

Stacia Hoover

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

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

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

Dave



Recreation RCG
Working Documen...

Stacia Hoover

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

Good afternoon,

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

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

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

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

Questions?



Recreation RCG
Working Documen...

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

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

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

Is this too soon for a flow group field trip?

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

From the weekly update...

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

Want to learn more about Coastal Conservation League issues?

sign up at www.coastalconservationleague.org

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

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

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

Bill

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

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

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

Subject: Study Plan Comments?

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Dave and others,

Attached is my edited copy of the proposed study plan.

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

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

Thanks for your consideration,

Bill

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

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Rec Flow comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

Points

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

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

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

Quoting Dave Anderson :

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

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

>

Quoting Bill Marshall :

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

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

>

> Thanks for your consideration,

>

> Bill

>

> Bill Marshall

> S.C. Department of Natural Resources

> 1000 Assembly Street, Suite 354

> Columbia, SC 29201

> (803) 734-9096

> marshallb@dnr.sc.gov

>

Dave,

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

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

Additional comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Malcolm Leaphart, SC Council of Trout Unlimited

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

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

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

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

--Eric Hoffer

Charlene Coleman

American Whitewater
Regional Coordinator

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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



Draft Flow
Assessment Study Pl.

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Dave,

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

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

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

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

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Looks good to me.

Patrick

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

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

The study plan seems okay to me. Thanks.

Bill

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Malcolm,

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

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

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

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

Thank you,
Kelly Maloney

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

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

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

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

Dave,

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

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

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

Thanks.

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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



Rec_02_Flow_Repo
rt_3.21.05.pdf...

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Agree with Patrick on his edits/comments.

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

Appreciate hearing us out. KAK

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

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

Hey Dave,

That captures it pretty well, only a couple changes,

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

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

Thanks for helping craft this,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

>
> Can do.

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

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

> Bill

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

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

> Wednesday evening works for me too.

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

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

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

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

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

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

> Bill

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

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

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

> Dave

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Dave,

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

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

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

Bill

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

Bill,

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

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

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

Thanks,

Dave

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dave,

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

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

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

Bill

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

Bill,

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Dave

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Recreation RCG,

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

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



Boating Density
Study Plan (20...

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



Downstream
Recreation Flow Ass..

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Safety RCG,

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

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



Downstream
Recreation Flow Ass..

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

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

Dave



Recreation RCG
Working Documen...

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

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

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

Have a great weekend!



001-Saluda
Recreation Assessme.

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

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

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



Boating Density
Study Plan (20...



Boating Density
Study Plan (20...

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Dave and others,

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

Thanks,

Bill Marshall
SCDNR and Lower Saluda SRAC

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

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

<<Draft Recreation RCG Work Plan.doc>>

Recreation Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

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

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

DRAFT

Recreation Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

Mission Statement

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

Identified Issues

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

RCG Tasks and Responsibilities

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

Recreation Resource Conservation Group Work Plan Saluda River Project

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

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Work Scope and Product

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

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

Schedule

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

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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



Saluda Recreation
Assessment S...

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

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

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

Thanks,
Tony Bebber

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

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

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



001-Saluda
Recreation Assessme.



Public Access Site
Questionnai...



Public Access Site
Questionnai...

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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



Draft Flow
Assessment Study Pl.

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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



Draft Flow
Assessment Study Pl.

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

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

Thanks,

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

Hi Tony,

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

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

Marty



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

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

Tony,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

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



Boating Density
Study Plan (DR...

Danielle Fitzpatrick

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

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

Tony Bebber, AICP
Planning Manager
South Carolina Dept. of Parks,
Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
803-734-0189
803-734-1042 fax
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.

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

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

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

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

Stacia Hoover

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

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

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

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

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



Recreation RCG
Working Documen...

Stacia Hoover

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

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

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

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

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



Recreation RCG
Working Documen...

Stacia Hoover

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

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

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

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

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

Tony Bebber, AICP
Planning Manager
South Carolina Dept. of Parks,
Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
803-734-0189
803-734-1042 fax
tbebber@scprt.com
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.

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

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

Subject: Reminder: Vision Statement and Identified Issues

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

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

Stacia Hoover

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Recreation RCG
Working Documen...

From: [HANCOCK, DAVID E](#)
To: [Alison Guth](#); [BOOZER, THOMAS C](#); [Alan Stuart](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [dchristie@infoave.net](#); [bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net](#); [HOFFMAN, VAN B](#); [kayakduke@bellsouth.net](#); [lbarber@sc.rr.com](#);
cc: [cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net](#); [Alan Stuart](#); [marshallb@dnr.sc.gov](#); [cheetahtk@yahoo.com](#); [flyhotair@greenwood.net](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [dchristie@infoave.net](#); [kayakduke@bellsouth.net](#); [mark_Leao@fws.gov](#); [Amanda_Hill@fws.gov](#); [gjobsis@americanrivers.org](#); [guyjones@sc.rr.com](#); [Bkawasi@sc.rr.com](#); [Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov](#); [BUTLER, JO A](#); [kakustafik@columbiasc.net](#); [Keith_Ganz_Sarto@hotmail.com](#); [lmichalec@aol.com](#); [lbarber@sc.rr.com](#); [Malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu](#); [Marty Phillips](#); [mwaddell@esri.sc.edu](#); [miriam@lakemurraycountry.com](#); [Norm@sc.rr.com](#); [wwending@sc.rr.com](#); [PatrickM@scccl.org](#); [joyyalicki@aol.com](#); [bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net](#); [suzrhodes@juno.com](#); [BOOZER, THOMAS C](#); [tbebber@scprt.com](#); [vinsont@dnr.sc.gov](#); [adventurec@mindspring.com](#); [tbrooks@newberrycounty.net](#); [ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R](#);
[MAHAN, RANDOLPH R](#); [EPPINK, THOMAS G](#);
Subject: RE: Recreation Management TWC
Date: Monday, February 27, 2006 8:19:02 AM

Alison,
The meeting has been changed and I do not know that a date and time has been confirmed.
Thanks,
David

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2006 8:12 AM
To: BOOZER, THOMAS C; Alan Stuart; Dave Anderson; HANCOCK, DAVID E; 'Tony Bebber'; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; HOFFMAN, VAN B; 'kayakduke@bellsouth.net'; 'lbarber@sc.rr.com'
Cc: 'cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net'; Alan Stuart; 'marshallb@dnr.sc.gov'; 'cheetahtk@yahoo.com'; 'flyhotair@greenwood.net'; Dave Anderson; 'dchristie@infoave.net'; 'kayakduke@bellsouth.net'; 'mark_Leao@fws.gov'; 'Amanda_Hill@fws.gov'; 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'; 'guyjones@sc.rr.com'; 'Bkawasi@sc.rr.com'; 'Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov'; BUTLER, JO A; 'kakustafik@columbiasc.net'; 'Keith_Ganz_Sarto@hotmail.com'; 'lmichalec@aol.com'; 'lbarber@sc.rr.com'; 'Malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu'; Marty Phillips; 'mwaddell@esri.sc.edu'; 'miriam@lakemurraycountry.com'; 'Norm@sc.rr.com'; 'wwending@sc.rr.com'; 'PatrickM@scccl.org'; 'joyyalicki@aol.com'; 'bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net'; 'suzrhodes@juno.com'; BOOZER, THOMAS C; 'tbebber@scprt.com'; 'vinsont@dnr.sc.gov'; 'adventurec@mindspring.com'; HANCOCK, DAVID E; 'tbrooks@newberrycounty.net'; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; EPPINK, THOMAS G

Stacia Hoover

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

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

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

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

Have a great weekend!



001-Saluda
Recreation Assessme.

Kacie Jensen

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

Recreation Management TWC Members,

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

Dave



Saluda Spring Use
Addendum Stu...

Kacie Jensen

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

Recreation Management TWC Members,

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

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

Dave



Boating Density
Report Revised...

Kacie Jensen

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

Recreation Management TWC Members,

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Recreation Plan
Straw Man (07-...

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

SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
(FERC NO. 516)

RECREATION PLAN

DRAFT

JULY 2006

Prepared by:

Kleinschmidt
Energy & Water Resource Consultants

SOUTH CAROLINA
ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

SALUDA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
(FERC NO. 516)

RECREATION PLAN

DRAFT

JULY 2006

Prepared by:

Kleinschmidt
Energy & Water Resource Consultants

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

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

RECREATION PLAN

DRAFT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

1.1 Regional Setting

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

1.2 Lake Murray

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

1.3 Lower Saluda River

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

2.0 DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND STORAGE

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

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTIONS, USE ESTIMATES, AND BOAT DENSITY ANALYSIS

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

4.0 FACILITY DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

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

4.1 Standard Process

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

4.2 Standard Process Steps and Questions

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

4.3 Recreation Solution Principles

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

5.0 FACILITY DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIZATION AND SCHEDULING

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

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

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

5.1 Prioritization Consultation

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

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

5.2 Implementation Schedule

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

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

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

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

5.3 Consultation Process

Deleted: Annual

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

5.4 Recreation Plan Addenda

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

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

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Normal

6.0 RECREATION CONCEPT PLAN EVALUATION [LEAVE SECTION 5.0

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

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

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

Deleted: Sites.

6.1 Sites Suitable for Development

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

Deleted: Sites.

6.2 Sites Unsuitable for Development

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

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

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

8.0 REFERENCES

Kacie Jensen

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

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

Bill

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

All,

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

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

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

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

Alan Stuart

Senior Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Energy and Water Resources

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone: (803)951-2077

Cell 803.640.8765

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: RE: Spring Addendum Draft Report

Dave and others:

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

General:

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

Specific:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Page 3-15, 2nd paragraph: Chorley Island should be Corley Island.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment.

