licensed to allow operation of 2900 Mwt.

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 2 Column: f

Parr Steam Plant functions in a combined cycle operation with four gas turbine peaking units and two heat recovery boilers. Production expenses and fuel data are for the entire operation. See column (f), lines 20-44 for combined data on Parr units

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 3 Column: c

This plant operated per lease from the US Department of Energy, dispatched to SRS steam requirements. Electric power is a by-product. "Net Capability Rating" for this plant is expected average hourly output. Labor is provided by a contracted outside vendor. The lease with the US Department of Energy expired 1/31/06 and was not renewed.

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 4 Column: c

See footnote on Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 3 column c.

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 5 Column: c

See footnote on Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 3 column c.

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 9 Column: c

See footnote on Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 3 column c.

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 10 Column: c

See footnote on Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 3 column c.

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 11 Column: c

See footnote on Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 3 column c.

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 11 Column: d

Employees not specifically assigned to individual units.

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 11 Column: e

Employees not specifically assigned to individual units.

Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 11 Column: f

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2005/Q4
FOOTNOTE DATA			

Employees not specifically assigned to individual units.

Schedule Page: 402.2 Line No.: 11 Column: b

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.2 Line No.: 11 Column: c

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.2 Line No.: 11 Column: d

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.2 Line No.: 11 Column: e

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.2 Line No.: 11 Column: f

Unattended - Automatic

Schedule Page: 402.3 Line No.: 11 Column: b

Employees not specifically assigned to individual units.

Schedule Page: 402.3 Line No.: 11 Column: c

Employees not specifically assigned to individual units.

Schedule Page: 402.3 Line No.: 11 Column: d

Employees not specifically assigned to individual units.

Schedule Page: 402.3 Line No.: 11 Column: e

Employees not specifically assigned to individual units.

Schedule Page: 402.3 Line No.: 11 Column: f

Employees not specifically assigned to individual units.

Schedule Page: 402.4 Line No.: 2 Column: b

In 2002, SCE&G placed into service two combined-cycle turbines that burn natural gas or fuel oil to produce 341 MW of new electric generation. The waste heat from the gas turbines replaces the coal-fired steam that powers two existing 75 MW steam turbines at the Urquhart Generating Station.

Schedule Page: 402.4 Line No.: 11 Column: b

Employees not specifically assigned to individual units.

Schedule Page: 402.4 Line No.: 11 Column: c

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.4 Line No.: 11 Column: d

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.4 Line No.: 11 Column: e

Unattended - automatic

Schedule Page: 402.4 Line No.: 11 Column: f

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.5 Line No.: 11 Column: b

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.5 Line No.: 11 Column: c

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.5 Line No.: 11 Column: d

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.5 Line No.: 11 Column: e

Unattended-automatic

Schedule Page: 402.5 Line No.: 11 Column: f

Cogen South is an LLC in which SCANA is a 50% investor.

Schedule Page: 402.6 Line No.: -1 Column: c

The major maintenance accrual represents an SCPSC approved reserve account capped at \$67.7 million over an eight-year period. Commencing in 2005 and continuing annually, the Company is allowed to collect \$8.5 million through electric rates to offset expenditures relating to turbine maintenance.

Pursuant to SCPSC Docket Number 2004-178-E, for the year ended December 2005, the Company incurred actual expenses in the amount of \$4.9 million for major maintenance on turbines that is subject to the major maintenance accrual. As a result, \$3.6 million plus interest

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2005/Q4
FOOTNOTE DATA			

of \$.1 million is currently recorded in a regulatory liability account that represents the net of the amount collected through rates when compared to actual expenditures for major maintenance performed on turbines.

Schedule Page: 402 Line No.: 43 Column: c1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402 Line No.: 43 Column: d1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402 Line No.: 43 Column: e1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402 Line No.: 43 Column: f1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402 Line No.: 44 Column: c1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402 Line No.: 44 Column: d1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402 Line No.: 44 Column: e1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402 Line No.: 44 Column: f1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 43 Column: b1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 43 Column: c1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402.1 Line No.: 44 Column: b1 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402.2 Line No.: 43 Column: e3 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402.3 Line No.: 43 Column: f3 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402.4 Line No.: 43 Column: b3 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402.4 Line No.: 43 Column: e3 All fuels.
Schedule Page: 402.6 Line No.: 43 Column: b2 All fuels.

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

HYDROELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants)

1. Large plants are hydro plants of 10,000 Kw or more of installed capacity (name plate ratings)
2. If any plant is leased, operated under a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or operated as a joint facility, indicate such facts in a footnote. If licensed project, give project number.
3. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give that which is available specifying period.
4. If a group of employees attends more than one generating plant, report on line 11 the approximate average number of employees assignable to each plant.

Line No.	Item (a)	FERC Licensed Project No. 1894 Plant Name: Parr (b)	FERC Licensed Project No. 516 Plant Name: Saluda (c)
1	Kind of Plant (Run-of-River or Storage)	Run-of-River	Storage
2	Plant Construction type (Conventional or Outdoor)	Conventional	Conventional
3	Year Originally Constructed	1914	1930
4	Year Last Unit was Installed	1921	1971
5	Total installed cap (Gen name plate Rating in MW)	14.80	207.30
6	Net Peak Demand on Plant-Megawatts (60 minutes)	15	201
7	Plant Hours Connect to Load	8,699	7,716
8	Net Plant Capability (in megawatts)		
9	(a) Under Most Favorable Oper Conditions	15	206
10	(b) Under the Most Adverse Oper Conditions	15	206
11	Average Number of Employees	3	3
12	Net Generation, Exclusive of Plant Use - Kwh	81,945,000	205,898,000
13	Cost of Plant		
14	Land and Land Rights	554,893	6,820,148
15	Structures and Improvements	1,330,768	3,933,900
16	Reservoirs, Dams, and Waterways	1,915,988	20,578,148
17	Equipment Costs	2,163,794	314,841,574
18	Roads, Railroads, and Bridges	104,503	233,527
19	Asset Retirement Costs	0	278
20	TOTAL cost (Total of 14 thru 19)	6,069,946	346,407,575
21	Cost per KW of Installed Capacity (line 20 / 5)	410.1315	1,671.0447
22	Production Expenses		
23	Operation Supervision and Engineering	43,938	179,016
24	Water for Power	235	0
25	Hydraulic Expenses	16,231	772,846
26	Electric Expenses	35,031	3,905
27	Misc Hydraulic Power Generation Expenses	45,644	155,712
28	Rents	0	0
29	Maintenance Supervision and Engineering	3,505	36,462
30	Maintenance of Structures	473	27
31	Maintenance of Reservoirs, Dams, and Waterways	11,014	435,185
32	Maintenance of Electric Plant	154,236	180,212
33	Maintenance of Misc Hydraulic Plant	1,084	32,841
34	Total Production Expenses (total 23 thru 33)	311,391	1,796,206
35	Expenses per net KWh	0.0038	0.0087

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of <u>2005/Q4</u>
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

HYDROELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

5. The items under Cost of Plant represent accounts or combinations of accounts prescribed by the Uniform System of Accounts. Production Expenses do not include Purchased Power, System control and Load Dispatching, and Other Expenses classified as "Other Power Supply Expenses."

6. Report as a separate plant any plant equipped with combinations of steam, hydro, internal combustion engine, or gas turbine equipment.

FERC Licensed Project No. 2532 Plant Name: Stevens Creek (d)	FERC Licensed Project No. 1895 Plant Name: Columbia Hydro (e)	FERC Licensed Project No. 0 Plant Name: (f)	Line No.
Run-of-River			1
Conventional			2
1914			3
1926			4
17.20	0.00	0.00	5
17	0	0	6
8,736	0	0	7
			8
15	0	0	9
12	0	0	10
5	0	0	11
89,057,000	0	0	12
			13
410,559	0	0	14
2,671,312	0	0	15
4,833,510	0	0	16
4,566,543	0	0	17
128,812	0	0	18
118	0	0	19
12,610,854	0	0	20
733.1892	0.0000	0.0000	21
			22
228,995	0	0	23
74,420	0	0	24
91,567	0	0	25
17,031	0	0	26
57,243	0	0	27
0	0	0	28
0	0	0	29
8,251	0	0	30
5,662	0	0	31
57,958	0	0	32
11,094	0	0	33
552,221	0	0	34
0.0062	0.0000	0.0000	35

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2005/Q4
FOOTNOTE DATA			

Schedule Page: 406 Line No.: 1 Column: b

Operated under license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Schedule Page: 406 Line No.: 1 Column: c

Operated under license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Schedule Page: 406 Line No.: 1 Column: d

Operated under license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Schedule Page: 406 Line No.: 1 Column: e

Columbia Hydro was conveyed to the City of Columbia in October 2002 as part of a franchise agreement. Effective November 2005, the Company and the City of Columbia entered into a new agreement under which the Company will continue to operate the plant until 2009. There is also a provision in the agreement for automatic extensions of one year up to ten years.

BLANK PAGE
(Next Page is 408)

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of <u>2005/Q4</u>
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

PUMPED STORAGE GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants)

1. Large plants and pumped storage plants of 10,000 Kw or more of installed capacity (name plate ratings)
2. If any plant is leased, operating under a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or operated as a joint facility, indicate such facts in a footnote. Give project number.
3. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give the which is available, specifying period.
4. If a group of employees attends more than one generating plant, report on line 8 the approximate average number of employees assignable to each plant.
5. The items under Cost of Plant represent accounts or combinations of accounts prescribed by the Uniform System of Accounts. Production Expenses do not include Purchased Power System Control and Load Dispatching, and Other Expenses classified as "Other Power Supply Expenses."

Line No.	Item (a)	FERC Licensed Project No. Plant Name: (b)	1984 Fairfield
1	Type of Plant Construction (Conventional or Outdoor)		Outdoor
2	Year Originally Constructed		1978
3	Year Last Unit was Installed		1978
4	Total installed cap (Gen name plate Rating in MW)		511
5	Net Peak Demand on Plant-Megawatts (60 minutes)		591
6	Plant Hours Connect to Load While Generating		4,289
7	Net Plant Capability (in megawatts)		576
8	Average Number of Employees		28
9	Generation, Exclusive of Plant Use - Kwh		896,430,000
10	Energy Used for Pumping		1,236,955,000
11	Net Output for Load (line 9 - line 10) - Kwh		-340,525,000
12	Cost of Plant		
13	Land and Land Rights		22,147,163
14	Structures and Improvements		35,405,715
15	Reservoirs, Dams, and Waterways		75,493,478
16	Water Wheels, Turbines, and Generators		67,439,635
17	Accessory Electric Equipment		6,924,134
18	Miscellaneous Powerplant Equipment		4,965,399
19	Roads, Railroads, and Bridges		1,328,336
20	Asset Retirement Costs		1,223
21	Total cost (total 13 thru 20)		213,705,083
22	Cost per KW of installed cap (line 21 / 4)		418.0459
23	Production Expenses		
24	Operation Supervision and Engineering		262,699
25	Water for Power		
26	Pumped Storage Expenses		125,867
27	Electric Expenses		403,517
28	Misc Pumped Storage Power generation Expenses		544,516
29	Rents		
30	Maintenance Supervision and Engineering		136,288
31	Maintenance of Structures		101
32	Maintenance of Reservoirs, Dams, and Waterways		332,733
33	Maintenance of Electric Plant		926,786
34	Maintenance of Misc Pumped Storage Plant		218,707
35	Production Exp Before Pumping Exp (24 thru 34)		2,951,214
36	Pumping Expenses		
37	Total Production Exp (total 35 and 36)		2,951,214
38	Expenses per KWh (line 37 / 9)		0.0033

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of <u>2005/Q4</u>
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

PUMPED STORAGE GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Large Plants) (Continued)

6. Pumping energy (Line 10) is that energy measured as input to the plant for pumping purposes.
7. Include on Line 36 the cost of energy used in pumping into the storage reservoir. When this item cannot be accurately computed leave Lines 36, 37 and 38 blank and describe at the bottom of the schedule the company's principal sources of pumping power, the estimated amounts of energy from each station or other source that individually provides more than 10 percent of the total energy used for pumping, and production expenses per net MWH as reported herein for each source described. Group together stations and other resources which individually provide less than 10 percent of total pumping energy. If contracts are made with others to purchase power for pumping, give the supplier contract number, and date of contract.

FERC Licensed Project No. Plant Name: (c)	0	FERC Licensed Project No. Plant Name: (d)	0	FERC Licensed Project No. Plant Name: (e)	0	Line No.
						1
						2
						3
						4
						5
						6
						7
						8
						9
						10
						11
						12
						13
						14
						15
						16
						17
						18
						19
						20
						21
						22
						23
						24
						25
						26
						27
						28
						29
						30
						31
						32
						33
						34
						35
						36
						37
						38

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of <u>2005/Q4</u>
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Small Plants)

1. Small generating plants are steam plants of, less than 25,000 Kw; internal combustion and gas turbine-plants, conventional hydro plants and pumped storage plants of less than 10,000 Kw installed capacity (name plate rating). 2. Designate any plant leased from others, operated under a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or operated as a joint facility, and give a concise statement of the facts in a footnote. If licensed project, give project number in footnote.

Line No.	Name of Plant (a)	Year Orig. Const. (b)	Installed Capacity/ Name Plate Rating (In MW) (c)	Net Peak Demand MW (60 min.) (d)	Net Generation Excluding Plant Use (e)	Cost of Plant (f)
1	Hydro-Neal Shoals	1905	4.40	7.0	11,441,000	4,273,457
2	Hydro License					
3	Project #2315					
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						
37						
38						
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						

Name of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company	This Report Is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report End of 2005/Q4
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

GENERATING PLANT STATISTICS (Small Plants) (Continued)

3. List plants appropriately under subheadings for steam, hydro, nuclear, internal combustion and gas turbine plants. For nuclear, see instruction 11, Page 403. 4. If net peak demand for 60 minutes is not available, give the which is available, specifying period. 5. If any plant is equipped with combinations of steam, hydro internal combustion or gas turbine equipment, report each as a separate plant. However, if the exhaust heat from the gas turbine is utilized in a steam turbine regenerative feed water cycle, or for preheated combustion air in a boiler, report as one plant.

Plant Cost (Incl Asset Retire. Costs) Per MW (g)	Operation Excl. Fuel (h)	Production Expenses		Kind of Fuel (k)	Fuel Costs (in cents per Million Btu) (l)	Line No.
		Fuel (i)	Maintenance (j)			
374	241,811		169,925			1
						2
						3
						4
						5
						6
						7
						8
						9
						10
						11
						12
						13
						14
						15
						16
						17
						18
						19
						20
						21
						22
						23
						24
						25
						26
						27
						28
						29
						30
						31
						32
						33
						34
						35
						36
						37
						38
						39
						40
						41
						42
						43
						44
						45
						46

Saluda Hydro Operations Questions Response Report
Generation Review TWC
April 6, 2006 Meeting

1. Provide a weekly generation report for all of the plants on the SCE&G system. At this time the group would like to see one of these reports, let's say the week of August 28, 2005. If it provides the group with the information we are looking for, I will obtain a copy of each week from January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005.