Tony Bebber, AICP

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

tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

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

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

Cc: Bill Argentieri; Randy Mahan

Subject: Spring Addendum Draft Report

Good morning,

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

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

Kacie Jensen

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bill Marshall

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

Good morning,

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

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

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

Posted on Mon, Aug. 13, 2007

The popular place you didn't know about

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

By JOEY HOLLEMAN
jholleman@thestate.com

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Dave,

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

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

Thanks again.

Bill

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

COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY BILL MATHIAS SEPTEMBER 6, 2007

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Contacts: Bill Argentieri

Gentlemen,

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

Thank you,

Kelly Maloney

Kleinschmidt Associates

Energy and Water Resource Consultants

141 Main Street, PO Box 650

Pittsfield, Maine 04967-0650

207-487-3328 x 271

207-487-3124 fax

Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com



Draft Flow
Assessment Report.z.

Kacie Jensen

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

Good morning,

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Saluda Spring Use
Addendum Stu...

Kacie Jensen

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

Good morning,

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Saluda Spring Use
Addendum Stu...

Kacie Jensen

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

Recreation Management TWC,

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

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

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

Other than that, things went smoothly.

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

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

Have a great weekend.

Marty

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

Kacie Jensen

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

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

Thanks again.

Tony Bebber, AICP

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

Recreation Management TWC Members:

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

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

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

Dave

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

Kacie Jensen

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

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

Thanks again.

Tony Bebber, AICP

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

Recreation Management TWC Members:

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

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

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

Dave

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Recreation Management TWC Members:

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

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

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

Dave



Boating Density
Report (2007-0...



Saluda Boat Density
Report - R...

Kacie Jensen

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

Kacie Jensen

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

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Dave - hope this is what you need!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kacie Jensen

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

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

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

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

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Dave,

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

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

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

Recreation RCG Members:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dave

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Hi Malcolm,

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

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

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

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

Thanks....Alan

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

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

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

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

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

Cc: keithcloud@yahoo.com

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation RCG Members:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dave

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Hi Malcolm,

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

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

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

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

Thanks....Alan

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

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

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

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

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

Cc: keithcloud@yahoo.com

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation RCG Members:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dave

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Recreation RCG Members:

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

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

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

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

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

Dave



Saluda Recreation
Assessment S...



Spring Use
Idendum Study Plan

Kacie Jensen

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

Dave,

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

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

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

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

Malcolm,

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

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

Dave

11/12/2007

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: RE: Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Dave,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation Management TWC Members:

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

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

ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Saluda_Recreation_Assessment_Study_Report_FINAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dave

Kacie Jensen

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

Malcolm,

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

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

Dave

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

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

Dave,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: Final Recreation Assessment Study Report

Recreation Management TWC Members:

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

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

ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Saluda_Recreation_Assessment_Study_Report_FINAL

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

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

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

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

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

Dave

Kacie Jensen

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

Dave,

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

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

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

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

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

Recreation Management TWC Members:

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

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

ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Saluda_Recreation_Assessment_Study_Report_FINAL.pdf>

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

11/12/2007

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

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

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

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

Dave

Kacie Jensen

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

Recreation Management TWC Members:

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

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

ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Saluda_Recreation_Assessment_Study_Report_FINAL.pdf

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

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



Responses to
omments (2007-04.

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

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

Dave

Kacie Jensen

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

My "track changes" comments are attached.

Tony Bebber, AICP

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

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

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

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

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

Dave



Spring Use
Addendum Study Plan



Response to
Comments on Spring
Use Addendum

Kacie Jensen

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

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

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

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave



Boating Density
Report (2007-0...

Kacie Jensen

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

Downstream Flows TWC,

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

Phase I - Literature Review and Desktop Analysis

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

Phase II – Focus Group and Field Reconnaissance

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

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

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

Phase III – Field Data Collection

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,
Kelly Maloney

Kacie Jensen

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

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

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

Tony Bebber, AICP

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

Recreation Management TWC,

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

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

Dave

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Recreation Management TWC,

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

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

Dave



Spring Use
Addendum Study Plan

Kacie Jensen

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



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

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

Tony Bebber

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

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

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

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

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

Cc: Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

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

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

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

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

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

Cc: Alan Stuart; BARGENTIERI@scana.com

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

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

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism

1205 Pendleton Street

Columbia, SC 29201

Phone 803-734-0189

Fax 803-734-1042

tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com

<<http://www.discoverouthcarolina.com/>> www.SouthCarolinaParks.com

<<http://www.southcarolinaparks.com/>> www.SCTrails.net <<http://www.sctrails.net/>>

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

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

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

Cc: Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

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

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

From: Dave Anderson

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

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

Cc: Alan Stuart; 'Bill Argentieri'

Subject: RE: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

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

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

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

From: Dave Anderson

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

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

Cc: Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri

Subject: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

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

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

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

Kacie Jensen

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



DNR comments
draft recreationa...

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

South Carolina Department of **Natural Resources**



March 2, 2007

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

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

Dear Dave;

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

Comments:

Goal Ii: the study seems adequate in the identification and inventory of existing sites and facilities. One shortcoming of this section is that the information describing the ADA accessibility of public access areas, which was included in the site descriptions, was not summarized for the sites.

Goal Iii: the study does identify patterns but the limited duration of the study does not allow complete characterization of use patterns. Since sampling was conducted between Memorial Day and September 30, 2006, some recreational users such as trout and striped bass anglers, waterfowl hunters, and college students may have been missed or under-represented.

Some of the results in this section were surprising to us. The heavy use at Mill Race-b is a newly emerged major change in the pattern of use. We were surprised to see higher numbers for Mill Race-b than for a. Two years ago the numbers of users in MR-b would have been much less than they are now. We believe that recreational use at the Mill Race sites will continue to change and increase significantly as the Three River Greenway is developed. The greenway will include a concrete trail along the river at Riverbanks Zoo, that's about 1 mile between Mill Race a and b; and above the zoo, the greenway will extend another 2 miles upstream to the I-26 crossing.

Also, we noted that the facilities on the west side of the Lake, such as Koon Landing, Shull Island, Lake Murray Estates and River Bend, have some of the highest weekly and

weekend use ratings of all sites. This may be helpful in prioritizing future recreational improvements.

Goal 2i: estimation of future recreational use does not seem to account for the enhanced facilities that will be part of the Three Rivers Greenway, which will increase user numbers at Mill Race sites.

Goal 2iii: this section of the report is pretty general and not specific in its identification of future needs for new recreation sites and facilities

The appendices were not included in the draft report!

On page 1-1, the text states that SCE&G manages four of the five recreation sites. On page 2-3, the text states that SCE&G manages two of five sites!

Recommendations:

In addition to spring sampling, we recommend that you convene a focus group with trout anglers to determine if they have any additional recreational access needs and/or improvements. Also, the need to convene a focus group to address paddling access should be discussed.

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

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

Sincerely,

Dick

Richard W. Christie
FERC Relicensing Coordinator,
SCDNR

Kacie Jensen

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

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

1) The total number of respondents (250) is so low that the worth of the study results is questionable... Additional input is needed, especially from target groups as noted below, and also because the study was not conducted in all months of a calendar year.

2) In further reference to point 1), no zip mailings as requested by Tony Bebber of SC PRT, the most knowledgeable of the stakeholders because of the SCOPR plans he has conducted for over 20 years for that agency. Nor, were any other efforts made for input beyond the person to person interviews at the selected sites, including from the recognized groups whose members have extensive experience from using the river, other than waterfowl hunters because of season. Input must be included from key groups such as those on the SC DNR Lower Saluda River Advisory Council like the SC Wildlife Federation, Trout Unlimited, Palmetto Paddlers, and American Whitewater, and also represented as stakeholders. ***These omissions means that the most active and knowledgeable users were essentially not included in the survey,*** especially as the access for many is not at any of the sites surveyed. For example, the nearly 400 Trout Unlimited members that mainly access the river through private property and represent several thousand man hours of fishing a year in the LSR were not included. Also, many boaters and others access the river through private property along the river. ***It is strongly recommended that the significant recreational groups be directly surveyed, at least through their leadership or reps in the relicensing process, or as additional focus groups. The report results should be revised to reflect the concerns and recommendations from those additional surveys, or from input from the appropriate stakeholder groups represented at the next recreational meetings. The Recreation Assessment should not be finalized and filed without their input.***

3) Wade fishing was not included in the use category (only boat fishing, bank fishing, dock/pier fishing) - *unless that use was included as 'bank' fishing since no boat or dock is used)???* That omission clearly shows that the study did not target the right audience as that is a significant user group as noted in comment 2) as most all the TU members wade fish, mostly with fly rods for sport which was another significant area of recreation use that could have been categorized. Fly fishing only and catch and release only fishing areas are wildly popular all over the country and often are significant drivers of tourist economies.

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

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

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

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

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

From: Dave Anderson

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

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

Cc: Alan Stuart; Bill Argentieri

Subject: Recreation Assessment Draft Report

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

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

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

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

Kacie Jensen

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

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

Once concern I have is that the assessment concludes, generally, that sites are in good condition and everything is ok for the most part. That is good news but it seems the useful info in terms of protection, mitigation and enhancement would be the problem areas and places where the current facilities are not quite cutting it. The results also show times of high use and declining rec. quality and we could summarize those in the conclusion to point us to our main areas of potential improvement? This would also help resolve any perception that the rec assessment runs counter to stakeholder experience, i.e. that everything is generally in good shape.

Thanks,

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

Kacie Jensen

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

Members of the Recreation Management TWC:

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

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

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

Kacie Jensen

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

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

Hope this works for you.

Tony Bebber, AICP

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

I'm getting the same error on that one.

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

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

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

Tony Bebber, AICP

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Tony Bebber, AICP

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

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

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

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

Subject: Recreation RCG Standard Process Form

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

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

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

Dave

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

Kacie Jensen

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dave



Recreation RCG
Working Documen...

From: [Jim Cumberland](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#);
cc: [Jim Cumberland](#); cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net; [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#); [Bill Marshall](#); BARGENTIERI@scana.com; yaccove@bellsouth.net; cheetahtk@yahoo.com; flyhotair@greenwood.net; dhancock@scana.com; dchristie@infoave.net; kayakduke@bellsouth.net; gjobsis@americanrivers.org; mrice@americanrivers.org; guyjones@sc.rr.com; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov; [Jenn Taraskiewicz](#); [Jennifer Hand](mailto:Jennifer_Hand); jdevereaux@scana.com; jbutler@scana.com; [Joy Downs](#); [Kustafik, Karen](#); Keith_Ganz_Sarto@hotmail.com; [Kelly Maloney](#); turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; [Lee Barber](#); 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; RMAHAN@scana.com; rparsons12@alltel.net; adventurec@mindspring.com; sjones@imichotels.net; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; [Suzanne Rhodes](#); vinsont@dnr.sc.gov; tbrooks@newberrycounty.net; tboozier@scana.com; [Tony Bebber](#); vhoffman@scana.com;
Subject: Recreation focus group proposal
Date: Thursday, December 20, 2007 11:54:42 AM
Attachments: [Recreation Focus Group Proposal - 12-11-2007.pdf](#)

Dave et al.,

Attached is a proposal developed by a focus group of parties with interests in recreation and land management issues at Lake Murray. It is designed for use as a strawman to be included in the Recreation groups' proposal back to the Lake and Land Management Committee.

I took this email list from the Saluda Relicensing website – if you're on the list but shouldn't be, please accept my apologies & let me know – I'll remove you from my list.

Happy holidays,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#);
[David Hancock](#); [Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Mark Davis \(mdavis@scprt.com\)](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#);
[Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [Van Hoffman](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: Recreation Plan and Alternatives
Date: Thursday, March 27, 2008 11:24:48 AM
Attachments: [Saluda Project Recreation Plan Summary and Alternatives \(2008-03-24\).doc](#)

Recreation Management TWC Members:

Attached is a list of the proposed actions in the Recreation Plan and the alternative proposals submitted. The plan from here is to have an engineer provide cost estimates for each of these actions so we can move forward with prioritization and scheduling. If there are any remaining alternatives that you would like to be considered (including specific additional lands that you think should be set aside for recreation), please get them to me as soon as possible.

If you see any errors, or if I have misstated the already submitted alternatives, please let me know that too.

Dave

Carl Bussells

From: bill mathias [bill25@sc.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 9:14 PM
To: Dave Anderson
Subject: Re: Revised Boat Density Report

Dave,

Thanks for sending the revised Boat Density Report. I have not completed my reading of it, but it certainly seems to address many of the issues that we discussed.

I hope to complete my review and get it back to you in the next few days.

Bill

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

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Bill Mathias](#)
Cc: [Alan Stuart](#) ; [Bill Argentieri](#)
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2007 3:19 PM
Subject: Revised Boat Density Report

Bill M.,

I have attached the revisions we have made to the boat density report based on your comments to the original report. I have left it in track changes to help you in your review. Please feel free to comment on these revisions. I would like to get a revised report out as soon as possible.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

David K. Anderson, Ph.D.
Recreation/Human Dimensions Specialist
Kleinschmidt Associates
4958 Valleydale Rd., Ste. 250
Birmingham, AL 35242
P: 205-981-4547
F: 205-981-4549
Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com

<<Boating Density Report (2007-08-24;RevisedFINAL).doc>>

Carl Bussells

From: bill mathias [bill25@sc.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 9:14 PM
To: Dave Anderson
Subject: Re: Revised Boat Density Report

Dave,

Thanks for sending the revised Boat Density Report. I have not completed my reading of it, but it certainly seems to address many of the issues that we discussed.

I hope to complete my review and get it back to you in the next few days.

Bill

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

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Bill Mathias](#)
Cc: [Alan Stuart](#) ; [Bill Argentieri](#)
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2007 3:19 PM
Subject: Revised Boat Density Report

Bill M.,

I have attached the revisions we have made to the boat density report based on your comments to the original report. I have left it in track changes to help you in your review. Please feel free to comment on these revisions. I would like to get a revised report out as soon as possible.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

David K. Anderson, Ph.D.
Recreation/Human Dimensions Specialist
Kleinschmidt Associates
4958 Valleydale Rd., Ste. 250
Birmingham, AL 35242
P: 205-981-4547
F: 205-981-4549
Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com

<<Boating Density Report (2007-08-24;RevisedFINAL).doc>>

Carl Bussells

From: BOOZER, THOMAS C [TBOOZER@scana.com]
Sent: Monday, October 08, 2007 9:54 AM
To: CARLSHEALY@aol.com
Cc: RMAHAN@scana.com; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Dick Christie; Dave Anderson; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Tony Bebber
Subject: RE: boaters revised

Carl, I have forward your letter and now your email to members of the Land and Lake relicensing committee. Please continue to review the issues discussed during these relicensing meetings as posted on the Web site. If you would like to address the Land and Lake committee, contact Alison Guth to schedule a time. Thanks Tommy

From: CARLSHEALY@aol.com [mailto:CARLSHEALY@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 06, 2007 10:01 PM
To: BOOZER, THOMAS C
Subject: boaters revised

Carl Shealy
226 Rocky Retreat Ct
Leesville, SC 29070
October 3, 2007
To Whom It May Concern,

I'm very concerned about the boater traffic problem that occurs every weekend of the summer months out here in "Hurricane Hole" (so named by the boaters). My family and my mother have year-round homes here. The cove is mostly surrounded by 22 acres owned by my brother, my mother, and myself. Many of these boaters that tie up have told us that they also own property on the lake, but that they prefer to come here and party with their friends.

We understand that Two Bird Cove, surrounded by land owned by the Harmon family and Phil Hamby, has a similar problem. They have attended a meeting with the TWC and SCE&G to voice their opposition to this arbitrary designation for boaters. We also read in the newspaper that the boaters have asked for these two coves to be specified as boater recreation areas. It is odd that no-one contacted the homeowners surrounding these coves to inform them of the possible plans.

As few as seven years ago, we occasionally saw a few sailboats tie up and anchor in the back of the cove but we did not have a problem with them as they made good and courteous neighbors. From those years the boat traffic continues to grow and it is no longer on the occasional holiday weekend that we compete for use of the cove. The number of boaters has grown continually, so that now it is every weekend, Saturday and Sunday with loud and discourteous transients who care only about themselves and how much fun they can have. They average 75 boats per day. We are concerned about this reckless use of the cove because we don't plan to move. This is land we inherited from my grandfather and we cherish it more than you can know. We rarely see sailboats come in and anchor any longer. They were once able to canoe and kayak around the cove. I understand that they were the ones who first asked for the designated recreation areas.

I would remind you that the entire lake is a boater's recreation area. If boaters were distributed evenly over the 5440 acre lake there would not be a problem but when such a large number of boats are parked in one cove there is a big problem. There is an environmental impact caused by the affluence of the boats, as well as the discharge from the individuals. There are also unacceptable levels of noise pollution especially from the extremely loud motors of the cigar boats, so that we cannot carry on a normal conversation on our screen porch or deck at the time these boats are entering and leaving the cove.

Many weekends we feel like prisoners inside our own home, so that we don't have to be a part of the unpleasant surroundings. When we are entertaining friends and family, we cannot use our cove for recreation because it is too

crowded, and we are forced to go elsewhere to ski, tube etc. I feel that if this continues to escalate that there will be drowning, injuries and other safety hazards for us and the boaters. There is just too much alcohol consumed by the boaters and simply too many power-boats so close to so many swimmers. A true recreation area would have to have regulations to ensure safety to the users and protection to the environment; including no-wake zones, no- speed zones, and a no-alcohol zone. In addition, we have read that you monitor the eagle's nests on the lake. You may not be aware that there was an eagle's nest in the trees off of the causeway that is part of Hurricane Hole. We are not sure if it remains inhabited by eagles since the boat traffic has grown because we have seen only one eagle this year in this area. We are fearful that they may not return to nest during upcoming nesting seasons of October to March. These eagles are a protected species, and I see that DNR and the Forestry Commission have scored certain areas for protection. Management of these areas must include the impact of boater's recreation on the natural resources of the lake. I believe that someone has failed to take this into account when they allowed such a large number of boats to use one specific area as a party cove.

Dreher Island State Park on the lake is within 1000 feet of the mouth of Hurricane Hole. Millions of taxpayer dollars are spent every year to maintain the state park as a pleasant and inviting recreation area for all. I suspect that the park rangers discourage rowdy, loud, obnoxious behavior displayed by many of the boaters. Perhaps that is why so much of the 12 miles of shoreline and several coves on Dreher Island are not utilized by the boaters. The cove directly across from Hurricane Hole is almost identical in depth and size. There is a ranger station overlooking that cove. If many of these boaters would agree to use the swim area of this existing state park, along with it's public boat ramps and bathrooms, this would solve everyone's needs, diminishing the congestion of Hurricane Hole greatly, returning it to it's natural and pleasant state. SCE&G owns numerous coves like those on the State Park which have no private homes and could be designated for boaters.