Response: The data requested regarding prior operation of all plants on our system is not maintained in the manner requested. We do not keep a weekly aggregate of generation for our plants. Thus, this information is not readily available. In addition, generation information at this level of detail is business-confidential and market-sensitive information. Disclosure of this information could result in substantial damage to SCE&G's position as both a purchaser and seller of energy in unregulated regional energy markets. Once information of this nature is disclosed to the market, there is no practical way to undo damage to SCE&G and its customers.

Nevertheless, in an effort to give you all available non-confidential material, attached are excerpts from the FERC Form - 1 annual filing made by SCE&G at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the calendar year ending December 31, 2005. These excerpts include the annual generation for each of SCE&G's facilities.

2. Provide a write-up on the reason why SCE&G operates their plants in the manner that they are operated.

Response: Describing how the units are operated on any particular day provides information of only limited value, since operations on one day do not necessarily correlate to operations on future days. Actual operations of the plants are subject to an infinitely variable set of conditions. Nevertheless, the general process/protocol (Economic Dispatch) relied upon to determine which plants/units SCE&G at least "plans" to operate is reasonably consistent.

Economic Dispatch is a generation planning tool employed faithfully at SCE&G. Twice each day, SCE&G engineers in the Economic Resource Commitment (ERC) group communicate with employees in the Transmission Services Operation Planning (OPS) group. These two functionally separate groups agree on hourly load forecasts for every hour of the coming 7 days.

Once agreement upon the forecast has been reached, the ERC engineers develop hourly economic dispatch plans to match. The economic dispatch plans that are created project a mix of planned generation from SCE&G units as well as off-system purchases. Units and purchases are economically stacked in every hour (most economically favorable to least economically favorable) to create a plan the

system can be controlled by to most economically serve its obligations – including the possibility of serving reserves.

Once the Reliability Coordinators review the economic dispatch plan and make the changes deemed necessary to preserve reliability (remember, reliability trumps economics), the result is a constrained dispatch plan. For example, it may be more economical to generate from Plant A, but the Reliability Coordinators may determine it not to be reliable to do so from a transmission of energy perspective. Conversely, it may not be as economical to generate from Plant B, but it may be necessary to do so in order to serve load in a remote area. Saluda Hydro operations provide a perfect example of this. As one of SCE&G's most economical plants, it should always be generating from a purely cost-of-generation perspective. Nevertheless, because of reliability factors, it is kept off-line so that it can be available to serve as reserves if emergencies occur. Some amount of generation must be available to respond to emergency reserve calls within the fifteen minute time period required by SCE&G's VACAR/SERC/NERC obligations.

The Reliability Coordinators hand-off the constrained dispatch plan to the System Controllers who then use it as a roadmap by which to operate the system. Inevitably, real life conditions do not exactly follow the assumptions the ERC, OPS, and Reliability Coordinators relied upon to create the plan, so the System Controllers make real time adjustments to operate the system.

3. Provide a write-up of how SCE&G uses the other plants in our system when Saluda is not available due to a scheduled outage of the whole plant or just one or two units. Last year could be a good example of the second half of this question since some of the units were not operational the entire year. What did you use for reserve when Unit 4 was not available?

Response: The use of generating units other than Saluda's units for reserves depends on the specific situation. Over time we have seen a variety of situations in which Saluda's units become unavailable to serve reserve requirements. For example, Saluda's units may be unavailable because of maintenance activities at Saluda. Likewise, sometimes it is necessary that divers be in and around the towers. Operations are suspended during this time and the units are made unavailable for use to respond to reserves until this activity is completed. A more subtle example is presented when the units are already fully loaded, perhaps in preparation for inflows from a tropical storm or hurricane or during a time when lake levels are intentionally being reduced for dam or equipment maintenance. In the hurricane example, because the units are generating, they are not offline and available in 15 minutes which are both requirements for being counted as system reserves. And even if not fully loaded, to the extent the units are loaded, we cannot count that already-in-operation capacity towards our reserves obligation.

Most situations are controllable and planned ahead of time so that the generation plans satisfy both economic and constrained dispatch objectives. For example, if divers need to work on the towers, SCE&G makes sure the work is scheduled when generation from Fairfield Pumped Storage is not needed to serve load. This allows Fairfield Pumped Storage to be dedicated for reserves. Other controllable situations are scheduled maintenance and planned releases, assuming we don't have to deal with high flows down the Broad River at the same time. Canoeing for Kids is a good example of a planned release – it's typically scheduled on a Saturday during an expected low load period. For the 2006 event, Fairfield Pumped Storage was used to carry reserves.

When Saluda units fail or require maintenance and need to be taken off line, the only option is to carry reserves on Fairfield Pumped Storage or on a combination of Fairfield Pumped Storage and quick-start turbines. A combination of the two is most common because individually, they are problematic. Fairfield Pumped Storage has certain constraints such as limited operations when the Broad River is at or above 40,000 cfs. Further discussion about turbine operations appears below in response to questions 4 and 5.

A final alternative is to back down steam generation across multiple units. This is the least desirable method of carrying reserves as well as the most costly for SCE&G customers. Because of the slow response of coal-fired generating units, to achieve the full fifteen minutes reserve requirement obligation, multiple units must be backed off if they are to be replied upon. Also, when using these units, there is a real potential for unit trips. Nevertheless, even if a plan to rely on backing down coal fired generation were to be put in place, this would not fully meet the offline and available definition of VACAR/SERC/NERC. Rather, it more closely resembles a backed down and available situation.

4. Provide a write-up of what SCE&G does in an emergency situation when Saluda is available. How is FFPS used in the equation to meet reserve? Does SCE&G use any other plants on our system to meet this reserve, if so which ones are used? Is Saluda always the first plant used during an emergency? Is Saluda the last plant used in an emergency?

Response: Fairfield Pumped Storage may be available if a base load or other currently generating unit trips. However, if the limited volume of water in Fairfield already is included in the generating plan to serve load later in the day, it may not be used to fulfill the Saluda mission for that day, i.e. to meet a reserves call. At other times however, even though Fairfield Pumped Storage may be planned for later use, if loads turn out not to be as high as forecasted, FFPS may be pressed into service to meet the emergency need. System Controllers must also consider the forecasted need for Fairfield Pumped Storage for the next day, as there may be a need to replenish the water supply for the upcoming day's use. While pumping back, obviously, FFPS cannot be counted on to supply reserves. Finally, there are flooding constraints that can take Fairfield Pumped Storage out

of the picture all together. Flows equal to or greater than 40,000 cfs in the Broad River render FFPS unavailable for operation in the generating mode. As the system changes throughout the day, multiple factors continually must be considered. Dependence on a single facility for reserves is not prudent; flexibility of reserve sources is crucial for reliability.

In addition to Fairfield Pumped Storage & Saluda Hydro, the other plants normally used for reserves are the quick-start turbines. Those are Urquhart Unit 4 and Parr units 1, 2, 3, & 4. Together they can generate about 108 MWs.

Saluda is not always the first plant used to serve reserves, nor is it always the last. As described above, there are a variety of factors to consider in determining which unit should be called upon to meet reserves.

5. How does SCE&G use the gas turbines on our system to meet reserve? Why does SCE&G not use them more than we do now? When does SCE&G use the gas turbines in general, peaking, base load, etc.? How are the gas turbines used, are they started and run for a long period of time or just a few hours a day; started and run just to meet a peak demand then shut off?

Response: See the responses to Questions 2, 3, & 4 above. Gas turbines are used to carry reserves in limited situations because they are not as reliable in meeting the strict NERC 15 minute requirements as Fairfield Pumped Storage and Saluda. Thus they are not used as often.

In general, gas turbines are used in peaking situations and normally run for very short periods of time and then shut off. They are always brought on after all steam units and most of Fairfield Pumped Storage is loaded. They are the least economical generation units and fall very late in the economic dispatch stack. Even though they are not as economical, SCE&G still runs them as peaking plants to serve load while it keeps Saluda off line for reserves. Were SCE&G to use turbines and part of Fairfield Pumped Storage for reserves, then to replace their peaking capacity, Saluda would have to be used as a peaking plant in their stead. This would mean Saluda would be used much more frequently than it is now.

6. Please provide the date, time, and MW that SCE&G was requested to provide reserve power during 2005. Provide the reason for the reserve usage, i.e. called by other utility, to meet our own emergency situation, etc. if the information is available. Which plants on the SCE&G system were used to meet the reserve request?

Response: Reports that SCE&G compiles regarding reserves operations have sensitive information belonging to companies other than SCE&G. What can be provided without violating those confidences follows. SCE&G played a role as part of the VACAR Reserve Sharing Group Agreement on 9 occasions during 2005. On 6 of those occasions SCE&G called on reserves from its VACAR Reserve Sharing Group partners. On the other 3 occasions SCE&G supplied

reserves to other companies. That makes a total of 9 Reserve Sharing Group events in which SCE&G participated. Except for the information it has shared over the past couple of years (and continues to publish) regarding its operation of Saluda to meet reserve requirements, SCE&G has not compiled reports on its use of Saluda for internal reserve needs.

7. Provide a write-up of how SCE&G determines when and at what rate to lower Lake Murray during the annual fall drawdown?

Response: SCE&G considers several factors in determining the appropriate target lake elevation during fall drawdown include current lake elevation, the need to gradually drawdown over several months, expectations and planning for “normal” winter and spring rainfall, predicted or possible severe weather conditions (such as the possibility of tropical storms or hurricanes), and the need and ability to maintain reserves during and after drawdown. Rapid drawdown of the lake always raises the specter of potential detriment to the stability of the dam. This is a major reason that SCE&G plans the annual drawdown to occur over several months. The other major issue to consider is Saluda Hydro’s availability for reserve generation as discussed in the response to Question 3. To the extent Saluda is operating for other reasons, it cannot be counted as reserves in response to its VACAR/SERC/NERC reserves obligations.

Lake Murray is not a flood storage reservoir and must be operated to allow the lake level to be lowered through plant generation without the use of the emergency spillway gates. As the name implies, the spillway gates are for emergency use, to address circumstances where inflow or expected inflow is greater than the discharge capacity of the plant at a time when the lake level is close to the normal maximum pool elevation. SCE&G goes to great pains to manage the lake level so this situation does not occur. A target water level reduction, usually one to two feet per month, has been considered a “typical” drawdown rate from late August through December in anticipation of normal rainfall from January through April of the following year. Generation during this drawdown period is performed as prudently as possible taking into account the issues described in Question 2

Statistically, the highest probability of a hurricane affecting the Saluda River Basin is in the month of September. Thus the lake level drawdown typically will start around the end of August. If there is a possibility of the approach of a tropical storm or hurricane to the Saluda River Basin area, which may appear to require lowering the lake level in anticipation of the storm, SCE&G will use a Flow Forecasting Model that evaluates data from the National Weather Service and United States Geological Survey to predict the elevation of Lake Murray under various discharge scenarios. Based on the results of specific model analyses, SCE&G will then lower the lake level as necessary to keep the level safely below elevation 360’ to maintain compliance with our FERC license. Although hurricane season ends in November, a typical lake level drawdown

continues through the end of December in anticipation of winter and spring rains as noted above.

8. Provide the times in which the Broad River flows were at or greater than 40,000 cfs in 2005.

Response: The SCE&G system dispatchers use three gages (Broad River near Carlisle (02156500), Tyger River near Delta (02160105), and Enoree River at Whitmire (02160700)) above Parr Hydro to determine when flows are **approaching** 40,000 cfs on the Broad River. The dispatchers will add the flows of these three gages to calculate the total flow in the Broad River at Fairfield Pumped Storage. To determine how many times the Broad River actually achieved flows equal to or in excess of 40,000 cfs, for this report we will look at the Broad River at Alston Gage (02161000) which is downstream of Parr Hydro on the Broad River. When the flows are at or above 40,000 cfs at the Alston Gage, Fairfield Pumped Storage will already have been taken off line in accordance with our FERC license. The attached spreadsheet lists the times the Broad River exceeded 40,000 cfs based on the Broad River at Alston Gage. The items highlighted (in yellow) show the number of times and percent of time for each month that the Broad River was at or above 40,000 cfs. Below are the exact dates/times in 2005 that the Broad River was at or above 40,000 cfs based on the Broad River at Alston Gage. SCE&G cannot validate and does not vouch for the accuracy of the data provided by the USGS gage.

March 29 - From 4 pm to 12 am

March 30 - From 1 am to 10 pm

June 2 - From 1 pm to 10 pm

October 8 - From 6 pm to 10 pm

October 9 - From 12 pm to 12 am

October 10 - From 1 am to 4 am

9. Provide a range of costs for MWHs of generation that was purchased on the open market for the last two years (2004 & 2005).

Response: This data is business confidential and market sensitive information. Disclosure of this information could result in substantial damage to SCE&G's position as both a purchaser and seller of energy in unregulated regional energy markets. Should power marketers have knowledge of these critical price points, they could adjust their bids accordingly. SCE&G could then be forced to buy energy at less favorable rates. Ultimately, SCE&G system consumers would receive less benefit from energy sales and pay a higher cost for purchased energy if market participants know SCE&G's purchasing history. Once information of this nature is disclosed to the market, there is no practical way to undo the damage to SCE&G and its customers.

Broad River at Alston Gage (02161000) Flows

MONTH			High		Total
			.00 Flows below 40,000 cfs	1.00 Flows equal to or greater than 40,000 cfs	
Jan	Count	744	0	744	
	% within MONTH	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	% within High	8.5%	.0%	8.5%	
	% of Total	8.5%	.0%	8.5%	
Feb	Count	672	0	672	
	% within MONTH	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	% within High	7.7%	.0%	7.7%	
	% of Total	7.7%	.0%	7.7%	
Mar	Count	731	13	744	
	% within MONTH	98.3%	1.7%	100.0%	
	% within High	8.4%	28.9%	8.5%	
	% of Total	8.3%	.1%	8.5%	
Apr	Count	720	0	720	
	% within MONTH	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	% within High	8.3%	.0%	8.2%	
	% of Total	8.2%	.0%	8.2%	
May	Count	744	0	744	
	% within MONTH	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	% within High	8.5%	.0%	8.5%	
	% of Total	8.5%	.0%	8.5%	
Jun	Count	710	10	720	
	% within MONTH	98.6%	1.4%	100.0%	
	% within High	8.1%	22.2%	8.2%	
	% of Total	8.1%	.1%	8.2%	

Jul	Count	744	0	744
	% within MONTH	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within High	8.5%	.0%	8.5%
	% of Total	8.5%	.0%	8.5%
Aug	Count	744	0	744
	% within MONTH	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within High	8.5%	.0%	8.5%
	% of Total	8.5%	.0%	8.5%
Sep	Count	720	0	720
	% within MONTH	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within High	8.3%	.0%	8.2%
	% of Total	8.2%	.0%	8.2%
Oct	Count	722	22	744
	% within MONTH	97.0%	3.0%	100.0%
	% within High	8.3%	48.9%	8.5%
	% of Total	8.2%	.3%	8.5%
Nov	Count	720	0	720
	% within MONTH	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within High	8.3%	.0%	8.2%
	% of Total	8.2%	.0%	8.2%
Dec	Count	744	0	744
	% within MONTH	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within High	8.5%	.0%	8.5%
	% of Total	8.5%	.0%	8.5%
Total	Count	8715	45	8760
	% within MONTH	99.5%	.5%	100.0%
	% within High	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	99.5%	.5%	100.0%

Stacia Hoover

From: Dave Anderson
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 (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: 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: Wednesday, May 24, 2006 10:17 AM
To: Dave Anderson; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Alan Axson'; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'Amanda Hill'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; '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'; RMAHAN@scana.com; 'Richard Mikell'; 'Stanley Yalicki'; 'Steve Bell'; 'Suzanne Rhodes'; 'Tim Flach'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tom Brooks'; 'Tommy Boozer'; 'Tony Bebbber'
Subject: Reminder: Vision Statement and Identified Issues

I have posted the files at the following FTP site for those of you that would like to retrieve them:

<ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Public/>

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

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 4:28 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: Lower Saluda River Recreation Angler Surveys

One of my homework assignments for the Downstream Flows TWC was to scan two creel surveys done by the SCDNR on the lower Saluda River. I thought some other members of the RCG might want to look at this information as well.