I am very concerned that when the decision was made for a boater's recreation area, no one considered the back property owners. As you can see from the way we have structured our homes, and maintained the 75' setback and buffer zones, we care deeply about the shoreline and the protection of that shoreline.

I have tried to keep a positive outlook about the boaters rights to use the lake, and I believe many of the family boaters just want a nice place to park for a few hours and swim, but unfortunately many of the boaters (the party groups) are very confrontational. We have spoken to some of the boaters directly when they get too close to our dock, and for the most part they agree to move a little further away. A friend at our home on one occasion wanted to know what marina we lived near. We explained it was not a named marina, just a tail-gating parking lot. I think that does speak to the impact on the environment. Similar restrictions as those for the development of a marina might need to be applied.

Since these boaters are not our invited guests, we cannot be responsible for the safety of those in our cove, and you must be held responsible. Any action you take now would go along way to prevent injury in the future to both the boaters, and damage to the environment. There is just a limit to how much the environment can take with noise and trash pollution. There are certainly limits to the enforcement of basic rules and regulations needed to make this a safe environment for all. I would be glad to discuss this with you or your team. I will be glad to share the photos and video of the traffic and the impact of the numerous boats. If something is not done to protect these boaters from themselves someone is going to get hurt.

Sincerely,
Carl and Donna Shealy

See what's new at AOL.com and [Make AOL Your Homepage](#).

Carl Bussells

From: BOOZER, THOMAS C [TBOOZER@scana.com]
Sent: Monday, October 08, 2007 9:54 AM
To: CARLSHEALY@aol.com
Cc: RMAHAN@scana.com; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Dick Christie; Dave Anderson; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Tony Bebber
Subject: RE: boaters revised

Carl, I have forward your letter and now your email to members of the Land and Lake relicensing committee. Please continue to review the issues discussed during these relicensing meetings as posted on the Web site. If you would like to address the Land and Lake committee, contact Alison Guth to schedule a time. Thanks Tommy

From: CARLSHEALY@aol.com [mailto:CARLSHEALY@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 06, 2007 10:01 PM
To: BOOZER, THOMAS C
Subject: boaters revised

Carl Shealy
226 Rocky Retreat Ct
Leesville, SC 29070
October 3, 2007
To Whom It May Concern,

I'm very concerned about the boater traffic problem that occurs every weekend of the summer months out here in "Hurricane Hole" (so named by the boaters). My family and my mother have year-round homes here. The cove is mostly surrounded by 22 acres owned by my brother, my mother, and myself. Many of these boaters that tie up have told us that they also own property on the lake, but that they prefer to come here and party with their friends.

We understand that Two Bird Cove, surrounded by land owned by the Harmon family and Phil Hamby, has a similar problem. They have attended a meeting with the TWC and SCE&G to voice their opposition to this arbitrary designation for boaters. We also read in the newspaper that the boaters have asked for these two coves to be specified as boater recreation areas. It is odd that no-one contacted the homeowners surrounding these coves to inform them of the possible plans.

As few as seven years ago, we occasionally saw a few sailboats tie up and anchor in the back of the cove but we did not have a problem with them as they made good and courteous neighbors. From those years the boat traffic continues to grow and it is no longer on the occasional holiday weekend that we compete for use of the cove. The number of boaters has grown continually, so that now it is every weekend, Saturday and Sunday with loud and discourteous transients who care only about themselves and how much fun they can have. They average 75 boats per day. We are concerned about this reckless use of the cove because we don't plan to move. This is land we inherited from my grandfather and we cherish it more than you can know. We rarely see sailboats come in and anchor any longer. They were once able to canoe and kayak around the cove. I understand that they were the ones who first asked for the designated recreation areas.

I would remind you that the entire lake is a boater's recreation area. If boaters were distributed evenly over the 5440 acre lake there would not be a problem but when such a large number of boats are parked in one cove there is a big problem. There is an environmental impact caused by the affluence of the boats, as well as the discharge from the individuals. There are also unacceptable levels of noise pollution especially from the extremely loud motors of the cigar boats, so that we cannot carry on a normal conversation on our screen porch or deck at the time these boats are entering and leaving the cove.

Many weekends we feel like prisoners inside our own home, so that we don't have to be a part of the unpleasant surroundings. When we are entertaining friends and family, we cannot use our cove for recreation because it is too

crowded, and we are forced to go elsewhere to ski, tube etc. I feel that if this continues to escalate that there will be drowning, injuries and other safety hazards for us and the boaters. There is just too much alcohol consumed by the boaters and simply too many power-boats so close to so many swimmers. A true recreation area would have to have regulations to ensure safety to the users and protection to the environment; including no-wake zones, no- speed zones, and a no-alcohol zone. In addition, we have read that you monitor the eagle's nests on the lake. You may not be aware that there was an eagle's nest in the trees off of the causeway that is part of Hurricane Hole. We are not sure if it remains inhabited by eagles since the boat traffic has grown because we have seen only one eagle this year in this area. We are fearful that they may not return to nest during upcoming nesting seasons of October to March. These eagles are a protected species, and I see that DNR and the Forestry Commission have scored certain areas for protection. Management of these areas must include the impact of boater's recreation on the natural resources of the lake. I believe that someone has failed to take this into account when they allowed such a large number of boats to use one specific area as a party cove.

Dreher Island State Park on the lake is within 1000 feet of the mouth of Hurricane Hole. Millions of taxpayer dollars are spent every year to maintain the state park as a pleasant and inviting recreation area for all. I suspect that the park rangers discourage rowdy, loud, obnoxious behavior displayed by many of the boaters. Perhaps that is why so much of the 12 miles of shoreline and several coves on Dreher Island are not utilized by the boaters. The cove directly across from Hurricane Hole is almost identical in depth and size. There is a ranger station overlooking that cove. If many of these boaters would agree to use the swim area of this existing state park, along with it's public boat ramps and bathrooms, this would solve everyone's needs, diminishing the congestion of Hurricane Hole greatly, returning it to it's natural and pleasant state. SCE&G owns numerous coves like those on the State Park which have no private homes and could be designated for boaters.

I am very concerned that when the decision was made for a boater's recreation area, no one considered the back property owners. As you can see from the way we have structured our homes, and maintained the 75' setback and buffer zones, we care deeply about the shoreline and the protection of that shoreline.

I have tried to keep a positive outlook about the boaters rights to use the lake, and I believe many of the family boaters just want a nice place to park for a few hours and swim, but unfortunately many of the boaters (the party groups) are very confrontational. We have spoken to some of the boaters directly when they get too close to our dock, and for the most part they agree to move a little further away. A friend at our home on one occasion wanted to know what marina we lived near. We explained it was not a named marina, just a tail-gating parking lot. I think that does speak to the impact on the environment. Similar restrictions as those for the development of a marina might need to be applied.

Since these boaters are not our invited guests, we cannot be responsible for the safety of those in our cove, and you must be held responsible. Any action you take now would go along way to prevent injury in the future to both the boaters, and damage to the environment. There is just a limit to how much the environment can take with noise and trash pollution. There are certainly limits to the enforcement of basic rules and regulations needed to make this a safe environment for all. I would be glad to discuss this with you or your team. I will be glad to share the photos and video of the traffic and the impact of the numerous boats. If something is not done to protect these boaters from themselves someone is going to get hurt.

Sincerely,
Carl and Donna Shealy

See what's new at [AOL.com](#) and [Make AOL Your Homepage](#).

From: [Alison Guth](#)
To: [" \(GreeterS@dnr.sc.gov\)":](mailto:GreeterS@dnr.sc.gov)
Subject: Downstream flow assessment activities
Date: Friday, May 11, 2007 4:32:39 PM
Attachments: [Focus Group Letters 2 - Greeter.doc](#)
[flow assessment letters - greeter.doc](#)

Hello Mr. Greeter,

I was informed that you have an interest in participating in next week's downstream flow activities for the Saluda Hydro Relicensing. I have sent you two letters addressing the focus group and the downstream flow assessment via snail mail, however I was unsure if I had the correct mailing address for you. Subsequently, I have attached copies of the letters below, just in case you do not receive the hard copies. Thanks, and contact me if you have any questions. 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

From: [Mike Waddell](#)
To: [Kelly Maloney](#);
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report
Date: Tuesday, October 16, 2007 11:11:04 AM

[Kelly](#): On the calibrations curves all I have are river station numbers. I would just like know what other constraints besides maximum rate of rise of 850 cfs.

[Mike](#)

From: Kelly Maloney [mailto:Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2007 10:54 AM
To: Mike Waddell
Cc: Jon Quebbeman; Alan Stuart
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report

[Mike](#),

Good morning. Could you clarify what you mean by constraints on the model?

I am unable to edit the pdf that shows the level logger locations in the report. Suffice it to say that the labels for the level loggers correspond to the locations on the river which are already labeled.

- Upstream of Hope Ferry is the most upstream location, just up from Hope Ferry.
- Corley Island, Gardendale, Oh Brother, Ocean Boulevard, Stacy's Ledge, and Shandon Rapids already have labels that correspond to the locations of the level loggers.
- Botanical Gardens is the level logger location at Mill Race Rapids in between Stacy's Ledge and Shandon Rapids - it has the label "Riverbanks Botanical Garden" right below it.

Thanks,
[Kelly](#)

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

From: Mike Waddell [mailto:mwaddell@esri.sc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2007 10:28 AM
To: Kelly Maloney
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report

{SpamScore: sss} {SpamScore: sss} {SpamScore: sss}

Kelly: How many constraints were put on the model. These calibrations are remarkable. Would please send me a map with river stations label on it. The only thing I can find on the calibrations is on Feb 14th and 15th the miss that event. Base on the calibrations curves nobody can argue the model results. I will be sending in the next few days my official comments, but now there will be very few. Thank you for your patience.

Mike

From: Kelly Maloney [mailto:Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 3:26 PM
To: Mike Waddell
Cc: Alan Stuart; Jon Quebbeman
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report
{SpamScore: sss} {SpamScore: sss} {SpamScore: sss}

Mike,

My apologies...I intended to include the graphs with the last email. Here they are for your review. As discussed in the report, the maximum stage and rate of change comes from the model. Actually, all of the results come from the model which was built using the level logger data. It's not appropriate to use the actual level logger data for the analysis because it would be comparing apples and oranges. For example, there were flows that were provided for such a short duration that the "maximum" stage was never actually achieved. The flow did not have enough time to stabilize so analyzing the data for that flow directly would have underestimated the max and time to max. Also as discussed in the report, the level loggers recorded water depths once per minute for 30 days from January 22 through February 22, 2007. The model likewise produces stage levels (in feet) for every minute of a 24-hour period for the reserve call scenario and the lake level management scenario and once every minute for 36 hours for the river stabilization scenario.

Thank you,
Kelly

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

From: Mike Waddell [mailto:mwaddell@esri.sc.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 3:05 PM
To: Kelly Maloney
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report
{SpamScore: sss} {SpamScore: sss}

Kelly: I understand this a recreation flow assessment. You talk about the modeling. With that being said, and I am person who does modeling but not surface water, I want to see the calibration curves and rms errors between the model data and measure data. That give me an ideal on how reliable the results from the model are. You publish maximum stage and rate of change table in the report are those numbers from the data recorder or results from the modeling. If the data is from the data recorders how often did the recorders punch data. Your last paragraph explains a lot, because a year ago June one of our TU members was at Corley Island when one of those rare call up for reserved came and he saw a wall of water ~2 feet in height sweep him down stream.

Mike

From: Kelly Maloney [mailto:Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 2:47 PM
To: Mike Waddell
Cc: Alan Stuart; Jon Quebbeman
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report
{SpamScore: sss} {SpamScore: sss}

Mike,

We identified the 850 cfs as a median release flow observed during the actual level logger deployments - which captured a full range of flow releases. In addition, this release represents a balance between the higher release of 1,167 cfs experienced during reserve calls (which last about an hour and a half) and the lower release of 500 cfs during lake level management releases (which last about 6 hours). The reality is (according to USGS hourly gage data provided by the SCDNR) that an hourly average of 18,000 cfs or greater has occurred only 18 days in the last 7 years; an average hourly of 12,000 cfs or greater has occurred only 6 percent of the time (139 days) in the last 7 years; an average hourly of 8,000 cfs or greater has occurred only 13 percent of the time (301 days) in the last 7 years. So, in reality, reserve call is not

a frequent occurrence.

The limitation has to do with the fact that an assumption for operations had to be made within the scope and context of this study. This is a recreational flow study - this study was never intended to be a full-blown operations model. That is being handled by another TWC. The purpose of this study was to characterize available recreation opportunities, understand the rate of change during operational flow scenarios, and identify public safety issues.

For a reserve call, the "rate of rise" is not 1,167 cfs, the release of water equates to 1,167 cfs every minute until the specified outflow is achieved. For 18,000 cfs, a baseflow of 500 cfs is assumed, so a flow of 18,000 cfs from the dam would be achieved within 15 minutes. I agree that effect of this release is significant for the most upstream sites and attenuates as it moves downstream but this significance is already evident even with a conservative assumption of 850 cfs every minute. The water comes up over 4 feet in 15 minutes under that operational assumption (a "rate of rise" of 0.29 feet per minute). Thus, we've already identified this as a safety concern and can recognize that the water comes up even faster during an actual reserve call.

I hope this answers your question and Jon and Alan can feel free to speak up if they have anything more to contribute.

Thanks,
Kelly

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

From: Mike Waddell [mailto:mwaddell@esri.sc.edu]

Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 1:13 PM

To: Kelly Maloney

Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report {SpamScore: sss}

Kelly: Please clarify that there is a limitation of 850 cfs because of the HEC-RAS code or is this your limitation. Because what concerns me is on page 13 the report states in reality when the reserve is call up to 18,000 cfs the actual

rate of rise is 1,167 cfs. This is not significant for most areas on the river except at Metts Landing and Corley Island where we fish. So what has to be done to simulate reality.

Mike

From: Kelly Maloney [mailto:Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 11:51 AM
To: Mike Waddell
Cc: Alan Stuart; Jon Quebbeman
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report {SpamScore: sss}

Mike,

I am having the graphs you requested generated and will send them shortly.

If I understand your second question correctly, the model assumes that the plant starts with a baseline flow of 500 cfs, then increases flows incrementally by 850 cfs per minute regardless of operational scenario. For a flow of 3000 cfs, for example, the model assumes at minute zero the flow is 500 cfs; at minute one the flow is 500 cfs plus 850 cfs (1350 cfs); minute two gains an additional 850 cfs increase, resulting in a flow of 2200 cfs; and minute three reaches the targeted flow of 3000 cfs. This assumption is discussed as a limitation of the model on page 13 of the report.

Just a reminder that, because I am departing for maternity leave on October 26, I would like to have all comments by October 19, if at all possible.

Thank you,
Kelly

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

From: Mike Waddell [mailto:mwaddell@esri.sc.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 10:04 AM

To: Kelly Maloney
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report

What I need to evaluate the report is to know at each cross section across the river where there was a water level recorder the graph showing the modeling results and actual water levels from the data recorders to determine how well the model calibrated with actual measurements. The other question I have are the rates of change in time and elevation based on incremented the flow at 850 cfs not 18000 cfs at one time.

Mike

From: Kelly Maloney [<mailto:Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com>]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 9:50 AM
To: Mike Waddell
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report

Mike,

They are generated from the model which was created with the level logger data.

Thanks,
Kelly

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

From: Mike Waddell [<mailto:mwaddell@esri.sc.edu>]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 9:48 AM
To: Kelly Maloney
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report

Kelly I was able to open them. In Appendix F the hydrographs are generated from the model or are they from the water level recorders?

Mike

From: Kelly Maloney [<mailto:Kelly.Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com>]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 9:24 AM
To: Mike Waddell; Alan Stuart
Subject: RE: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report

Mike,

The files are quite large. Please let me know if you are unable to retrieve or open them.

Thank you,
Kelly

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

From: Mike Waddell [<mailto:mwaddell@esri.sc.edu>]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 7:45 AM
To: Kelly Maloney; Alan Stuart
Subject: Down Stream Recreation Flow Assessment Report

Kelly: I am missing Appendix E and F. Therefore I cannot finish reviewing this report. Would please send me the missing appendices and I will need a another week or two to finish reviewing and making comments.

Mike

Michael G. Waddell
Research Associate Professor
Earth Sciences and Resources Institute
University of South Carolina
Office (803) 777-6484

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2007 1:15 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Carl Sundius; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); Jennifer O'Rourke; John Frick; Joy Downs; Randy Mahan; Rhett Bickley; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; Sheri Armstrong ; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Synithia Williams; Tom Ruple; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; 'J. Ryan'
Subject: Draft SMP and Agenda; schneider@scetv.org

Hello TWC,

In preparation for our meeting Tuesday, I have attached the Agenda, as well as the Draft Shoreline Management Plan. It may be helpful to briefly review the draft SMP to be ready to discuss it very generally at the meeting. Appendix A is still in the process of being developed and will be distributed at a later date. Thanks, and email me if you have any questions.
Alison



Lake and Land
lanagement TWC A.



Shoreline
nagement Plan - DF



App. D Final Saluda
Sedimentat...



App. C Buffer Zone
Management...



App. B Woody
Debris Plan (9 0...



App. E Baseline
Environmental ...



App. F Lake Murray
Water Quali...

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone 803-951-2077

Fax 803-951-2124

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2007 1:15 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Carl Sundius; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); Jennifer O'Rourke; John Frick; Joy Downs; Randy Mahan; Rhett Bickley; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; Sheri Armstrong ; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Synithia Williams; Tom Ruple; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; 'J. Ryan'
Subject: Draft SMP and Agenda; schneider@scetv.org

Hello TWC,

In preparation for our meeting Tuesday, I have attached the Agenda, as well as the Draft Shoreline Management Plan. It may be helpful to briefly review the draft SMP to be ready to discuss it very generally at the meeting. Appendix A is still in the process of being developed and will be distributed at a later date. Thanks, and email me if you have any questions.
Alison



Lake and Land
lanagement TWC A.



Shoreline
nagement Plan - DF



App. D Final Saluda
Sedimentat...



App. C Buffer Zone
Management...



App. B Woody
Debris Plan (9 0...



App. E Baseline
Environmental ...



App. F Lake Murray
Water Quali...

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone 803-951-2077

Fax 803-951-2124

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2007 1:15 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Carl Sundius; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); Jennifer O'Rourke; John Frick; Joy Downs; Randy Mahan; Rhett Bickley; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; Sheri Armstrong ; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Synithia Williams; Tom Ruple; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; 'J. Ryan'
Subject: Draft SMP and Agenda; schneider@scetv.org

Hello TWC,

In preparation for our meeting Tuesday, I have attached the Agenda, as well as the Draft Shoreline Management Plan. It may be helpful to briefly review the draft SMP to be ready to discuss it very generally at the meeting. Appendix A is still in the process of being developed and will be distributed at a later date. Thanks, and email me if you have any questions.
Alison



Lake and Land
lanagement TWC A.



Shoreline
nagement Plan - DF



App. D Final Saluda
Sedimentat...



App. C Buffer Zone
Management...



App. B Woody
Debris Plan (9 0...