Since I had to scan them in, the file sizes are 5.6 mb for the one done in 1996-97 and 3 mb for the one done in 1998-99.

I didn't want to clog everyone's e-mail up, so if you are interested in receiving a copy, just reply to this e-mail and I will send you the PDF files. If you can't receive such large files (due to e-mail limitations or slow internet connection) and still want a copy, let me know and I will put them on a CD and mail them to you (if you provide me with a mailing address).

Stacia Hoover

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 5:28 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 Bebber
Subject: Lower Saluda River Recreation Angler Surveys

One of my homework assignments for the Downstream Flows TWC was to scan two creel surveys done by the SCDNR on the lower Saluda River. I thought some other members of the RCG might want to look at this information as well.

Since I had to scan them in, the file sizes are 5.6 mb for the one done in 1996-97 and 3 mb for the one done in 1998-99.

I didn't want to clog everyone's e-mail up, so if you are interested in receiving a copy, just reply to this e-mail and I will send you the PDF files. If you can't receive such large files (due to e-mail limitations or slow internet connection) and still want a copy, let me know and I will put them on a CD and mail them to you (if you provide me with a mailing address).

Stacia Hoover

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Friday, May 12, 2006 4:46 PM
To: 'Elymay2@aol.com'; Dave Anderson; 'vhoffman@scana.com'; 'cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net'; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'amanda_hill@fws.gov'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; 'marshallb@dnr.sc.gov'; 'cheetahrk@yahoo.com'; 'flyhotair@greenwood.net'; Dave Anderson; 'dhancock@scana.com'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'kayakduke@bellsouth.net'; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'; 'guyjones@sc.rr.com'; 'ipitts@scprt.com'; 'jeff_duncan@nps.gov'; 'jenno@scwf.org'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'jdevereaux@scana.com'; 'jbutler@scana.com'; 'kakustafik@columbiasc.net'; 'keith_ganz_sarto@hotmail.com'; Kelly Maloney; 'lmichalec@aol.com'; 'turnerle@dhec.sc.gov'; 'lbarber@sc.rr.com'; 'malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu'; 'mark_leao@fws.gov'; Marty Phillips; 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; 'miriam@lakemurraycountry.com'; 'norm@sc.rr.com'; 'wwending@sc.rr.com'; 'patrickm@scccl.org'; 'crafton@usit.net'; RMAHAN@scana.com; 'adventurec@mindspring.com'; 'Jooyalicki@aol.com'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; 'suzrhodes@juno.com'; 'tflach@thestate.com'; 'vinsont@dnr.sc.gov'; 'tbrooks@newberrycounty.net'; 'tboozier@scana.com'; 'tbebber@scprt.com'
Subject: RE: 04-17-06 Draft Recreation RCG Meeting Notes

Maybe the word "issues" is the sticking point. Issues are decided on in the RCG and a TWC could be tasked to deal with a specific issue or issues (e.g., the Recreation Management TWC). Once the TWC is tasked with an issue, they don't have to seek "approval" from the RCG to conduct a specific study in a certain way--they decide what information is needed to deal with the issue and whether or not existing information is sufficient. If there is not enough existing information to solve the issue, the study plan will be finalized in the TWC and then sent to the RCG for "informational purposes". Also, the results from the TWCs will be used by RCGs in their final recommendations to the SHRG.

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

From: Elymay2@aol.com [mailto:Elymay2@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, May 12, 2006 2:26 PM

To: Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com; vhoffman@scana.com; cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net; alan.stuart@kleinschmidtusa.com; alison.guth@kleinschmidtusa.com; amanda_hill@fws.gov; bargentieri@scana.com; marshallb@dnr.sc.gov; cheetahrk@yahoo.com; flyhotair@greenwood.net; dave.anderson@kleinschmidtusa.com; dhancock@scana.com; dchristie@infoave.net; kayakduke@bellsouth.net; gjobsis@americanrivers.org; guyjones@sc.rr.com; ipitts@scprt.com; jeff_duncan@nps.gov; jenno@scwf.org; Jennifer.Summerlin@KleinschmidtUSA.com; jdevereaux@scana.com; jbutler@scana.com; kakustafik@columbiasc.net; keith_ganz_sarto@hotmail.com; Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com; Lmichalec@aol.com; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; lbarber@sc.rr.com; malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu; mark_leao@fws.gov; marty.phillips@kleinschmidtusa.com; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; miriam@lakemurraycountry.com; norm@sc.rr.com; wwending@sc.rr.com; patrickm@scccl.org; crafton@usit.net; rmahan@scana.com; adventurec@mindspring.com; Jooyalicki@aol.com; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; suzrhodes@juno.com; tflach@thestate.com; vinsont@dnr.sc.gov; tbrooks@newberrycounty.net; tboozier@scana.com; tbebber@scprt.com

Subject: Re: 04-17-06 Draft Recreation RCG Meeting Notes

Dave: You mentioned in the following paragraph that all issues will be finalized by the TWC and then sent to the **RCG for informations purposes**. This is not my understanding of the process. It is my understanding that TWCs receive approval from RCG and not the other way around. I would like for this to read **and then sent to the RCG for approval**.

(Dave reminded the group that one of their tasks is to finalize the Standard Process Form and to review the stakeholder list on the Saluda relicensing website. There was some discussion about

the TWC sending items to the RCG for approval. **Dave noted all issues will be finalized by the TWCs and then sent to the RCG for informational purposes.)**

I also had a comment on tasks and goals and are commented on in the draft.

Thank you

Joy Downs

Executive Director

The Lake Murray Association, Inc.

803-781-8411 (fax or phone)

E-mail Elymay2@aol.com

Stacia Hoover

Subject: FW: Operations TWC Meeting
Location: Saluda Dam Field Office

Start: Wed 5/3/2006 9:30 AM
End: Wed 5/3/2006 3:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2006 4:02 PM
To: Bret Hoffman
Subject: FW: Operations TWC Meeting
When: Wednesday, May 03, 2006 9:30 AM-3:00 PM (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: Saluda Dam Field Office

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2006 12:05 PM
To: Ray Ammarell; Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri; Bob Olsen; Bud Badr; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Mike Waddell; Patrick Moore; Mike Schimpff
Subject: Operations TWC Meeting
When: Wednesday, May 03, 2006 9:30 AM-3:00 PM (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: Saluda Dam Field Office

Hello Operations TWC,

Well this was a tricky one to set up as many of you are going to be out of town. However, the most convenient date for the majority was May 3rd. We will be meeting at 9:30 am at the Dam Field Office. This is located directly opposite side of the Dam from the training center. If you would like directions just give me a call or email me. I have also been informed that there are teleconferencing abilities in this meeting place. Since I have already have a good idea who is coming based on our previous emails to set up a meeting date, there is really no need to RSVP, unless you are bringing a colleague/co-worker/friend to the meeting. Thanks and see many of you soon, Alison

Stacia Hoover

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2006 6:48 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 Bebber
Subject: Next Recreation RCG Meeting Date

For those of you that haven't seen it on the website, the next Quarterly Public Meeting has been set for July 18, 2006. I would like to hold the next Recreation RCG meeting on July 21, 2006 at the Lake Murray Training Center at 9:00 am.

Alison will request RSVPs as the meeting date approaches.

Stacia Hoover

From: C. Andy Miller [MILLERCA@dhec.sc.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2006 10:15 AM
To: jimruane@comcast.net; Alan Stuart
Cc: Alison Guth; wharden@mindspring.com; tufford@sc.edu
Subject: [BULK] RE: May 3rd meeting

Its sounds like we are firm now at the Kleinschmidt Offices at 9:30 on Wednesday. I certainly don't want to constrain the discussion but I would suggest as a potential agenda the following so that we can be sure to bring back to the RCG a report on what I believe we were charged with:

1. The need for a TMDL on Lake Murray. Should it focus on the Western side of the impoundment?
2. Sufficiency of a W2 model as a component of a TMDL
3. Is the current W2 a potential component (in principle) or would we need a new one focusing on the Western end?
4. What other models would be needed to supplement the in lake processes model?
5. What kind of extra monitoring would be needed?
6. What other data would be needed?
7. Current modeling objectives vs TMDL objectives
8. Model documentation availability
9. Larger modeling issues and concerns

Any additions/deletions?

AM

Andy Miller
Watershed Manager-Saluda/Santee
SCDHEC
Bureau of Water
(803)-898-4031

www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html
millerca@dhec.sc.gov

>>> <jimruane@comcast.net> 4/30/2006 7:12 PM >>>

It may be useful to discuss our W2 calibration process in general and show input files using AGPM, but we do not want to dwell too much on the specifics of the current model since it is being upgraded. I can also present information on our current thinking on the upgrading, but this would be only preliminary info. We would welcome comments on our current plans.

Thanks, Jim

----- Original message -----

From: Daniel Tufford <tufford@sc.edu>

> I am still interested in reviewing the technical documentation on the
> parameterization, calibration, verification, and any testing that has been
done

> with the W2 model. We were unable to conclude the discussion on this
topic by

> e-mail so I want to address it when we are talking together.

>

> Regards,

> Daniel L. Tufford, Ph.D.

> Research Assistant Professor

> University of South Carolina

> Department of Biological Sciences

> Sumwalt 209F (office)

> 701 Sumter Street, Room 401 (mail)

> Columbia, SC 29208

> e-mail: tufford@sc.edu

> web: <http://www.biol.sc.edu/~tufford>

> Ph: 803.777.3292 Fx: 803.777.3292

>

>

> Quoting Alan Stuart :

>

> > Yes, the office is located at the Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) complex
which

> > faces Hwy 302 right at the intersection with Airport Blvd. If coming
from

> > I-26, proceed through the traffic light at Airport blvd. Go to the
entrance

> > to FTZ off of 302, take the first left and Kleinschmidt's office is at the
> > end of the complex.

> >

> > -----Original Message-----

> > From: C. Andy Miller

> > To: jimruane@comcast.net; tufford@sc.edu

> > Cc: Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com;
Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com;

> > wharden@mindspring.com

> > Sent: 4/28/06 5:04 PM

> > Subject: Re: May 3rd meeting

> >

> > The Kleinschmidt offices are good with me as well, and I hope for
Wayne

> > Harden too. Is the office located in West Columbia per the phone
book?

> >

> > AM

> >

> > >> > "Jim Ruane" 4/28/2006 4:41 PM >>>

> >

> > Either place is fine with me, too....but since there are no time
> > constraints

> > at the KA office, maybe we should go for that location.

> >

> > Thanks, Jim

> >

> > Richard J. Ruane, Reservoir Environmental Mgt., Inc.

> > 900 Vine Street Suite 5

> > Chattanooga, TN 37403

> > 423-265-5820; cell: 423-605-5820; Fax: 423-266-5217;

jim@chatt.net

> >

> > ----- Original Message -----

> > From: "Dan Tufford"

> > To: "C. Andy Miller"

> > Cc: ; ;

> > ;

> > Sent: Friday, April 28, 2006 3:11 PM

> > Subject: Re: May 3rd meeting

> >

> >

> > > Either place is fine with me. Dan
> > >
> > > C. Andy Miller wrote:
> > >
> > > > Alan,
> > > >
> > > > Thanks for the offer of lunches! I'm ok with any location that
> > suits
> > > > the group. My hope was however that four hours would be plenty
if we
> > > > wanted to be disciplined with a more limited agenda. That being
> > said
> > > > and considering Jim's long journey we may want to maximize his
> > > > availability. I don't know where the Klienschmidt offices are
> > however.
> > > > The offer for DHEC offices still stands but would anyone have an
> > > > objection to the Kleinschmidt office?
> > > >
> > > > AM
> > > >
> > > > Andy Miller
> > > > Watershed Manager-Saluda/Santee
> > > > SCDHEC
> > > > Bureau of Water
> > > > (803)-898-4031
> > > >
> > > > www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html
> >
> > > > < <http://www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html>
> > >
> > > > millerca@dhec.sc.gov < <mailto:millerca@dhec.sc.gov>
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >>> Alan Stuart 4/28/2006 12:37
> > PM
> > >>>
> > > > Alison will you please take care of lunches for this meeting. It
> > would
> > seem
> > > > McAlister's or Village Gourment might be a good option.