App. E Baseline
Environmental ...



App. F Lake Murray
Water Quali...

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone 803-951-2077

Fax 803-951-2124

Carl Bussells

From: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2007 7:38 PM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: Re: Draft SMP and Agenda; schneider@scetv.org

Alison-Apparently Ron Ahle is not able to attend the morning session. I think it is critical for Ron to be a part of the discussion of the agenda items I requested. I recommend that the morning session be canceled and the meeting be convened at 1 pm. If time does not allow for agenda items originally scheduled for the 1pm session those can be taken up at a future date.

Thanks,

Steve

- **1:00 to 1:30** Requested Review of Issues Related to Shoreline Uses and Rebalancing
- **1:30 to 2:30** Requested Review of First Draft of SMP

Adjourn

----- Original message from "Alison Guth" <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>: -----

Hello TWC,

In preparation for our meeting Tuesday, I have attached the Agenda, as well as the Draft Shoreline Management Plan. It may be helpful to briefly review the draft SMP to be ready to discuss it very generally at the meeting. Appendix A is still in the process of being developed and will be distributed at a later date. Thanks, and email me if you have any questions.
Alison

<<Lake and Land Management TWC Agenda 92507.doc>>

<<Shoreline Management Plan - DRAFT 2007-09-20.doc>> <<App. D Final Saluda Sedimentation and Erosion Plan 2006-01-25.pdf>> <<App C Buffer Zone Management Plan (9 06 07).doc>> <<App B Woody Debris Plan (9 06 07).doc>> <<App. E Baseline Environmental Monitoring Plan for Lake Murray Marinas.pdf>> <<App. F Lake Murray Water Quality Monitoring Plan.pdf>>

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone 803-951-2077

Fax 803-951-2124

Carl Bussells

From: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2007 7:38 PM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: Re: Draft SMP and Agenda; schneider@scetv.org

Alison-Apparently Ron Ahle is not able to attend the morning session. I think it is critical for Ron to be a part of the discussion of the agenda items I requested. I recommend that the morning session be canceled and the meeting be convened at 1 pm. If time does not allow for agenda items originally scheduled for the 1pm session those can be taken up at a future date.

Thanks,

Steve

- **1:00 to 1:30** Requested Review of Issues Related to Shoreline Uses and Rebalancing
- **1:30 to 2:30** Requested Review of First Draft of SMP

Adjourn

----- Original message from "Alison Guth" <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>: -----

Hello TWC,

In preparation for our meeting Tuesday, I have attached the Agenda, as well as the Draft Shoreline Management Plan. It may be helpful to briefly review the draft SMP to be ready to discuss it very generally at the meeting. Appendix A is still in the process of being developed and will be distributed at a later date. Thanks, and email me if you have any questions.
Alison

<<Lake and Land Management TWC Agenda 92507.doc>>

<<Shoreline Management Plan - DRAFT 2007-09-20.doc>> <<App. D Final Saluda Sedimentation and Erosion Plan 2006-01-25.pdf>> <<App C Buffer Zone Management Plan (9 06 07).doc>> <<App B Woody Debris Plan (9 06 07).doc>> <<App. E Baseline Environmental Monitoring Plan for Lake Murray Marinas.pdf>> <<App. F Lake Murray Water Quality Monitoring Plan.pdf>>

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone 803-951-2077

Fax 803-951-2124

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#); ["Van Hoffman"](#); ["Bill Marshall"](#); [Dave Anderson](#); ["David Hancock"](#); ["Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)"](#); ["George Duke"](#); [Jennifer Summerlin](#); ["Jim Cumberland "](#); ["Joy Downs"](#); [Kelly Maloney](#); ["Lee Barber"](#); ["Malcolm Leaphart"](#); [Marty Phillips](#); ["Steve Bell"](#); ["Tim Vinson"](#); ["Tommy Boozer"](#); ["Tony Bebber"](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
cc: ["Bill Argentieri"](#);
Subject: RE: Example Recreation Plans
Date: Thursday, September 06, 2007 10:31:22 AM

I've received a few reports of errors with the link. Let's try this:

<ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>

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

From: Dave Anderson

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 4:46 PM

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

Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'

Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

In preparation for next weeks meeting, I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

<file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>

I will be sending around an updated "working document" later this week.

See you next week,

Dave

P.S. Your comments on the Spring Addendum are due by September 10th.

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2007 3:17 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Stan Jones (sjones@imichotels.net); Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler
Subject: FW: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation RCG Members,

I am reviewing my notes from previous meetings and noticed I was supposed to send this out to the entire RCG rather than just the TWC. Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

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

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 4:46 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2007 3:17 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Stan Jones (sjones@imichotels.net); Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber
Subject: FW: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation RCG Members,

I am reviewing my notes from previous meetings and noticed I was supposed to send this out to the entire RCG rather than just the TWC. Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

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

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 4:46 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2007 3:17 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Argentieri; Bill Brebner ; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Charlie Rentz; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Guy Jones; Irvin Pitts (ipitts@scprt.com); Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Larry Turner (turnerle@dhec.sc.gov); Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Mike Waddell; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Randy Mahan; Regis Parsons (rparsons12@alltel.net); Richard Mikell; Stan Jones (sjones@imichotels.net); Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler
Subject: FW: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation RCG Members,

I am reviewing my notes from previous meetings and noticed I was supposed to send this out to the entire RCG rather than just the TWC. Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

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

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 4:46 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2007 10:31 AM
To: Dave Anderson; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Bill Marshall'; Dave Anderson; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net)'; 'George Duke'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Jim Cumberland'; 'Joy Downs'; Kelly Maloney; 'Lee Barber'; 'Malcolm Leaphart'; Marty Phillips; 'Steve Bell'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tommy Boozer'; 'Tony Bebbber'; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: RE: Example Recreation Plans

I've received a few reports of errors with the link. Let's try this:

ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip

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

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 4:46 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

In preparation for next weeks meeting, I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip

I will be sending around an updated "working document" later this week.

See you next week,

Dave

P.S. Your comments on the Spring Addendum are due by September 10th.

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2007 10:31 AM
To: Dave Anderson; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Bill Marshall'; Dave Anderson; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net)'; 'George Duke'; Jennifer Summerlin; 'Jim Cumberland'; 'Joy Downs'; Kelly Maloney; 'Lee Barber'; 'Malcolm Leaphart'; Marty Phillips; 'Steve Bell'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tommy Boozer'; 'Tony Bebbber'; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: RE: Example Recreation Plans

I've received a few reports of errors with the link. Let's try this:

ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip

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

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 4:46 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

In preparation for next weeks meeting, I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip

I will be sending around an updated "working document" later this week.

See you next week,

Dave

P.S. Your comments on the Spring Addendum are due by September 10th.

Carl Bussells

From: Tony Bebber [tbebbber@scprt.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2007 10:27 AM
To: Dave Anderson
Subject: RE: Example Recreation Plans

Ok mine said it couldn't find the site. Want to try sending again? Thanks!

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone 803-734-0189
Fax 803-734-1042
tbebbber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 5:46 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; dchristie@comporium.net; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: Bill Argentieri
Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

In preparation for next weeks meeting, I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

<[file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip](ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip)>

I will be sending around an updated "working document" later this week.

See you next week,

Dave

P.S. Your comments on the Spring Addendum are due by September 10th.

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 5:46 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

In preparation for next weeks meeting, I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

[<file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>](file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip)

I will be sending around an updated "working document" later this week.

See you next week,

Dave

P.S. Your comments on the Spring Addendum are due by September 10th.

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 5:46 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

In preparation for next weeks meeting, I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

[<file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>](file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip)

I will be sending around an updated "working document" later this week.

See you next week,

Dave

P.S. Your comments on the Spring Addendum are due by September 10th.

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 5:46 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'
Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

In preparation for next weeks meeting, I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

[<file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>](file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip)

I will be sending around an updated "working document" later this week.

See you next week,

Dave

P.S. Your comments on the Spring Addendum are due by September 10th.

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Van Hoffman](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [David Hancock](#);
[Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#); [Jennifer Hand](#);
[Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Kelly Maloney](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Marty Phillips](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#);
[Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
cc: ["Bill Argentieri"](#);
Subject: Example Recreation Plans
Date: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 5:45:54 PM

Recreation Management TWC Members:

In preparation for next weeks meeting, I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

<file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>

I will be sending around an updated "working document" later this week.

See you next week,

Dave

P.S. Your comments on the Spring Addendum are due by September 10th.

Thanks Bill, that helps me understand a bit better of what we were trying to accomplish. Makes sense.
Alan

From: Bill Marshall [mailto:MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov]

Sent: Tue 9/11/2007 10:23 AM

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

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

Subject: RE: Spring Addendum Draft Report

Alan -- regarding the objectives of the study: Generally, I think we have assumed that we already know what the user activities are; therefore, we were after better numbers on the users... By my recollection, knowing that there is heavy usage of the river in the spring by college students and anglers, I primarily wanted to get a better handle on the numbers of these users. Secondly, we wanted input regarding needs and preferences.

Comments on the study plan probably indicate that few of us held much hope for on-campus interviews and I think we did encourage getting into the field with more surveying. Water under the bridge at this point; and now I suppose we'll do the best with what we have.

Thanks to Tony for giving the report his thorough review.