> > > >
> > > > If the group believes this meeting will extend beyond 1:30, I will
> > propose to
> > > > meet at our Kleinschmidt office. We have enough space to
accomodate
> > > > everyone.
> > > >
> > > > Alan
> > > >
> > > > -----Original Message-----
> > > > From: C. Andy Miller
> > > > To: jimruane@comcast.net; tufford@sc.edu
> > > > Cc: Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com;
> > Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com;
> > > > wharden@mindspring.com
> > > > Sent: 4/28/06 10:07 AM
> > > > Subject: Re: RE: May 3rd meeting
> > > >
> > > > Folks,
> > > >
> > > > I'm able to retain the room here to 1:30 PM. Jim we appreciate
your
> > > > willingness to discuss these issues in detail. We can work
> > through
> > > > lunch and order in sandwiches or plan on bringing a lunch and
> > having it
> > > > indoors or out to our covered area. If we do need additional time
> > we
> > > > might be able to move to another conference room since we are a
> > fairly
> > > > small group. So, if this arraignment is acceptable to all please
> > > > respond. I'll send back a draft agenda and building directions. If
> > > > there are other items ya'll think we can discuss at the end I'll
> > adjust
> > > > accordingly.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > A
> > > >
> > > > Andy Miller
> > > > Watershed Manager-Saluda/Santee
> > > > SCDHEC

> > > > Bureau of Water
 > > > > (803)-898-4031
 > > > >
 > > > > www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html
 > >
 > > > > < <http://www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html>
 > > >
 > > > > < <http://www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html>
 > > >
 > > > > millerca@dhec.sc.gov < <mailto:millerca@dhec.sc.gov>
 > > >
 > > > >
 > > > > M
 > > > > >>> "Jim Ruane" 4/28/2006 8:24 AM >>>
 > > > >
 > > > > Hi Andy and others
 > > > >
 > > > > Meeting at DHEC is fine with me, but we should consider allowing

 > > more
 > > > > time
 > > > > for discussion, either thru lunch or after. We have a lot to cover,
 > > and
 > > > > there are a range of approaches to address the issues on your
 > > agenda.
 > > > > Each
 > > > > of these approaches will have pros and cons, and it would be
 helpful
 > > to
 > > > > identify these.
 > > > >
 > > > > Thanks, Jim
 > > > >
 > > > > Richard J. Ruane, Reservoir Environmental Mgt., Inc.
 > > > > 900 Vine Street Suite 5
 > > > > Chattanooga, TN 37403
 > > > > 423-265-5820; cell: 423-605-5820; Fax: 423-266-5217;
 jim@chatt.net
 > > > >
 > > > > ----- Original Message -----
 > > > > From: "Alan Stuart"
 > > > > To: "Daniel Tufford " ; "C. Andy Miller "

>>>>
>>>> Cc: ; "Alan Stuart"
>>>> ;>>>> "Alison Guth" ;
>>>>
>>>> **Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 6:58 PM**
>>>> **Subject: RE: RE: May 3rd meeting**
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> **Gentlemen,**
>>>>>
>>>>> **Andy if the offer still stands go ahead and have it at**
DHEC's
>> **offices.**
>>>> **Dan**
>>>>> **was correct in our conversation. However, I thought**
the meeting
>> **I**
>> **was**
>>>>> **originally planning to attend was at the training center**
and in
>> **later**
>>>>> **dicussions with Shane he alerted me they are meeting**
at Carolina
>>>> **Research**
>>>>> **Park. This location is closer to DHEC's offices. Dan,**
Thank you
>> **for**
>>> **& gt; trying.**
>>>>>
>>>>> **Thanks,**
>>>>> **Alan**
>>>>>
>>>>> **-----Original Message-----**
>>>>> **From: Daniel Tufford**
>>>>> **To: C. Andy Miller**
>>>>> **Cc: jimruane@comcast.net;**
Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com;
>>>>> **Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com;**
wharden@mindspring.com
>>>>> **Sent: 4/26/06 6:47 PM**
>>>>> **Subject: Re: RE: May 3rd meeting**
>>>>>

> > > > I spoke with Alan today at the L&LM RCG meeting and expressed my
> > > > belief
> > > > that it
> > > > is very important that he be there with us. He indicated he would
> > do
> > > > so
> > > > and
> > > > that it would be ea sier for him if we can meet at the training
> > center,
> > > > where
> > > > another RCG meeting will be going on that day that he needs to be
> > part
> > > > of as
> > > > well. He said he would check on availability of one of the
> > smaller
> > > > rooms.
> > > > Unfortunately I had to leave the RCG meeting before lunch so I do
> > not
> > > > know the
> > > > outcome of that. He did not rule out meeting with us at SCDHEC,
> > but
> > > > has
> > > > a
> > > > strong preference for something closer to his other meeting.
> > > >
> > > > I hope you were able to get a room at the training center, Alan.
> > > >
> > > > Regards,
> > > > Daniel L. Tufford, Ph.D.
> > > > Research Assistant Professor
> > > > University of South Carolina
> > > > Department of Biological Sciences
> > > > Sumwalt 209F (office)

> > > > **701 Sumter Street, Room 401 (mail)**
 > > > > **Columbia, SC 29208**
 > > > > **e-mail: tufford@sc.edu**
 > > > > **web: <http://www.biol.sc.edu/~tufford>**
 > >
 > > < <http://www.biol.sc.edu/~tufford> >
 > > > >
 > > > > **Ph: 803.777.3292 Fx: 803.777.3292**
 > > > >
 > > > >
 > > > > **Quoting "C. Andy Miller" :**
 > > > >
 > > > > > **Jim and others,**
 > > > > >
 > **& g t;** > > > > **For the May 3rd meeting, I had offered to hold it**
here at
 > > **DHEC's**
 > > > > **Bull**
 > > > > **Street**
 > > > > > **Office. 9:30 to 12:00. If this is an agreeable location**
for
 > > **you**
 > > **all**
 > > > > > **please**
 > > > > > **respond to this e-mail ccing the others and I'll send**
some
 > > > > **directions**
 > > > > > **to our**
 > > > > > **building. If another location is preferable please**
offer a
 > > > > **suggestion**
 > > > > > **to the**
 > > > > > **group.**
 > > > > >
 > > > > > **Thanks,**
 > > > > > **AM**
 > > > > >
 > > > > > **Andy Miller**
 > > > > > **Watershed Manager-Saluda/Santee**
 > > > > > **S CDHEC**
 > > > > > **Bureau of Water**
 > > > > > **(803)-898-4031**

>>>>>
>>>>> www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html
>>
>>>> < <http://www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html>
>>>
>>>> < <http://www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html>
>>>
>>>>> millerca@dhec.sc.gov
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> 4/25/2006 8:18 PM >>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Hey folks
>>>>>
>>>>> I will be there on May 3. I think in one of our
previous >> emails,
>> we
>>>>> worked
>>>>>> out a time and place, but I am working at home and
do not have
>> those
>>>>> emails.
>>>>>> I'll check them in the morning at the office, but I am
flexible
>> re:
>>>>> the time
>>>>>> on May 3 if we need to change either the time or the
place.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Thanks, Jim
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ----- Original message -----
>>>>>> From: Alan Stuart
>>>>>> I see no harm in a meeting to discuss in general
terms those
>> items
>>>>>> Andy
>>>>>>> identified in his email . These issues appear more
related to
>>>>> DHEC's
>>>>>> position as the regulatory entity of what may be

potentially

> > > > **available**

> > > > > **or**

> > > > > **required as part of the TMDL process. I believe the subject**

> > **matter**

> > > > > **Andy has**

> > > > > **identified could be discussed within or outside of the**

> > **relicensing**

> > > > > **process**

> > > > > **and without commitment by any of the parties.**

> > > > >

> > > > > **Jim, I think if you can work it in your schedule meeting face**

> > **to**

> > > > **face**

> > > > > **with**

> > > > > **Andy and Dan would prove more beneficial than a long conference**

> > > > **call.**

> > > > >

> > > > > **I have asked Alison to attend the meeting to facilitate minutes**

> > > > > **preparation.**

> > > > >

> > > > >

> > > > > **Alan**

> > > > >

> > > > >

> > > > > **Alan W. Stuart**

> > > > >

> > > > > **Senior Licensing Coordinator**

> > > > > **Kleinschmidt Energy and Water Resources**

> > > > > **101 Trade Zone Drive Suite 21A**

> > > > > **West Columbia, SC 29170**

> > > > >

> > > > > **Phone 803.822.3177**

> > > > > **Cell 803.640.8765**

> > > > >

> > > > > **-----Original Message-----**

> > > > > **From: C. Andy Miller**

[mailto:MILLERCA@dhec.sc.gov]

> >

> > > ; > <mailto:MILLERCA@dhec.sc.gov] >

> > > > > **Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 5:18 PM**

> > > > > **To: jimruane@comcast.net; tufford@sc.edu**

> > > > > **Cc: Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com;**

> > **Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com**

> > > > > **Subject: May 3rd meeting**

> > > > >

> > > > >

> > > > > **Folks,**

> > > > >

> > > > > **I'd like to express the desire that we still meet on
May 3rd as**

> > > > > **planned to**

> > > > > **discuss the issue of a TMDL on lake Murray. Even if
we have**

> > **reached**

> > > > > **something of an impasse on the release of technical
details of**

> > **the**

> > > > > **current**

> > > > > **modeling effort we should still be able to discuss:**

> > > > >

> > > > > **-The need for a TMDL on Lake Murray focusing on
the Western**

> > **side of**

> > > > > **the**

> > > > > **impoundment**

> > > > > **-Sufficiency of the W2 as component of the TMDL**

> > > > > **-Is the current W2 a potential component (in
principle) or**

> > **would we**

> > > > > **need a**

> > > > > **new one focusing on the Western end?**

> > > > > **-What other models would be needed to supplement
the in lake**

> > > > **processes**

> > > > > **model?**

> > > > > **-What kind of extra monitoring would be needed?**

> > > > > **-What other data would be needed?**

> > > > >

>>>>> **If Jim is not already going to be in Columbia that day I would**
>>>> **suggest**
>>>>> **a**
>>>>> **conference call.**
>>>>> **I think we owe it to the larger Water Quality RCG to have had**
>>>> **further**
>>>>> **discussion on the issue we were charged to address in order to**
>> **have**
>>>> **a**
>>>>> **report**
>>>>> **at the May 23rd meeting. Please respond with your thoughts and**
>> **a**
>>>>> **decision on**
>>>>> **the meeting.**
>>>>>>
>>>>>> **Thanks,**
>>>>>> **AM**
>>>>>>
>>>>>> **Andy Miller**
>>>>>> **Watershed Manager-Saluda/Santee**
>>>>>> **SCDHEC**
>>>>>> **Bureau of Water**
>>>>>> **(803)-898-4031**
>>>>>>
>>>>>> **www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html**
>>
>>>> < **<http://www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html>**
>>>
>>>> < **<http://www.scdhec.gov/water/shed/home.html>**
>>>
>>>>>> **millerca@dhec.sc.gov**
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>

Stacia Hoover

Subject: Operations TWC Meeting
Location: Saluda Dam Field Office

Start: Wed 5/3/2006 9:30 AM
End: Wed 5/3/2006 3:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Required Attendees: Operations TWC

Hello Operations TWC,

Well this was a tricky one to set up as many of you are going to be out of town. However, the most convenient date for the majority was May 3rd. We will be meeting at 9:30 am at the Dam Field Office. This is located directly opposite side of the Dam from the training center. If you would like directions just give me a call or email me. I have also been informed that there are teleconferencing abilities in this meeting place. Since I have already have a good idea who is coming based on our previous emails to set up a meeting date, there is really no need to RSVP, unless you are bringing a colleague/co-worker/friend to the meeting. Thanks and see many of you soon, Alison

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2006 11:17 AM
To: 'Larry Turner'; 'Gina Kirkland'
Subject: Saluda Hydro Operations TWC Meeting

Hello Gina and Larry,

I just wanted to shoot you guys a quick email about the Saluda Hydro Relicensing Operations Technical Working meeting to discuss the Operations Model. I had sent out an email earlier last week asking for best meeting times and it is looking like the 3rd of May is the date of choice for most people. I was wondering if this date was convenient for either one of you to attend. Thanks so much and take care. Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2006 5:53 PM
To: Ray Ammarell; Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bud Badr; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Mike Waddell; Patrick Moore; Mike Schimpff
Subject: Operations TWC Meeting

Hello all,

We are in the process of setting up a meeting date for the next Operations TWC meeting. This meeting would include discussion the progress that has been made on the model as well as a rundown of the FFM and its subsequent background data. I propose the following dates, please let me know which one(s) are available on your schedules:

May 3rd
May 16th
May 17th

Thanks, and please let me know as soon as possible. Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

Cheryl Balitz

From: Bill Marshall [MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:07 PM
To: Alan Stuart
Cc: Tony Bebber; Alison Guth; Bud Badr; Charlene Coleman; Dick Christie; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Steve Bell; Dave Anderson; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm Leaphart; Tom Stonecypher
Subject: RE: ADHOC Meeting

Alan,

Thanks for calling a meeting.

I cannot make the meeting on March 29 as I am committed to out-of-town business on March 28-30.

If you find a need to reschedule then the other days, besides Mar 28-30, in the next two weeks are open/flexible for me.

Thanks,

Bill Marshall

From: Alan Stuart [mailto:Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:29 AM
To: Tony Bebber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Charlene Coleman; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Mark Leao; Mike Summer (msummer@scana.com); Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; Randy Mahan; Ray Ammarell; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman; Tommy Boozer; Aaron Small; Alan Axson; Bill Mathias; Bret Hoffman; Dave Anderson; David Price; Edward Schnepel; Jerry Wise; Jim Devereaux; John and Rob Altenberg; Karen Kustafik; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Miriam Atria; Norm Nicholson; Norman Ferris; Tom Eppink
Subject: ADHOC Meeting

Good evening all,

I wanted to get back and respond to Steve Bell's request to convene an emergency meeting of the Operations RCG. Based on Steve's request and the flurry of emails that I've noticed going back and forth I support Steve's request to have a meeting. In monitoring the emails, I sense quite a bit of misunderstanding/miscommunication between all of the Parties in this process. I have heard no unreasonable operational alternatives requests proposed by the stakeholders and believe these need to be evaluated as part of this process. To steal a quote from Steve "everything is on the table for consideration" and well it should be during this process. All of the groups have done an outstanding job developing reasonable operational alternatives to evaluate and in my experiences this is half the battle. You have a great deal of participants in this process with very diverse backgrounds which are a great tool in defining the issues and developing potential alternatives for analysis. You should utilize these resources that you have at your disposal to the fullest extent otherwise you are cheating yourselves. Part of our job as Kleinschmidt is to ensure that each and every reasonable alternative is given serious and due consideration throughout this process. Make no mistake; I assure you this will happen because we do not want to leave any stone unturned when it comes time to evaluate the options for your comprehensive Protection, Mitigation and Enhancement Agreement (PM&EA). Remember our job as Kleinschmidt is to try and bring everyone to the table, keep everyone there, work through the issues/information needs, make sure all reasonable alternatives are given their due consideration and analysis, and ultimately assist the group's endeavors to reach consensus on recommendations.

You all have done an outstanding job identifying and scoping of the issues/interests. This is another huge step in the process that should not be taken lightly. You should be proud of this accomplishment. I have seen a lot of

progress made in the Technical Working Committees and RCG's and you should not want all of the positive efforts to deteriorate . One item I would like to touch on, it is becoming very apparent that some of the correspondence we have noticed of late may be directed on a more personal level. Folks, I made this comment early on that there are two major things (among many things) that we must all recognize in the other to make this process move forward to reach a common goal, RESPECT for each other and OPEN and HONEST communication. I know in the "heat of the argument" personalities and emotions tend to take over but let's not lose sight that everyone is in this process because they feel strongly about some issue or issues. We should RESPECT them for their opinion, the time and effort they are putting forth and just because they care that much about the project to be involved. No matter how frustrated we become at times what must be maintained is mutual respect for each other, period no questions asked. Therefore, in the future in an effort to eliminate the potential for personal attacks, I am requesting that all email correspondence for recommendations, operational alternatives analysis etc be directed by all parties to Kleinschmidt (me). I think this will help eliminate the personalize and provide more fruitful results. I'd also like to challenge everyone that in the future we all try to leave the egos and differences at the door and get back to the matter of going through the process in a very stepwise manner in working toward the common goal, the PM&EA .

Now I'll step down from the soapbox and get to the matter at hand. Since there appears to be a strong relationship between the Operations and Safety RCG's regarding operation of Saluda Hydro (with respect to potential alternatives including ramping etc) I'm proposing both the Operations and Safety groups conduct a joint RCG meeting. I believe a meeting will help to re-establish the working relationships and make sure there are no misunderstandings between the parties. Additionally, we can address the items/alternatives/issues raised in the bevy of emails which have been circulating. With that being said, I would like to convene the joint Operations/Safety RCG meeting on **Wednesday March 29, 2006 at 9:30 at the Lake Murray Training Center**. I have confirmed with Rita that space is available.

I know this is very short notice but feel this is extremely important before moving forward. Please let Alison know no later than Monday March 27 by COB that you are attending so she can get a headcount for lunch. If you have questions please email or give me a call.

Have a great evening all and my apologies for the novel,

Alan

Alan Stuart
Senior Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Energy and Water Resources
101 Trade Zone Drive Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170

Phone 803.822.3177
Cell 803.640.8765

Stacia Hoover

From: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2006 8:46 AM
To: Patrick Moore; rrcollins@n-h-i.org; jgantenbein@n-h-i.org; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; C Coleman
Cc: Alison Guth; Tony Bebbler; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; RMAHAN@scana.com; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman; vetaylor@adelphia.net
Subject: Request to schedule Operations RGC meeting

Bill- The operational procedures clearly state that everyone's issues, including SCE&G's, will be addressed during the relicensing process. It's the responsibility of the members of the RGC's to review all issues, including SCE&G's and to determine whether the issue is project related, and if so, review available information and/or request additional information thru studies etc. Charlene and Patrick M.have requested additional information on SCE&G's issue "maximum flexibility" . I believe the proper forum to review their request and SCE&G's concerns is the Operations RGC. Lake Watch would like to make a formal request that a meeting be scheduled ASAP to discuss

(1) SCE&G's position that "we fully intend to relicense Saluda for the purpose of reserve generation which, by definition, is used in times that cannot always (or even usually) be predicted."

(2) Discuss in more detail, SCE&G's ability to use existing resources other than Saluda to meet reserve requirements.

(3) Review Saluda generation record for 2005 (and other years if needed) to detemine , the frequency of use, times of day and week used, and the times and frequency other resources were used to meet reserve requirements.

(4) Discuss Charlene Coleman's and Patrick Moore's request for information on "alternatives" to maximum flexibility.

(5) A review of the operational procedures as it relates to resolving this issue, including a discussion on using Dr. Bill Cultler's , " Issue Resolution Report Template".

It is apparent from talking with other stakeholders, that there are many unanswered questions relating to reserve capacity. I understand that it will take some time to provide a report on "cost analysis" on alternatives. But in the meantime we should begin reviewing available information and resolving the issues stated above. Additionally it is important that we meet now in order to establish a record of how we resolve this issue. Please include this request as additional comments to the Operations RGC summary.

Thanks,

Steve Bell
Lake Murray Watch

>> From: "Patrick Moore" <PatrickM@sccc1.org>
> Date: 2006/03/17 Fri PM 03:53:14 EST
> To: <rrcollins@n-h-i.org> ,
> <jgantenbein@n-h-i.org> ,
> "ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R" <BARGENTIERI@scana.com> ,
> "C Coleman" <cheetahtk@yahoo.com>

> CC: "Alison Guth" <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>,
> "Tony Bebber" <tbebber@scprt.com>,
> "Alan Stuart" <alan.stuart@kleinschmidtusa.com>,
> "Alison Guth" <alison.guth@kleinschmidtusa.com>,
> "Amanda Hill" <amanda_hill@fws.gov>,
> "Bill Hulslander" <bill_hulslander@nps.gov>,
> "Bill Marshall" <marshallb@dnr.sc.gov>,
> "Bud Badr" <badrb@dnr.sc.gov>,
> "Dave Landis" <dlandis1@sc.rr.com>,
> "Dick Christie" <dchristie@infoave.net>,
> "George Duke" <kayakduke@bellsouth.net>,
> "Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers)" <gjobsis@americanrivers.org>,
> "Gina Kirkland" <kirklagl@dhec.sc.gov>,
> "Hank McKellar" <McKellarH@dnr.sc.gov>,
> "James Smith" <bkawasi@sc.rr.com>,
> "Jeff Duncan" <jeff_duncan@nps.gov>,
> "Jennifer O'Rourke" <jenno@scwf.org>,
> "Joy Downs" <elymay2@aol.com>,
> "Kristina Massey" <dvklmass@bellsouth.net>,
> "Larry Michalec" <lmichalec@aol.com>,
> <turnerle@dhec.sc.gov>,
> "Mark Leao" <mark_leao@fws.gov>,
> "SUMMER, MICHAEL C" <MSUMMER@scana.com>,
> "Mike Waddell" <mwaddell@esri.sc.edu>,
> "Parkin Hunter" <parkin@parkinhunter.com>,
> "Ralph Crafton" <crafton@usit.net>,
> "Randal Shealy" <rlshealy@aol.com>,
> "MAHAN, RANDOLPH R" <RMAHAN@scana.com>,
> "AMMARELL, RAYMOND R" <RAMMARELL@scana.com>,
> "Russell Jernigan" <rjernigan@scfbins.com>,
> "Steve Bell" <bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net>,
> "Suzanne Rhodes" <suzrhodes@juno.com>,
> "Tom Ruple" <truple@sc.rr.com>,
> "Tom Stonecypher" <stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com>,
> "Bret Hoffman" <Bret.Hoffman@KleinschmidtUSA.com>,
> <vetaylor@adelphia.net>

> Subject: RE: Operations Notes-please read

> Bill,

> Thank you for sharing SCE&G's interest in having the maximum
> flexibility at the Saluda project to meet your reserve capacity
> obligations. While we understand this is SCE&G's interest, it is
> unlikely to meet the interests of other stakeholders and the intent of
> the FERC relicensing process. The FERC process is the opportunity to
> fully explore all operational alternatives and evaluate which
> alternatives serve the public interest and best meet the interests of all stakeholders.

> To be clear, there is nothing in any applicable law or regulation, or
> even the VACAR agreement that requires SCE&G to operate Saluda as a
> reserve facility.

> While other options may not fully meet the interests of SCE&G, to
> treat other options as being "off the table" is premature. Assessing
> operational alternatives for the Saluda project, including those with
> ramping and other operational changes in TWC studies, is legitimate
> and necessary.

> Operating Saluda to meet reserve capacity obligations is a choice on
> the part of SCE&G. We must examine project impacts of this choice vs.
> the project impacts of other operation alternatives. As we continue
> in the RCGs we will be evaluating how Saluda as reserve does or does
> not meet other interests such as water quality, aquatic habitat,
> recreation, and public safety. As each of these is discussed, we must
> evaluate each issue under reserve operations and alternative
> operations. We cannot rule out alternative Saluda operations until
> they have been adequately studied.

>
> It is well within the purview of the FERC and DHEC to require
> operational changes affecting reserve capacity to assure compliance
> with federal and state laws and regulations such as the National
> Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, Federal Power Act,
> Clean Water Act, and South Carolina water quality standards. I think
> the likely outcome of the relicensing process is that SCE&G can retain
> some of their operational flexibility, and perhaps even most of the
> flexibility, but not the maximum.
>
> There are viable alternatives to operating Saluda strictly as a
> reserve facility. The Coastal Conservation League and American Rivers
> look forward to working through each of these alternatives and
> producing a comprehensive settlement to enhance all public benefits of
> the project.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> Patrick Moore
> Water Quality Associate
> Coastal Conservation League
> 1207 Lincoln St. Suite 203-C
> Columbia, S.C. 29201
> 803.771.7102
> -----Original Message-----
> From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R [mailto:BARGENTIERI@scana.com]
> Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 10:27 AM
> To: C Coleman
> Cc: Alison Guth; Tony Bebbber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill;
> Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie;
> George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank
> McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs;
> Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Mark Leao;
> SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph
> Crafton; Randal Shealy; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell
> Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret
> Hoffman
> Subject: RE: Operations Notes
>
> Charlene,
>
> Ramping will eliminate the ability for SCE&G to use Saluda as a
> contingency reserve plant and not allow us to use the plant to meet
> our system requirements. Therefore, we will need to replace the
> energy source that Saluda provides at this time. SCE&G is in the
> process of developing our alternative energy source costs that are
> necessary for the relicensing process. Once we have gathered this
> information and are in a position to present it to the Resource
> Conservation Groups we will set up a meeting for all of the RCGs.
>
> While we are on the subject, we would like to directly address an
> issue that we have talked around, but perhaps not as directly as we
> should have, and that is unrestricted use of Saluda as reserve. We
> fully understand our obligation to explore alternatives, and we will
> do so thoroughly with appropriate stakeholder input. But, at the end
> of that effort, it should be clear that to replace Saluda as reserve
> would be a multi-hundred million dollar prospect. We know the
> standard argument here, but we deeply resent any implication veiled in
> comments such as "Is generation worth a human life?" Of course, the
> short answer is "no." But that is an oversimplification. There is
> danger inherent in many worthwhile enterprises and the production and
> use of electricity is no different. Accepting that fact, as we must,
> the question must be - How do we make it less dangerous? That said,
> we fully intend to relicense Saluda for the purpose of reserve
> generation which, by definition, is used in times that cannot always
> (or even usually) be predicted. In order to protect that, we are
> willing to put a lot of other things on the table, and we will. But

> at the end of the day, we have to have Saluda as reserve.
>
> So with that in mind, how do we move forward and make the experience
> on the LSR as safe as reasonably possible? A safety plan for the
> Lower Saluda that encompasses the fact that there will be unplanned
> generation will go a part of the way toward answering that question.
>
>
> As far as the effect of riverbed scouring and fisheries, these topics
> will be investigated in the Fish & Wildlife RCG and associated
> Technical Working Committees.
>
> Bill
>
>
>
> _____
>
> From: C Coleman [mailto:cheetahtrk@yahoo.com]
> Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 12:33 PM
> To: Alison Guth; Tony Bebber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill;
> ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave
> Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers);
> Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer
> O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner
> (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell;
> Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; MAHAN,
> RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne
> Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman
> Subject: Re: Operations Notes
>
> I'd like to request a reference of comments.
>
> In the study of modeling and costs, I think a cost of ramping to
> Generation analysis, as a solution to public safety issues down
> stream, should be included. This is the only way we can make
> informative decisions in the future. Especially since every safety
> meeting refers to the idea of Ramping as an Operational issue.
>
> Also any study that relates Operations changes costs, as they are
> affected by controls that reduce neagtive resource impacts.to river
> bed scouring and fishery "Put, Grow and Take" status of the Scenic
> Saluda river.
>
> Thanks
> Charlene
>
> Alison Guth <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com> wrote:
> Hello all
> We have had a few additions and comments on the meeting notes, so I
> am sending around a copy of the notes with attached comments for
> everyone's review before they become final on Friday.
> Alison
> <<2006-01-26 draft Meeting Minutes comments- Operations.doc>>
> Alison Guth
> Licensing Coordinator
> Kleinschmidt Associates
> 101 Trade Zone Drive
> Suite 21A
> West Columbia, SC 29170
> P: (803) 822-3177
> F: (803) 822-3183
>
>
>
>
> Learn to get in touch with the silence within yourself and know that

> everything in this life has a purpose.
> - Elizabeth Kubler-Ross
> _____
>
> Yahoo! Travel
> Find great deals
> <http://us.lrd.yahoo.com/_ylc=X3oDMTFscDlocTFiBF9TAzMyOTc1MDIEX3MDMjcx
> OT
> Q4MQRwb3MDMgRzZWMDbWFpbC1mb290ZXIEc2xrA3l0LXR0/SIG=12hqieud9/**http%3a/l
> eisure.travelocity.com/Promotions/0,,YHOE%7c1381%7cvacs_main,00.html>
> to the top 10 hottest destinations!
>
>

Stacia Hoover

From: Dick Christie [dchristie@InfoAve.Net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2006 6:31 PM
To: BARGENTIERI@scana.com
Cc: Alison Guth; Tony Bebbber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis American Rivers; Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Mark Leao; SUMMER MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Ralph Crafton; RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman; vetaylor@adelphia.net; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Patrick Moore; rrcollins@n-h-i.org; jgantenbein@n-h-i.org; C Coleman
Subject: RE: Request to schedule Operations RGC meeting

Hi Bill - with this issue we are facing but one of many conflicts that will challenge us in the next few years! We should remember that we are in the discovery phase, a time when information is requested and questions are raised. If that information is not provided now, it most likely will be asked for later in the process and may result in the application being judged deficient and the issuance of an additional request for information (AIR). This often results in a delay in the issuance of a license and additional expense to the licensee. We will all be better served by the process if we avoid establishing positions and focus on the issue at hand, which is discovery! If we focus on our interests, and the information needed to evaluate those interests, we may find that a "new" solution is staring us in the face!

We think the information requests forwarded in the attached email are reasonable, and would be helpful in evaluating operational options. Further discussion would be warranted at an Operations Resource Committee meeting. Thanks.

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

From: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net [mailto:bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2006 7:46 AM
To: Patrick Moore; rrcollins@n-h-i.org; jgantenbein@n-h-i.org; ARGENTIERI WILLIAM R; C Coleman
Cc: Alison Guth; Tony Bebbber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis American Rivers; Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Mark Leao; SUMMER MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Ralph Crafton; RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman; vetaylor@adelphia.net
Subject: Request to schedule Operations RGC meeting

Bill- The operational procedures clearly state that everyone's issues, including SCE&G's, will be addressed during the relicensing process. It's the responsibility of the members of the RGC's to review all issues, including SCE&G's and to determine whether the issue is project related, and if so, review available information and/or request additional information thru studies etc. Charlene and Patrick M. have requested additional information on SCE&G's issue "maximum flexibility" . I believe the proper forum to review their request and SCE&G's concerns is the Operations RGC. Lake Watch would like to make a formal request that a meeting be scheduled ASAP to discuss

(1) SCE&G's position that "we fully intend to relicense Saluda for the purpose of reserve generation which, by definition, is used in times that cannot always (or even usually) be predicted."

(2) Discuss in more detail, SCE&G's ability to use existing resources other than Saluda to meet reserve requirements.

(3) Review Saluda generation record for 2005 (and other years if needed) to determine , the frequency of use, times of day and week used, and the times and frequency other resources were used to meet reserve requirements.

(4) Discuss Charlene Coleman's and Patrick Moore's request for information on "alternatives" to maximum flexibility.

(5) A review of the operational procedures as it relates to resolving this issue, including a discussion on using Dr. Bill Cultler's , " Issue Resolution Report Template".

It is apparent from talking with other stakeholders, that there are many unanswered questions relating to reserve capacity. I understand that it will take some time to provide a report on "cost analysis" on alternatives. But in the meantime we should begin reviewing available information and resolving the issues stated above. Additionally it is important that we meet now in order to establish a record of how we resolve this issue. Please include this request as additional comments to the Operations RGC summary.