Bill

From: Alan Stuart [mailto:Alan.Stuart@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Monday, September 10, 2007 8:28 PM

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

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

Subject: RE: Spring Addendum Draft Report

All,

I have read Tony's comments on the report find them interesting and appreciative for him providing them. Not being a recreational specialist, something I'm still struggling with is with respect to these USC/college students. It is my understanding we did not potentially capturing some usage patterns of these individuals during the first study. I was out during the IFIM study (early June) and we had transects established at both Shandon Rapids and Millrace and made a point to carefully observe these folks. The users were both PREVELANT all during the day (from about noon to dusk) and they appeared to be overwhelmingly college age students (late teens to mid/late 20's) Whether these folks were actually registered at a local college I cannot say for certain. However, I did notice some cars with student parking stickers, some without. My point I guess I'm getting at, they all appeared to be engaged in all similar activities, sunbathing, some floating on pool floats, partying and what I would simply call general socializing (which included ALL kinds of activities from what appeared to be two grizzly bears locked in a grappling match for mating rights to well I'll leave that to everyone's imagination). I guess I'm still trying to figure out how use patterns of the "college students" would

deviate significantly from the "non-college students" we observed in the Rec Study. Honestly, I didn't see the opportunity to do much more than what they were doing. I did notice the tremendous amount of dogs these people seemed to bring with them. It literally reminded me of the dog park at Saluda Shoals but on a much larger scale. On a more positive note, I did notice DNR was actively patrolling the areas (kudos to Bill Marshall's and Tim Vinson's group).

I agree with Tony that we may have not captured the actual Jan-May period. However, what I do question is, am I to understanding we were attempting to collect use data (patterns) on "college age" folks we may have missed or were we attempting to gather usage information specifically from USC college age students (with the assumption they participated in some activity outside what's been described and previously observed in the other study). I know we attempted to convene a focus group with students and where unsuccessful. However, based on my observations and the conflicts during the IFIM study with "student age users", I'm not sure we missed anything in terms of use patterns from Jan-May that we didn't collect during the regular survey. Short of they may not have been in the water as much during the Jan-May period because of air temperatures. Even still I can't imagine it would significantly deviate from what I observed and how current education level would influence the use patterns. With all of this said, I'll leave it to you recreational folks to work through this.

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

Alan Stuart

Senior Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Energy and Water Resources

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone: (803)951-2077

Cell 803.640.8765

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: RE: Spring Addendum Draft Report

Dave and others:

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

General:

It appears that the only "new" on-site data collected was in late May and only on three (?) dates on the lower Saluda River. This was after local colleges adjourned in early May. This time period

likely reflects similar usage as the “Summer” study done in 2006 and adds very little to the concern about different usage patterns in January through May. Some new data was collected from user groups – anglers at a special meeting of the Saluda River Chapter of Trout Unlimited/Federation of Fly Fishers, and knowledgeable river users during the test flows for another study in late May. Specific responses to the questions were not provided in an appendix so it could be reviewed by those on the committees. The “Spring Addendum” uses the “Summer” study and two other secondary data sources to estimate January through May usage, providing very suspect data and negates the original reason for the “Spring Addendum.” I am not sure the goals of the study were met.

Specific:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Page 3-8, 1st sentence: "Most (58%) of this effort was from the bank (including wade fishing)."

Page 3-12, 2nd paragraph: use Bill Marshall's corrections regarding the LSR Corridor Plan and Update.

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

Page 3-14, 1st paragraph: typo in walking.

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

Page 3-15, 2nd paragraph: Chorley Island should be Corley Island.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment.

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism

1205 Pendleton Street

Columbia, SC 29201

Phone 803-734-0189

Fax 803-734-1042

tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

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

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

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

Cc: Bill Argentieri; Randy Mahan

Subject: Spring Addendum Draft Report

Good morning,

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

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

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

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

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

From: [Jim Cumberland](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#);
cc: [Jim Cumberland](#); cfdwaxson@columbiasc.net; [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#); [Bill Marshall](#); BARGENTIERI@scana.com; yaccove@bellsouth.net; cheetahtk@yahoo.com; flyhotair@greenwood.net; dhancock@scana.com; dchristie@infoave.net; kayakduke@bellsouth.net; gjobsis@americanrivers.org; mrice@americanrivers.org; guyjones@sc.rr.com; ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff_Duncan@NPS.gov; [Jenn Taraskiewicz](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); jdevereaux@scana.com; jbutler@scana.com; [Joy Downs](#); [Kustafik, Karen](#); Keith_Ganz_Sarto@hotmail.com; [Kelly Maloney](#); turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; [Lee Barber](#); 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; RMAHAN@scana.com; rparsons12@alltel.net; adventurec@mindspring.com; sjones@imichotels.net; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; [Suzanne Rhodes](#); vinsont@dnr.sc.gov; tbrooks@newberrycounty.net; tboozier@scana.com; [Tony Bebber](#); vhoffman@scana.com;
Subject: Recreation focus group proposal
Date: Thursday, December 20, 2007 11:54:42 AM
Attachments: [Recreation Focus Group Proposal - 12-11-2007.pdf](#)

Dave et al.,

Attached is a proposal developed by a focus group of parties with interests in recreation and land management issues at Lake Murray. It is designed for use as a strawman to be included in the Recreation groups' proposal back to the Lake and Land Management Committee.

I took this email list from the Saluda Relicensing website – if you're on the list but shouldn't be, please accept my apologies & let me know – I'll remove you from my list.

Happy holidays,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#); ["Van Hoffman"](#); ["Bill Marshall"](#); [Dave Anderson](#); ["David Hancock"](#); ["Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)"](#); ["George Duke"](#); [Jennifer Summerlin](#); ["Jim Cumberland "](#); ["Joy Downs"](#); [Kelly Maloney](#); ["Lee Barber"](#); ["Malcolm Leaphart"](#); [Marty Phillips](#); ["Steve Bell"](#); ["Tim Vinson"](#); ["Tommy Boozer"](#); ["Tony Bebber"](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
cc: ["Bill Argentieri"](#);
Subject: RE: Example Recreation Plans
Date: Thursday, September 06, 2007 10:31:22 AM

I've received a few reports of errors with the link. Let's try this:

<ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>

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

From: Dave Anderson

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 4:46 PM

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

Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'

Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

In preparation for next weeks meeting, I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

<file://ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>

I will be sending around an updated "working document" later this week.

See you next week,

Dave

P.S. Your comments on the Spring Addendum are due by September 10th.

From: [Bill Marshall](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: Old State Road
Date: Monday, September 24, 2007 10:29:46 AM

Dave -- the only place I am aware of where Old State Road still exists in the Columbia area is along the Congaree River. A popular access site to the Congaree is the Cayce Landing, aka Thomas Newman Landing, off Old State Road south of Cayce.

If someone referred to Old State Road on the Saluda then they may have been talking about where the road once crossed the Saluda, which is at the site where Riverbanks Zoo and Garden is located. Downstream of the current, modern bridge at the zoo you can see the stone foundation remains of the old bridge: stone abutments on each bank and a stone pier support (now island) in the middle of the river. The bridge was burned during the Civil War during Sherman's march. There is some bank fishing that occurs around the abutments. That's about all I know on the subject. I hope this jars some recollections

Bill

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2007 4:56 PM
To: Bill Marshall
Subject: Old State Road

Bill,

I am going through the comments on the Spring Addendum and need to say something on this Old State Road access that Tony brought up. Can you refresh my memory as to where this is (I remember it was access to the Broad really, but that's about it).

Thanks,

Dave

From: [Alison Guth](#)
To: ["regis parsons";](#)
Subject: RE: Recreation RCG meeting
Date: Wednesday, September 12, 2007 10:32:27 AM

Yes, I apologize, I thought you were on the original distribution list... I will forward you the agenda

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

From: regis parsons [mailto:rparsons12@alltel.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2007 10:31 AM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Recreation RCG meeting

Alison,
Is there any agenda yet for what is going to be discussed at tomorrow's meeting? Thanks!

Regis

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

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2007 8:29 AM
To: regis parsons
Subject: RE: Recreation RCG meeting

This meeting will be held at the meeting room at Panera Bread Company off of Bower Parkway (right off of Harbison). Here is the address if you would like to mapquest it: 1007 Bower Parkway, Columbia, SC 29212. I have never been there before but Bower Parkway runs in between Boaters World and the shopping center that contains Publix and Target.

Alison

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

From: regis parsons [mailto:rparsons12@alltel.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2007 10:20 PM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: Recreation RCG meeting

Please give me information about where the meeting will be held. Thanks!

Regis

_____ NOD32 2519 (20070910) Information _____

This message was checked by NOD32 antivirus system.

<http://www.eset.com>

From: [Bill Marshall](#)
To: [Alison Guth](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [BARGENTIERI@scana.com](#); [Charlene Coleman](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [Guy Jones](#); [J. Hamilton Hagood](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Karen Kustafik](#); [Kelly Maloney](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#); [Mike Waddell](#);
cc: [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: RE: Draft Flow Study Report
Date: Thursday, October 18, 2007 6:46:45 PM

Hello everyone – Here are my comments on the Draft Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Report. Only wish I had a bit more time to process this and do a more thorough review but must get it out today.

General comment: I think this report provides much useful information and provides a helpful integration of Saluda River recreational information, which has been produced in various reports of the Saluda Relicensing Process.

Page 10: regarding the paragraph explaining the hydro operational scenarios that are demonstrated by the model. Comment: Demonstrating typical hydro operational scenarios, as was done, is appropriate; however, because we are concerned with safety issues and risks from hydro operations to downstream river users, we should include analyses of maximum flow scenarios that create conditions that pose the greatest risks to downstream river users. Conditions that pose the greatest risks are probably those where the hydro operations produce the maximum rates of change in river stage at each downstream station.

A reserve call of only 1.5-hour duration may have less affect (produce slower rates of rise) at the Zoo area than reserve calls of longer durations (three hours or more) because it takes roughly two hours for the “wave” to arrive at the zoo. While, the 6-hour lake-level management scenarios provide adequate duration of flows to see a maximum effect at the zoo, another question arises (as presented in a following comment re. page-13): how would the incremental flow increase of 1,167 cfs per minute, versus 850 cfs, effect the results for rate of change?