Thanks ,

Steve Bell
Lake Murray Watch

>> From: "Patrick Moore" <PatrickM@scccl.org>
> Date: 2006/03/17 Fri PM 03:53:14 EST
> To: <rrcollins@n-h-i.org>,
> <jgantenbein@n-h-i.org>,
> "ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R" <BARGENTIERI@scana.com>,
> "C Coleman" <cheetahtrk@yahoo.com>
> CC: "Alison Guth" <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>,
> "Tony Bebber" <tbebber@scprt.com>,
> "Alan Stuart" <alan.stuart@kleinschmidtusa.com>,
> "Alison Guth" <alison.guth@kleinschmidtusa.com>,
> "Amanda Hill" <amanda_hill@fws.gov>,
> "Bill Hulslander" <bill_hulslander@nps.gov>,
> "Bill Marshall" <marshallb@dnr.sc.gov>,
> "Bud Badr" <badrb@dnr.sc.gov>,
> "Dave Landis" <dlandisl@sc.rr.com>,
> "Dick Christie" <dchristie@infoave.net>,
> "George Duke" <kayakduke@bellsouth.net>,
> "Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers)" <gjobsis@americanrivers.org>,
> "Gina Kirkland" <kirklagl@dhec.sc.gov>,
> "Hank McKellar" <McKellarH@dnr.sc.gov>,
> "James Smith" <bkawasi@sc.rr.com>,
> "Jeff Duncan" <jeff_duncan@nps.gov>,
> "Jennifer O'Rourke" <jenno@scwf.org>,
> "Joy Downs" <elymay2@aol.com>,
> "Kristina Massey" <dvklmass@bellsouth.net>,
> "Larry Michalec" <lmichalec@aol.com>,
> <turnerle@dhec.sc.gov>,
> "Mark Leao" <mark_leao@fws.gov>,
> "SUMMER, MICHAEL C" <MSUMMER@scana.com>,
> "Mike Waddell" <mwaddell@esri.sc.edu>,
> "Parkin Hunter" <parkin@parkinhunter.com>,
> "Ralph Crafton" <crafton@usit.net>,
> "Randal Shealy" <rlshealy@aol.com>,
> "MAHAN, RANDOLPH R" <RMAHAN@scana.com>,
> "AMMARELL, RAYMOND R" <RAMMARELL@scana.com>,
> "Russell Jernigan" <rjernigan@scfbins.com>,
> "Steve Bell" <bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net>,
> "Suzanne Rhodes" <suzrhodes@juno.com>,
> "Tom Ruple" <truple@sc.rr.com>,
> "Tom Stonecypher" <stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com>,
> "Bret Hoffman" <Bret.Hoffman@KleinschmidtUSA.com>,
> <vetaylor@adelphia.net>
> Subject: RE: Operations Notes-please read
>
> Bill,

>
> Thank you for sharing SCE&G's interest in having the maximum
> flexibility at the Saluda project to meet your reserve capacity
> obligations. While we understand this is SCE&G's interest, it is
> unlikely to meet the interests of other stakeholders and the intent of
> the FERC relicensing process. The FERC process is the opportunity to
> fully explore all operational alternatives and evaluate which
> alternatives serve the public interest and best meet the interests of
> all stakeholders.
>
> To be clear, there is nothing in any applicable law or regulation, or
> even the VACAR agreement that requires SCE&G to operate Saluda as a
> reserve facility.
>
> While other options may not fully meet the interests of SCE&G, to
> treat other options as being "off the table" is premature. Assessing
> operational alternatives for the Saluda project, including those with
> ramping and other operational changes in TWC studies, is legitimate
> and necessary.
>
> Operating Saluda to meet reserve capacity obligations is a choice on
> the part of SCE&G. We must examine project impacts of this choice vs.
> the project impacts of other operation alternatives. As we continue
> in the RCGs we will be evaluating how Saluda as reserve does or does
> not meet other interests such as water quality, aquatic habitat,
> recreation, and public safety. As each of these is discussed, we must
> evaluate each issue under reserve operations and alternative
> operations. We cannot rule out alternative Saluda operations until
> they have been adequately studied.
>
> It is well within the purview of the FERC and DHEC to require
> operational changes affecting reserve capacity to assure compliance
> with federal and state laws and regulations such as the National
> Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, Federal Power Act,
> Clean Water Act, and South Carolina water quality standards. I think
> the likely outcome of the relicensing process is that SCE&G can retain
> some of their operational flexibility, and perhaps even most of the
> flexibility, but not the maximum.
>
> There are viable alternatives to operating Saluda strictly as a
> reserve facility. The Coastal Conservation League and American Rivers
> look forward to working through each of these alternatives and
> producing a comprehensive settlement to enhance all public benefits of
> the project.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> Patrick Moore
> Water Quality Associate
> Coastal Conservation League
> 1207 Lincoln St. Suite 203-C
> Columbia, S.C. 29201
> 803.771.7102
> -----Original Message-----
> From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R [mailto:BARGENTIERI@scana.com]
> Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 10:27 AM
> To: C Coleman
> Cc: Alison Guth; Tony Bebbler; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill;
> Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie;
> George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank
> McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs;
> Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Mark Leao;
> SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph
> Crafton; Randal Shealy; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R;
> Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom
> Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman
> Subject: RE: Operations Notes

>
> Charlene,
>
> Ramping will eliminate the ability for SCE&G to use Saluda as a
> contingency reserve plant and not allow us to use the plant to meet
> our system requirements. Therefore, we will need to replace the
> energy source that Saluda provides at this time. SCE&G is in the
> process of developing our alternative energy source costs that are
> necessary for the relicensing process. Once we have gathered this
> information and are in a position to present it to the Resource
> Conservation Groups we will set up a meeting for all of the RCGs.
>
> While we are on the subject, we would like to directly address an
> issue that we have talked around, but perhaps not as directly as we
> should have, and that is unrestricted use of Saluda as reserve. We
> fully understand our obligation to explore alternatives, and we will
> do so thoroughly with appropriate stakeholder input. But, at the end
> of that effort, it should be clear that to replace Saluda as reserve
> would be a multi-hundred million dollar prospect. We know the
> standard argument here, but we deeply resent any implication veiled in
> comments such as "Is generation worth a human life?" Of course, the
> short answer is "no." But that is an oversimplification. There is
> danger inherent in many worthwhile enterprises and the production and
> use of electricity is no different. Accepting that fact, as we must,
> the question must be - How do we make it less dangerous? That said,
> we fully intend to relicense Saluda for the purpose of reserve
> generation which, by definition, is used in times that cannot always
> (or even usually) be predicted. In order to protect that, we are
> willing to put a lot of other things on the table, and we will. But
> at the end of the day, we have to have Saluda as reserve.
>
> So with that in mind, how do we move forward and make the experience
> on the LSR as safe as reasonably possible? A safety plan for the
> Lower Saluda that encompasses the fact that there will be unplanned
> generation will go a part of the way toward answering that question.
>
>
> As far as the effect of riverbed scouring and fisheries, these topics
> will be investigated in the Fish & Wildlife RCG and associated
> Technical Working Committees.

> Bill

>
> _____
>
> From: C Coleman [mailto:cheetahrk@yahoo.com]
> Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 12:33 PM
> To: Alison Guth; Tony Bebber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill;
> ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave
> Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers);
> Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer
> O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner
> (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell;
> Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; MAHAN,
> RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne
> Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman
> Subject: Re: Operations Notes

> I'd like to request a reference of comments.

>
> In the study of modeling and costs, I think a cost of ramping to
> Generation analysis, as a solution to public safety issues down
> stream, should be included. This is the only way we can make
> informative decisions in the future. Especially since every safety
> meeting refers to the idea of Ramping as an Operational issue.

>
> Also any study that relates Operations changes costs, as they are
> affected by controls that reduce neagtive resource impacts.to river
> bed scouring and fishery "Put, Grow and Take" status of the Scenic
> Saluda river.
>
> Thanks
> Charlene
>
> Alison Guth <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com> wrote:
> Hello all
> We have had a few additions and comments on the meeting notes, so I
> am sending around a copy of the notes with attached comments for
> everyone's review before they become final on Friday.
> Alison
> <<2006-01-26 draft Meeting Minutes comments- Operations.doc>>
> Alison Guth
> Licensing Coordinator
> Kleinschmidt Associates
> 101 Trade Zone Drive
> Suite 21A
> West Columbia, SC 29170
> P: (803) 822-3177
> F: (803) 822-3183
>
>
>
> Learn to get in touch with the silence within yourself and know that
> everything in this life has a purpose.
> - Elizabeth Kubler-Ross
> _____
>
> Yahoo! Travel
> Find great deals
> <http://us.lrd.yahoo.com/_ylc=X3oDMTFscDlocTFiBF9TAzMyOTc1MDIEX3MDMjcxOTQ4MQRwb3MDMgRzZWMDbWFpbC1mb290ZXIEc2xrA3l0LXR0/SIG=12hqieud9/**http%3a/eisure.travelocity.com/Promotions/0,,YHOE%7c1381%7cvacs_main,00.html>
> to the top 10 hottest destinations!
>
>

Stacia Hoover

From: Amanda_Hill@fws.gov
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2006 9:57 AM
To: Alan Stuart
Cc: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; 'Hal Beard' ; 'Brian J. McManus' ; 'cdwood@usgs.gov' ; 'Dick Christie (dchristie@infoave.net)' ; 'Julie Gantenbein' ; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org' ; 'Jim Ruane' ; 'Gina Kirkland - DHEC' ; 'Patrick Moore' ; 'Prescott Brownell (Prescott.Brownell@noaa.gov)' ; 'Ray Ammarell (RAmmarell@scana.com)' ; RMAHAN@scana.com; 'Richard Roos-Collins' ; 'Sarah W Ellisor' ; 'Steve Summer' ; 'BOWLES, THOMAS M' ; 'Tom Eppink' '
Subject: Re: Saluda Hydro Operations Meeting Agenda



Agenda.doc (19 KB)

Hello Alan,

Due to unforeseen scheduling changes, I will be in Atlanta at our Regional Office on Thursday and unable to attend or call in. Please keep me apprised of the information presented at the meeting. Thanks.

Amanda Hill
Fisheries Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
176 Croghan Spur Rd., Suite 200
Charleston, SC 29407
843-727-4707 ext. 303
843-727-4218 fax
amanda_hill@fws.gov

NOTE NEW PHONE EXTENSION

"Our mission is working with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish, wildlife and plants and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people."

Alan Stuart
<Alan.Stuart@Klei
nschmidtUSA.com>

03/20/2006 08:09
AM

To

Alan Stuart
<Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com>,
' 'Amanda Hill
(Amanda_Hill@fws.gov)' ' "
<Amanda_Hill@fws.gov>, "'Dick
Christie (dchristie@infoave.net)'
' " <dchristie@infoave.net>, 'Hal
Beard' '
<BeardH@scdnr.state.sc.us>,
' 'Prescott Brownell
(Prescott.Brownell@noaa.gov)' ' "
<Prescott.Brownell@noaa.gov>,
' "'gjobsis@americanrivers.org' ' "
<gjobsis@americanrivers.org>,
' 'Patrick Moore' '
<PatrickM@scccl.org>, 'Gina
Kirkland - DHEC' '
<KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov>,
' "'cdwood@usgs.gov' ' "

<cdwood@usgs.gov>, 'Sarah W
Ellisor' ' <sellisor@usgs.gov>,
'Richard Roos-Collins' '
<rrcollins@n-h-i.org>, 'Julie
Gantenbein' '
<gantenbein@n-h-i.org>

cc

'Bill Argentieri' '
<BArgentieri@scana.com>, 'Jim
Ruane' ' <jimruane@comcast.net>,
'Randy Mahan (RMahan@scana.com)' '
' <RMahan@scana.com>, 'Ray
Ammarell (RAmmarell@scana.com)' '
<RAmmarell@scana.com>, 'Steve
Summer' ' <SSummer@scana.com>,
'Tom Eppink' '
<TEppink@scana.com>, 'Brian J.
McManus' '
<bjmcmanus@JonesDay.com>,
'BOWLES, THOMAS M' '
<TBOWLES@scana.com>, Alison Guth
<Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>,
'EPPINK, THOMAS G' '
<TEPPINK@scana.com>

Subject

Saluda Hydro Operations Meeting
Agenda

Good morning all,

Please find the attached agenda for our upcoming meeting on March 23, 2006 at CAROLINA RESEARCH PARK (CRP. As you will see we have a pretty full day so please be prompt. We are scheduled to go until 2:15 p.m but time/dicussions will likely dictate the length of the meeting.

As a reminder, CRP is located off of Farrow Road in Columbia and please let me know if anyone needs directions to CRP.

For those conferencing in by telephone, the call in number to the conference room is (803) 217-7397.

regards,
Alan

Alan Stuart
Kleinschmidt
Senior Licensing Coordinator
(803) 822-3177
(803) 640-8765 cellphone

(See attached file: Agenda.doc)

Meeting Agenda

Saluda Hydro (FERC No. 516) Operations Meeting

Carolina Research Park

9:00 A.M.

March 23, 2006

9:00 – 9:30	Review 2005 Operations Plan
9:30 – 10:30	Review/Discuss Dissolved Monitor relocation Study
10:30 – 12:00	Review/Discuss 2005 Operations Report
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch
12:45 – 1:30	Discuss 2005 Turbine Testing Results and plans for 2006 testing
1:30 – 2:15	Discuss 2006 Operations Plan Preparation and Schedule
2:15	Adjourn

Stacia Hoover

From: Patrick Moore [PatrickM@sccl.org]
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 4:53 PM
To: rrcollins@n-h-i.org; jgantenbein@n-h-i.org; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; C Coleman
Cc: Alison Guth; Tony Bebber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; RMAHAN@scana.com; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman; vetaylor@adelphia.net
Subject: RE: Operations Notes-please read

Bill,

Thank you for sharing SCE&G's interest in having the maximum flexibility at the Saluda project to meet your reserve capacity obligations. While we understand this is SCE&G's interest, it is unlikely to meet the interests of other stakeholders and the intent of the FERC relicensing process. The FERC process is the opportunity to fully explore all operational alternatives and evaluate which alternatives serve the public interest and best meet the interests of all stakeholders.

To be clear, there is nothing in any applicable law or regulation, or even the VACAR agreement that requires SCE&G to operate Saluda as a reserve facility.

While other options may not fully meet the interests of SCE&G, to treat other options as being "off the table" is premature. Assessing operational alternatives for the Saluda project, including those with ramping and other operational changes in TWC studies, is legitimate and necessary.

Operating Saluda to meet reserve capacity obligations is a choice on the part of SCE&G. We must examine project impacts of this choice vs. the project impacts of other operation alternatives. As we continue in the RCGs we will be evaluating how Saluda as reserve does or does not meet other interests such as water quality, aquatic habitat, recreation, and public safety. As each of these is discussed, we must evaluate each issue under reserve operations and alternative operations. We cannot rule out alternative Saluda operations until they have been adequately studied.

It is well within the purview of the FERC and DHEC to require operational changes affecting reserve capacity to assure compliance with federal and state laws and regulations such as the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, Federal Power Act, Clean Water Act, and South Carolina water quality standards. I think the likely outcome of the relicensing process is that SCE&G can retain some of their operational flexibility, and perhaps even most of the flexibility, but not the maximum.

There are viable alternatives to operating Saluda strictly as a reserve facility. The Coastal Conservation League and American Rivers look forward to working through each of these alternatives and producing a comprehensive settlement to enhance all public benefits of the project.

Respectfully,

Patrick Moore
 Water Quality Associate
 Coastal Conservation League
 1207 Lincoln St. Suite 203-C
 Columbia, S.C. 29201
 803.771.7102

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

From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R [mailto:BARGENTIERI@scana.com]

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 10:27 AM

To: C Coleman

Cc: Alison Guth; Tony Bebbler; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman

Subject: RE: Operations Notes

Charlene,

Ramping will eliminate the ability for SCE&G to use Saluda as a contingency reserve plant and not allow us to use the plant to meet our system requirements. Therefore, we will need to replace the energy source that Saluda provides at this time. SCE&G is in the process of developing our alternative energy source costs that are necessary for the relicensing process. Once we have gathered this information and are in a position to present it to the Resource Conservation Groups we will set up a meeting for all of the RCGs.

While we are on the subject, we would like to directly address an issue that we have talked around, but perhaps not as directly as we should have, and that is unrestricted use of Saluda as reserve. We fully understand our obligation to explore alternatives, and we will do so thoroughly with appropriate stakeholder input. But, at the end of that effort, it should be clear that to replace Saluda as reserve would be a multi-hundred million dollar prospect. We know the standard argument here, but we deeply resent any implication veiled in comments such as "Is generation worth a human life?" Of course, the short answer is "no." But that is an oversimplification. There is danger inherent in many worthwhile enterprises and the production and use of electricity is no different. Accepting that fact, as we must, the question must be – How do we make it less dangerous? That said, we fully intend to relicense Saluda for the purpose of reserve generation which, by definition, is used in times that cannot always (or even usually) be predicted. In order to protect that, we are willing to put a lot of other things on the table, and we will. But at the end of the day, we have to have Saluda as reserve.

So with that in mind, how do we move forward and make the experience on the LSR as safe as reasonably possible? A safety plan for the Lower Saluda that encompasses the fact that there will be unplanned generation will go a part of the way toward answering that question.

As far as the effect of riverbed scouring and fisheries, these topics will be investigated in the Fish & Wildlife RCG and associated Technical Working Committees.

Bill

From: C Coleman [mailto:cheetahtk@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 12:33 PM

To: Alison Guth; Tony Bebbler; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; Bill

Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman

Subject: Re: Operations Notes

I'd like to request a reference of comments.

In the study of modeling and costs, I think a cost of ramping to Generation analysis, as a solution to public safety issues down stream, should be included. This is the only way we can make informative decisions in the future. Especially since every safety meeting refers to the idea of Ramping as an Operational issue.

Also any study that relates Operations changes costs, as they are affected by controls that reduce neagtive resource impacts.to river bed scouring and fishery "Put, Grow and Take" status of the Scenic Saluda river.

Thanks
Charlene

Alison Guth <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com> wrote:

Hello all

We have had a few additions and comments on the meeting notes, so I am sending around a copy of the notes with attached comments for everyone's review before they become final on Friday.

Alison

<<2006-01-26 draft Meeting Minutes comments- Operations.doc>>

[Alison Guth](#)

[Licensing Coordinator](#)

[Kleinschmidt Associates](#)

[101 Trade Zone Drive](#)

[Suite 21A](#)

[West Columbia, SC 29170](#)

[P: \(803\) 822-3177](#)

[F: \(803\) 822-3183](#)

Learn to get in touch with the silence within yourself and know that everything in this life has a purpose.

- Elizabeth Kubler-Ross

Yahoo! Travel

[Find great deals](#) to the top 10 hottest destinations!

Stacia Hoover

From: C Coleman [cheetahtrk@yahoo.com]**Sent:** Friday, March 17, 2006 3:31 PM**To:** BARGENTIERI@scana.com**Cc:** Alison Guth; Tony Bebber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; RMAHAN@scana.com; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman**Subject:** RE: Operations Notes

Everyone,

I appreciate the mail, public and private. Bill, I completely understand and respect your defending your position as part of the company.

Please appreciate the position I represent and recognize, I do understand the importance of reserve generation, economics and cost values.

I can be accused of a lot of things but “veiling” what I say or mean isn’t one of them. I believe Randy will attest to the fact I am openly honest and to the point.

It is my job to represent public interests, protect the resource, make sure all things are examined and become part of public record. I believe I have endeavored to work with SCE&G to help “make it less dangerous”. American Whitewater and I, personally, desire to assist in examining every avenue to make the Saluda River and many other rivers safer and accessible to the public, all while protecting our dwindling resources.

I and others have been told, repeatedly, that ramping (in some form) and flows regulation will ultimately be handled by the Operations Committee. In light of that information and direction I formally issued my comments as part of public record.

My comments not meant as an insult, cheap shot, or innuendo, but rather covering all points pertinent to the licensing of a hydro facility in formality.

At the end of the day...everyone goes home safe.

Happy St. Patrick’s Day

Respectfully submitted,

Charlene Coleman

American Whitewater

"ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R" <BARGENTIERI@scana.com> wrote:

Charlene,

Ramping will eliminate the ability for SCE&G to use Saluda as a contingency reserve plant and not allow us to use the plant to meet our system requirements. Therefore, we will need to replace the energy source that Saluda provides at this time. SCE&G is in the process of developing our alternative energy source costs that are necessary for the relicensing process. Once we have gathered this information and are in a position

to present it to the Resource Conservation Groups we will set up a meeting for all of the RCGs.

While we are on the subject, we would like to directly address an issue that we have talked around, but perhaps not as directly as we should have, and that is unrestricted use of Saluda as reserve. We fully understand our obligation to explore alternatives, and we will do so thoroughly with appropriate stakeholder input. But, at the end of that effort, it should be clear that to replace Saluda as reserve would be a multi-hundred million dollar prospect. We know the standard argument here, but we deeply resent any implication veiled in comments such as "Is generation worth a human life?" Of course, the short answer is "no." But that is an oversimplification. There is danger inherent in many worthwhile enterprises and the production and use of electricity is no different. Accepting that fact, as we must, the question must be – How do we make it less dangerous? That said, we fully intend to relicense Saluda for the purpose of reserve generation which, by definition, is used in times that cannot always (or even usually) be predicted. In order to protect that, we are willing to put a lot of other things on the table, and we will. But at the end of the day, we have to have Saluda as reserve.

So with that in mind, how do we move forward and make the experience on the LSR as safe as reasonably possible? A safety plan for the Lower Saluda that encompasses the fact that there will be unplanned generation will go a part of the way toward answering that question.

As far as the effect of riverbed scouring and fisheries, these topics will be investigated in the Fish & Wildlife RCG and associated Technical Working Committees.

Bill

From: C Coleman [mailto:cheetahtk@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 12:33 PM

To: Alison Guth; Tony Bebber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman

Subject: Re: Operations Notes

I'd like to request a reference of comments.

In the study of modeling and costs, I think a cost of ramping to Generation analysis, as a solution to public safety issues down stream, should be included. This is the only way we can make informative decisions in the future. Especailly since every safety meeting refers to the idea of Ramping as an Operational issue.

Also any study that relates Operations changes costs, as they are affected by controls that reduce neagtive resource impacts.to river bed scouring and fishery "Put, Grow and Take" status

of the Scenic Saluda river.

Thanks
Charlene

Learn to get in touch with the silence within yourself and know that everything in this life has a purpose.
- Elizabeth Kubler-Ross

Yahoo! Mail
Bring photos to life! [New PhotoMail](#) makes sharing a breeze.

Stacia Hoover

From: C Coleman [cheetahtk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 1:33 PM
To: Alison Guth; Tony Beber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Mark Leao; Mike Summer (msummer@scana.com); Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; RMAHAN@scana.com; Ray Ammarell; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman
Subject: Re: Operations Notes

I'd like to request a reference of comments.

In the study of modeling and costs, I think a cost of ramping to Generation analysis, as a solution to public safety issues down stream, should be included. This is the only way we can make informative decisions in the future. Especially since every safety meeting refers to the idea of Ramping as an Operational issue.

Also any study that relates Operations changes costs, as they are affected by controls that reduce neagive resource impacts.to river bed scouring and fishery "Put, Grow and Take" status of the Scenic Saluda river.

Thanks
 Charlene

Alison Guth <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com> wrote:

Hello all
 We have had a few additions and comments on the meeting notes, so I am sending around a copy of the notes with attached comments for everyone's review before they become final on Friday.
 Alison
 <<2006-01-26 draft Meeting Minutes comments- Operations.doc>>
 Alison Guth
 Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
 101 Trade Zone Drive
 Suite 21A
 West Columbia, SC 29170
 P: (803) 822-3177
 F: (803) 822-3183

Learn to get in touch with the silence within yourself and know that everything in this life has a purpose.
 - Elizabeth Kubler-Ross

Yahoo! Travel

11/5/2007

[Find great deals](#) to the top 10 hottest destinations!

Stacia Hoover

From: RMAHAN@scana.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 12:51 PM
To: BARGENTIERI@scana.com; EPPINK, THOMAS G
Cc: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; bjmcmamus@jonesday.com; BOOZER, THOMAS C; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; SUMMER, STEPHEN E
Subject: RE: Operations Notes

Until we develop, if necessary, any sort of adjustments to what folks might understand the policy to be, maybe we should just go ahead and add Moore's "quote" with a footnote that this quote was specifically requested to be inserted into the record by Mr. Moore, even though the meeting minutes are not being offered as transcripts.

From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 11:48 AM
To: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; EPPINK, THOMAS G
Cc: 'alan.stuart@kleinschmidtUSA.com'; 'Alison Guth'; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; 'bjmcmamus@jonesday.com'; BOOZER, THOMAS C; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; SUMMER, STEPHEN E
Subject: RE: Operations Notes

What do you suggest we do about these minutes before they are issued as final?

From: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 11:43 AM
To: EPPINK, THOMAS G; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R
Cc: 'alan.stuart@kleinschmidtUSA.com'; 'Alison Guth'; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; 'bjmcmamus@jonesday.com'; BOOZER, THOMAS C; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; SUMMER, STEPHEN E
Subject: RE: Operations Notes

I'm sorry, but I specifically complained in an earlier RCG meeting about the minutes becoming like the Congressional Record. To me, this is a bad thing. The Congressional Record process allows members, after the fact, to insert all manner of comments and documents **as if they really were disclosed and discussed during the debate process**, falsely projecting the impression that the full body had the realistic opportunity to hear and respond to the contents of those after-the-fact amendments/additions to the supposed written record of Congressional debate. And that "dummied up" record then becomes part of what courts look to when trying to discern the Congressional intent in the passage of legislation. I am sure Mr. Moore is quite familiar with this process, and desires mightily to try to establish a record of "discussions" that falsely creates the impression that his "quotes" were in fact uttered during the meetings and hence considered by all. We allow members to ask that materials be appended to the minutes, but only with the full and prominent disclosure that these after-the-fact additions are just that – i.e. materials not presented to the members during the meeting, but rather added after the fact. I still object to turning these meeting minutes into a game of false record creation. If we are not, we need to be calling folks on it when they clearly are fudging what was said during the meetings.

From: EPPINK, THOMAS G
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 11:07 AM
To: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R
Cc: 'alan.stuart@kleinschmidtUSA.com'; 'Alison Guth'; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; 'bjmcmamus@jonesday.com'; BOOZER, THOMAS C; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; SUMMER, STEPHEN E
Subject: RE: Operations Notes

I would certainly agree if we are talking about precise technical terms or concepts that have to be "right" to

correctly convey the message of the speaker, but am less inclined to grant the same to someone's grandstanding.

I like our current approach. If I said something and you didn't capture what I meant, I'll change it (maybe even to what I meant, but didn't say) – kind of like the Congressional Record.

From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 11:04 AM
To: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R
Cc: 'alan.stuart@kleinschmidtUSA.com'; 'Alison Guth'; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; 'bjmcmanus@jonesday.com'; BOOZER, THOMAS C; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; EPPINK, THOMAS G; SUMMER, STEPHEN E
Subject: RE: Operations Notes

You make a good point. Most likely whatever we do will be looked upon as trying to control the meeting documentation.

From: SUMMER, STEPHEN E
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 11:00 AM
To: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; alan.stuart@kleinschmidtUSA.com; Alison Guth; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; bjmcmanus@jonesday.com; BOOZER, THOMAS C; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; EPPINK, THOMAS G
Subject: RE: Operations Notes

I agree Randy. I like the concept that we should stay away from quotes in the minutes unless someone, in the meeting, requests that their words be recorded verbatim.
Steve

From: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 9:55 AM
To: alan.stuart@kleinschmidtUSA.com; Alison Guth; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; bjmcmanus@jonesday.com; BOOZER, THOMAS C; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; SUMMER, STEPHEN E; EPPINK, THOMAS G
Subject: RE: Operations Notes

Long ago we determined that to record meetings would not be a good thing overall as it might tend to have a "chilling" effect on they open and free discussion of whatever is on participants' minds. I believe that still to be the right decision. However, there seem to be continuing efforts by various participants to salt the meeting records with "pithy" comments dressed up as "quotes." I thought we had laid to rest the idea that meeting minutes were to be anything more than general summaries of the nature and direction of the discussions, rather than transcripts. Nevertheless, I believe there is a place for those who have particularly complex or to them, vital points to be made such that they want the record to reflect precisely the words used, thus removing any room for misunderstanding or misperception. (Truly, I question the value even of that, as transcripts of conversations or other proceedings are just as likely to produce great debate about what really was meant and communicated, as shorthand notes.) And that place can be recognized in a process that allows someone who believes it critical to do so, to alert the note-taker that what he/she is **about to say** needs to be taken down verbatim, so that it can be recorded thusly, read back aloud during the meeting, and confirmed by the speaker as accurate. If not thusly alerted, there should not be any post-meeting efforts to stick in some alleged "quotes." This should eliminate the post-meeting back and forth about whether a claimed quote (remembering again that we intentionally chose not to produce transcripts) is accurate or merely the product of a post-meeting epiphany that it could have been better said. I hesitate to make this suggestion, however, as I predict that in short order, those who believe that their words to be no less nourishing to the mind than manna from heaven or no less meaningful than Heavenly pronouncements from Yahweh, will increasingly make that request and soon we'll be bogged down trying to accommodate those requests.

What say ye?

From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 8:20 AM
To: Alison Guth
Cc: Patrick Moore
Subject: RE: Operations Notes

Alison,

Good job, everything looks good except the quote from Patrick Moore on page 4. I know you copied exactly what Patrick sent you as comments to the meeting minutes. I highlighted a portion of the quote in case Patrick would like to change his quote again so that it reflects what he actually said. If this was just a summary of the major points it wouldn't be a problem, but since it is a quote I believe it should be accurate.

Patrick – please let Alison know if you want to correct the grammar or leave it as is.

Bill

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2006 3:52 PM
To: Tony Bebber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Charlene Coleman; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman
Subject: Operations Notes

Hello all

We have had a few additions and comments on the meeting notes, so I am sending around a copy of the notes with attached comments for everyone's review before they become final on Friday.

Alison

<<2006-01-26 draft Meeting Minutes comments- Operations.doc>>

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

Stacia Hoover

From: Patrick Moore [PatrickM@scccl.org]
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2006 5:05 PM
To: RMAHAN@scana.com; Alison Guth; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Alan Stuart; ArmstrongS@dnr.sc.gov; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Kristina Massey; Bret Hoffman; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; dlandis1@sc.rr.com; truple@sc.rr.com; BadrB@dnr.sc.gov; dchristie@infoave.net; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Theresa_thom@nps.gov; Elymay2@aol.com; KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov; amanda_hill@fws.gov; Mike Schimpff
Cc: tbebbber@scprt.com; bill_hulslander@nps.gov; marshallb@dnr.sc.gov; cheetahrk@yahoo.com; kayakduke@bellsouth.net; gjobsis@americanrivers.org; mckellarh@sc.dnr.gov; bkawasi@sc.rr.com; jeff_duncan@nps.gov; dvklmass@bellsouth.net; lmichalec@aol.com; mark_leao@fws.gov; parkin@parkinhunter.com; crafton@usit.net; r1shealy@aol.com; rjernigan@scfbins.com; suzrhodes@juno.com; stonecypher@isteamconsulting.com
Subject: RE: Draft Operations Meeting notes-Glaring Omission

If Alison took any offense to my comments, I certainly and sincerely apologize.

I also feel she doesn't need Randy's help in speaking up as to what she may or may not take offense to. If she asked for Randy to say something, that is another story all together. I am well aware of the daunting task of recording all of the things that go on in all of the RCGs and understand there will be incidental omissions.

In re-reading my email, I can find nothing that qualifies as a "sneer". I said "I am not sure how such a clear statement was overlooked". I stand by this statement. I made a statement to the head facilitator, he repeated it to the group and asked for clarification, 2 stakeholders spoke in support of the proposition, and the head facilitator wrote it down for the group and said it would happen at some point in the future. So, no offense to Alison intended, I am not sure how such a clear statement was overlooked. Randy was not even in the room.

I also said "thanks for all your hard work". This was a genuine thank you for being the clearinghouse of all the information exchanges that this new license process entails. I can see how, after pointing out an omission, a cynical person might interpret that as some sort of "shot" at the minutes recorder. It was definitely not intended as such and I was genuinely wondering aloud how the omission occurred. I can find no other portion of the email that could be construed as offensive.

You will also find no mention whatsoever of an express or implied effort on the part of SCE&G to skew the minutes in the email I sent to Alison.

I would appreciate any further attempts to stir the pot with a well intentioned correction be sent to me personally.

Patrick Moore

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

From: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R [mailto:RMAHAN@scana.com]
Sent: Fri 3/3/2006 4:26 PM
To: Patrick Moore; Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; alan.stuart@kleinschmidtUSA.com; ArmstrongS@dnr.sc.gov; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Kristina.Massey@KleinschmidtUSA.com; Bret.Hoffman@KleinschmidtUSA.com; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; dlandis1@sc.rr.com; truple@sc.rr.com; BadrB@dnr.sc.gov; dchristie@infoave.net; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Theresa_thom@nps.gov; Elymay2@aol.com; KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov; amanda_hill@fws.gov; Mike.Schimpff@KleinschmidtUSA.com
Cc: tbebbber@scprt.com; bill_hulslander@nps.gov; marshallb@dnr.sc.gov; cheetahrk@yahoo.com; kayakduke@bellsouth.net; gjobsis@americanrivers.org; mckellarh@sc.dnr.gov; bkawasi@sc.rr.com; jeff_duncan@nps.gov; dvklmass@bellsouth.net; lmichalec@aol.com; mark_leao@fws.gov; parkin@parkinhunter.com; crafton@usit.net; r1shealy@aol.com; rjernigan@scfbins.com; suzrhodes@juno.com;

stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com

Subject: Re: Draft Operations Meeting notes-Glaring Omission

If one believes something may have been omitted from the minutes that one believes to be material and important, it certainly is appropriate to say so, so that the omission can be rectified. However, it does not advance the ball whatsoever in the direction of open and honest communication and the creation of a useful record to imply with a verbal sneer that it must have been some intentional, underhanded effort to skew the record and, as if it were possible with the extraordinary amount of cross memberships in RCGs and TWCs, to avoid dealing with a raised topic. There are no orders, explicit or implicit, from SCE&G or anyone else to prepare meeting minutes in any way other than with total honesty and in accordance with the notes taken at the meetings. I believe Alison is due an apology.

Randy Mahan

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

From: Patrick Moore

To: Alison Guth; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; Alan Stuart; ArmstrongS@dnr.sc.gov; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; EPPINK, THOMAS G; Kristina Massey; Bret Hoffman; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; dlandisl@sc.rr.com; Tom Ruple; BadrB@dnr.sc.gov; Dick Christie; Mike Waddell; Steve Bell; Theresa_thom@nps.gov; Joy Downs; Gina Kirkland; Amanda Hill; Mike Schimpff

CC: Tony Bebber; Alan Stuart; Amanda Hill; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Charlene Coleman; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; Mark Leao; SUMMER, MICHAEL C; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; AMMARELL, RAYMOND R; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman

Sent: Fri Mar 03 15:53:08 2006

Subject: RE: Draft Operations Meeting notes-Glaring Omission

Hey Alison,

One of the last things that happened at the meeting was that I requested an operational alternatives analysis and presentation at the next Operations RCG meeting, then to all RCGs. I recall at least Steve Bell and Mike Waddell voiced their support for this proposition and Alan wrote it on the easel. I am not sure how such a clear statement was overlooked.

Please make sure the minutes reflect that request, who supported it, and Alan's response that it would happen in the future.

Thanks for all your hard work,

Patrick Moore

Water Quality Associate

Coastal Conservation League

1207 Lincoln St. Suite 203-C

Columbia, S.C. 29201

803.771.7102

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

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Friday, March 03, 2006 2:48 PM

To: 'Bill Argentieri'; Alan Stuart; 'ArmstrongS@dnr.sc.gov'; 'msummer@scana.com'; 'teppink@scana.com'; Kristina Massey; Bret Hoffman; 'Randy Mahan'; 'rammarell@scana.com'; 'dlandis1@sc.rr.com'; 'Tom Ruple'; 'BadrB@dnr.sc.gov'; 'Dick Christie'; 'Mike Waddell'; 'Steve Bell'; Patrick Moore; 'Theresa_thom@nps.gov'; 'Joy Downs'; Gina Kirkland; 'Amanda Hill'; Mike Schimpff

Cc: Tony Bebber; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Hulslander; Bill Marshall; Bud Badr; Charlene Coleman; Dave Landis; Dick Christie; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Gina Kirkland; Hank McKellar; James Smith; Jeff Duncan; Joy Downs; Kristina Massey; Larry Michalec; Mark Leao; Mike Summer (msummer@scana.com); Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patrick Moore; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; Randy Mahan; Ray Ammarell; Russell Jernigan; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tom Stonecypher; Bret Hoffman

Subject: Draft Operations Meeting notes

Hello Operations RCG,

Well today is my day to get caught up on meeting notes. You will notice that I have CC'ed the entire group on this email. Our new meeting notes protocol includes the entire group on the draft notes, however, I will only accept changes to the meeting notes themselves from individuals that attended the meeting. If you did not attend the meeting but have a comment you may submit it to me for inclusion in a special separate section at the end of the document. Please have any changes or comments back to me by Feb 17th. Thanks and I hope everyone has a wonderful weekend. Alison

<<2006-01-26 draft Meeting Minutes - Operations.doc>>

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

101 Trade Zone Drive

Suite 21A

West Columbia, SC 29170

P: (803) 822-3177

F: (803) 822-3183

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2006 5:11 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'bill_hulslander@nps.gov'; 'cheetahtrk@yahoo.com'; 'dlandis1@sc.rr.com'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'kayakduke@bellsouth.net'; 'KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov'; 'Bkawasi@sc.rr.com'; 'Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov'; 'Elymay2@aol.com'; 'dvklmass@bellsouth.net'; 'lmichalec@aol.com'; 'parkin@parkinhunter.com'; 'PatrickM@scccl.org'; 'crafton@usit.net'; 'rjernigan@scfbins.com'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; 'suzrhodes@juno.com'; 'truple@sc.rr.com'; 'Stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com'; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'; 'rammarell@scana.com'; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; 'msummer@scana.com'; RMAHAN@scana.com; Kristina Massey; 'mark_leao@fws.gov'; 'amanda_hill@fws.gov'; 'BadrB@dnr.sc.gov'; 'tohunter@scbar.org'; 'marshallb@dnr.sc.gov'; 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; 'r1shealy@aol.com'; 'tbeber@scprt.com'; Bret Hoffman; Mike Schimpff
Subject: Final Operations Meeting Notes

Hello Operations Group

Attached is the Final set of meeting notes from the Dec. 6th Meeting. The draft Jan 26th meeting notes should be out next week. Have a wonderful weekend. Alison



2005-12-06 Final
Meeting Notes...

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

**Saluda Hydro Relicensing
Operations Resource Conservation Group**

Meeting Agenda

January 26, 2006

9:30 AM

Saluda Shoals Park – Rivers Conference Center – SE Freight Room

- **9:30 to 12:00** Hydrologic Models Presentation and Question Session
- **12:00 to 12:30** Lunch
- **12:30 to 2:30** Interactive Discussion on Model Inputs and Sources
- **2:30 to 3:00** Develop List of Homework Assignments, Develop Agenda for Next Meeting, and Set Meeting Date

Adjourn



Stacia Hoover

Subject: Operations Resource Group Meeting
Location: Saluda Shoals Park - Rivers Conference Center

Start: Thu 1/26/2006 9:30 AM
End: Thu 1/26/2006 3:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Required Attendees: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; bill_hulslander@nps.gov; cheetahtk@yahoo.com; dlandis1@sc.rr.com; dchristie@infoave.net; kayakduke@bellsouth.net; KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov; Bkawasi@sc.rr.com; Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov; Elymay2@aol.com; dvklmass@bellsouth.net; lmichalec@aol.com; parkin@parkinhunter.com; PatrickM@scccl.org; crafton@usit.net; rjernigan@scfbins.com; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; suzrhodes@juno.com; truple@sc.rr.com; Stonecypher@isteamconsulting.com; gjobsis@americanrivers.org; rammarell@scana.com; bargentieri@scana.com; msummer@scana.com; rmahan@scana.com; Kristina Massey; mark_leao@fws.gov; amanda_hill@fws.gov; BadrB@dnr.sc.gov; tohunter@scbar.org; marshallb@dnr.sc.gov; mwaddell@esri.sc.edu; r1shealy@aol.com; tbebbert@scprt.com; Bret Hoffman

Good Afternoon Operations Group

Our next Operations Resource Group meeting will occur on January 26 at 9:30. As you may remember, in the last meeting we were unable to secure a meeting room at the Lake Murray Training Center for this date. Subsequently, we will have our meeting at the Rivers Center at Saluda Shoals Park. Please let me know by the 20th if you are planning on attending so that I will know how many lunches to order. Thanks so much and email me with any questions that you may have.

Sincerely,
Alison

Stacia Hoover

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2006 4:37 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; 'bill_hulslander@nps.gov'; 'cheetahtrk@yahoo.com'; 'dlandis1@sc.rr.com'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'kayakduke@bellsouth.net'; 'KIRKLAGL@dhec.sc.gov'; 'Bkawasi@sc.rr.com'; 'Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov'; 'Elymay2@aol.com'; 'dvklmass@bellsouth.net'; 'lmichalec@aol.com'; 'parkin@parkinhunter.com'; 'PatrickM@scccl.org'; 'crafton@usit.net'; 'rjernigan@scfbins.com'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; 'suzrhodes@juno.com'; 'truple@sc.rr.com'; 'Stonecypher@istreamconsulting.com'; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'; 'pxanthakos@scana.com'; 'rammarell@scana.com'; 'BARGENTIERI@scana.com'; 'msummer@scana.com'; 'RMAHAN@scana.com'; Kristina Massey; 'mark_leao@fws.gov'; 'amanda_hill@fws.gov'; 'BadrB@dnr.sc.gov'; 'tohunter@scbar.org'; 'marshallb@dnr.sc.gov'; 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; 'r1shealy@aol.com'; 'tbebber@scprt.com'; Bret Hoffman
Subject: Operations Mission Statement

Hello Operations RCG Members,

In our last Operations RCG we finalized the Operations Mission Statement. I have attached the final copy for your perusal and it will also be posted on the website. Thanks to all for your participations in this process. Please email me with any questions that you may have. Thanks, Alison



Operations RCG
Mission Stateme...

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
101 Trade Zone Drive
Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170
P: (803) 822-3177
F: (803) 822-3183

OPERATIONS RESOURCE CONSERVATION GROUP

MISSION STATEMENT

The Mission of the Operations Resource Conservation Group (ORCG) is to develop a robust hydrologic model for the Saluda Project which will establish a baseline of current hydrologic, hydraulic, and operational conditions, and aid in analyzing and understanding the potential upstream and downstream effects of potential changes to project operations, in support of the missions and goals of all other Saluda Hydroelectric Relicensing RCGs. The objective is to fairly consider those impacts, to include low-flow conditions as a part of developing consensus-based, operations focused recommendations for the FERC license application. Model results are to be presented in readily understandable terms and format. A key measure of success in achieving the mission and goals will be a published Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement (PM&E) Agreement.

Stacia Hoover

From: s gustafson [sgustafson@sc.rr.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2006 12:03 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Bret Hoffman; Mike Schimpff
Subject: Saluda Hydro Relicensing

Dear Sirs,

This note is in reference to the presentation made at the RCG Operations team meeting on 12 Oct 2006. As the site does not including meeting notes, I do not know who was present. It appears that KA was involved in the development of this presentation. I sent this note to all of you because I could not determine the appropriate audience.

The web site provides a copy of the presentation made about the Saluda Operations model. Slide 27 of 37 shows constraints. It lists 380 feet elevation as a constraint. My understanding is that SCE&G is required to maintain the reservoir below 360 feet about sea level.

Please comment on the use of the 380 feet constraint.

As I am sure you are aware, reservoir levels above 360 would cause significant damage to many structures around the reservoir. Why would the model consider constraints above the 360 foot elevation? Does this mean that there is consideration being given to a maximum above the 360 foot elevation?

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,
Sam Gustafson

Stacia Hoover

From: Alan Stuart
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2006 1:55 PM
To: s gustafson; Alison Guth; Bret Hoffman; Mike Schimpff
Subject: RE: Saluda Hydro Relicensing

Dear Mr. Gustafson,

If you look closely at the slide it is labeled sample input. The 380' elevation and 20,000 cfs whitewater releases are both extreme examples of the format at which constraints (i.e. lake elevation and flow releases to the lower Saluda River) must be provided. It was conveyed to the audience these sample constraints were just examples and had no relevance to the Saluda project. Rest assured modeling efforts will be confined between 360 ' and 345' (most likely between 358' and 345') and that SCE&G has no intention of raising Lake Murray's level above 360'.

Thank you for contacting us directly as it helps put to rest any unnecessary rumors. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

regards,
 Alan

Alan Stuart

Senior Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Energy and Water Resources
101 Trade Zone Drive Suite 21A
West Columbia, SC 29170

Office: 803-822-3177
Cell: 803-640-8765
Fax: 803-822-3183

email: Alan.Stuart@kleinschmidtusa.com

From: s gustafson [mailto:sgustafson@sc.rr.com]
Sent: Sat 11/18/2006 12:03 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Bret Hoffman; Mike Schimpff
Subject: Saluda Hydro Relicensing

Dear Sirs,

This note is in reference to the presentation made at the RCG Operations team meeting on 12 Oct 2006. As the site does not including meeting notes, I do not know who was present. It appears that KA was involved in the development of this presentation. I sent this note to all of you because I could not determine the appropriate audience.

The web site provides a copy of the presentation made about the Saluda Operations model. Slide 27 of 37 shows constraints. It lists 380 feet elevation as a constraint. My understanding is that SCE&G is required to maintain the reservoir below 360 feet about sea level.

Please comment on the use of the 380 feet constraint.

As I am sure you are aware, reservoir levels above 360 would cause significant damage to many structures around the reservoir. Why would the model consider constraints above the 360 foot elevation? Does this mean that there is consideration being given to a maximum above the 360 foot elevation?

Thank you for your consideration,

11/5/2007