Page 11: The second and third paragraphs refer to matching calculated hydraulic results with the observed hydraulic results. Comment: The report needs to include more information and discussion of accuracy. Is there some measure of error or accuracy that can be reported for matching the calculated results with those observed? It would be helpful to have a graphical presentation of model calibration results comparing model predictions against observed data for important hydraulic features such as depth, time of arrival, and rates of stage

increase along the river reach.

Page 13: The first paragraph explains assumptions related to the analyses and reports that incremental flow increases were set at 850 cfs per minute (a median figure) regardless of operational scenario. Comment: Because we are concerned with safety issues and risks to river users related to downstream flows resulting from hydro operations, shouldn't we model flow scenarios using the maximum incremental flow of 1,167 cfs per minute, as this would give us information about the most rapid rates of change in the river. And if judged that there are only minor differences in results using the various incremental flow increases, then it would be useful to demonstrate and explain the differences.

Page 13-14: regarding the paragraph explaining "wave arrival." Comment: Explanations about "initial rates of rise" and the transition to the "more steep rates of rise" and how much time is involved overall is important to understand. More graphical presentations would help improve the information.

The last sentence of this paragraph mentions the importance of understanding the first 15 minutes following "wave arrival" compared to overall rate of change at each location on the river. Based on our knowledge of the lower Saluda, it would seem that the first 15 and 30-minute periods of time after wave arrival and the first 1 to 4 feet in rise are the most important aspects to understand for dealing with river safety concerns.

Overall, more graphical presentations in the report would be a welcomed addition to the many tables provided.

Page 14, second paragraph, last sentence may need clarification: Sentence seems to say the greatest rate of change is between 75% and 90% of maximum. Should it say "between start of rise to 75% and 90% of maximum"?

Pages 13-14, discussion of assumptions: Comment: Please explain what boundary conditions were used in the downstream side. Does the downstream condition always include 500 cfs flow.

Page 17, second paragraph – Edit: Cornerstone Presbyterian Church, located off of Old Bush River Road, owns waterfront property adjacent to the boat ramp at Saluda Shoals Park (not Rawls Creek).

Page 21, one report bullet says: "A hand-carry access site below the I-20 bridge (City of Columbia is currently working on this access site)." – this should be "site below I-26 bridge" -- as this is where City of Columbia will be developing the

Saluda River Walk with a boater access just below the bridge.

Pages 27-29 – Comment: The discussion of average daily flows (here and on page 81) tends to misrepresent the flows that are realistically available to recreational users. Because flows fluctuate widely in any given day due to hydro operations, the statistical “average daily flow” (3,291 cfs for example) might only be available for 10 minutes in a given day as the river goes from 500 cfs to 18,000 cfs and back down again in one day.

Perhaps a better way to characterize “available flows” for recreationist would be to look at hourly averages and describe when favorable flow ranges are maintained for some period of time (and not just a brief point on a dynamic hydrograph). For example, I’d suggest looking at favorable flow ranges that were maintained four hours during daylight hours, as this sort of timeframe better fits what recreational uses might really consider as a flow opportunity.

Page 73, bullet item – I think the telephone ring-down (call-down) system was tested for a while but is not yet “in place” (or is it?)

Page 80, third paragraph -- I don’t think the River Alliance study evaluated flows for flatwater boating, as the report, on pp 22-23, says that the study “focused only on sections of the lower Saluda which had whitewater characteristics.” The RA study does address “open tandem canoes” on the whitewater sections and two flows (roughly 2,000 cfs and 4500 cfs) were evaluated. On p. 45 a table RA reports flows as “recommended safety ranges” for “canoe” but does not distinguish between the “open tandem canoe” and “whitewater canoe” categories.

Page 81-82 – Comment: Similar to comments, above, for page 10 and page 13, I think the rate of change analyses and conclusions about rate of change should address a maximum and sustained flow scenario from the hydro plant that produces the most rapid change effects downstream at all sites. I think that would be a 3-hour reserve call requiring 18,000 cfs released at maximum incremental flow rates (1,167 cfs?). Various scenarios are well analyzed and presented in this report but none of them seem to push the variables to their potential maximum limits.

Probably the most safety-relevant information to produce and report is the steepest rates of change within the first 15 and 30 minutes (or first 1 to 4 feet of rise) after “wave arrival” at each site.

Here are my comments.

Tony Bebber, AICP

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

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: Stacia Hoover [mailto:Stacia.Hoover@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2007 9:23 AM

To: Alison Guth; Van Hoffman; Alan Stuart; Amanda Hill; Andy Miller; Bertina Floyd; Bill Argentieri; Bill East; Bill Marshall; Bill Mathias; btrump@scana.com; Carl Sundius; Charlie Compton; Charlie Rentz; Chris Page; Daniel Tufford; David Allen; David Hancock; Dee Dee Simmons ; Dick Christie; Don Tyler; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); Hank McKellar; Irvin Pitts; Jennifer O'Rourke; John Frick; Joy Downs; Kim Westbury; Kit Oswald ; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; laura.mccary@gmail.com; Linda Lester ; Linda Schneider ; Mark Leao; Mary Kelly; Michael Murrell; Mike Duffy; msummer@scana.com; Mike Waddell; Parkin Hunter; Patricia Wendling; Patrick Moore; Phil Hamby ; Ralph Crafton; Randal Shealy; Randy Mahan; rparsons12@alltel.net; Rhett Bickley; Richard Kidder; SKEENER@sc.rr.com; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; ryanity@scana.com; Sheri Armstrong ; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Synithia Williams; Theresa Powers; Tom Brooks; Tom Ruple; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber; J. Ryan; Alan Axson; Bill Brebner ; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer Hand; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Karen Kustafik; Keith Ganz-Sarto; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Richard Mikell; sjones@imichotels.net; Tim Vinson

Cc: Dave Anderson

Subject: Draft Lake Murray Permitting Handbook

Good morning Lake and Land Management TWC,

Please find attached the Draft *Lake Murray Permitting Handbook* for your review. If you have any questions regarding this document, please feel free to contact Alan Stuart or myself (207-487-3328) at Kleinschmidt.

Thank you,

Stacia

<<Permitting Handbook 2007-11-06.doc>>

Stacia Hoover, *Scientist*

Kleinschmidt Associates

Energy & Water Resource Consultants

141 Main Street

Pittsfield, ME 04967

phone: (207) 487-3328

fax: (207) 487-3124

Stacia.Hoover@KleinschmidtUSA.com

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Kelly Maloney](#);
Subject: FW: revised with rank - Recreational Flow Request from American Whitewater
Date: Friday, October 26, 2007 9:55:51 PM
Attachments: [American Whitewater revised.doc](#)

Let me know when you want to talk about all this (after things settle down).

Looks like a full moon tonight...

-----Original Message-----

From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R [mailto:BARGENTIERI@scana.com]
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2007 2:39 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Dave Anderson
Subject: FW: revised with rank - Recreational Flow Request from American Whitewater

FYI

From: C Coleman [mailto:cheetahtk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2007 3:28 PM
To: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R
Cc: Kevin Colburn
Subject: revised with rank

Randy and Bill,

Thank you Gentlemen for your continuing efforts to protect and enhance the Saluda River/Lake Murray resources.

Here is a rough out of the levels of priority you requested as to recreational flows. As you know we always appreciate more. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,
Charlene

It is not so much the example of others we imitate, as the reflection of ourselves in their eyes and the echo of ourselves in their words.

--Eric Hoffer

Charlene Coleman

American Whitewater
Regional Coordinator

Do You Yahoo!?

Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around

<http://mail.yahoo.com>

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: ["C Coleman"; "Bill Marshall"; Alison Guth; "Tony Bebber"; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; "Guy Jones"; "J. Hamilton Hagood"; Jennifer Hand; "Jim Cumberland"; "Karen Kustafik"; Kelly Maloney; "Malcolm Leaphart"; "Mike Waddell";](#)
Subject: RE: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report
Date: Sunday, January 27, 2008 7:03:48 PM

Bill,

Alan told me you were interested in a meeting and I agree it's time to have one. I have drafted some draft recommendations that are being reviewed internally and hope to have them out soon. Sit tight and we'll let everyone know when they are ready and meet to discuss.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: C Coleman [mailto:cheetahtk@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, January 25, 2008 2:46 PM

To: Bill Marshall; Alison Guth; Tony Bebber; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; J. Hamilton Hagood; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Mike Waddell

Subject: Re: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report

yes

When you have decided what you believe, what you feel must be done, have the courage to stand alone and be counted.

- Eleanor Roosevelt

Charlene Coleman

American Whitewater
Regional Coordinator

----- Original Message -----

From: Bill Marshall <MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov>
To: Alison Guth <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>; Tony
Bebber <tbebber@scprt.com>; Bill Argentieri <bargentieri@scana.
com>; Charlene Coleman <cheetahtrk@yahoo.com>; Dave Anderson
<dave.anderson@kleinschmidtusa.com>; Guy Jones <guyjones@sc.rr.
com>; J. Hamilton Hagood <jhamilton@scana.com>; Jennifer
Summerlin <Jennifer.Hand@KleinschmidtUSA.com>; Jim
Cumberland <jimc@scccl.org>; Karen Kustafik
<kakustafik@columbiasc.net>; Kelly Maloney <Kelly.
Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com>; Malcolm Leaphart
<malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu>; Mike Waddell <mwaddell@esri.sc.
edu>

Sent: Friday, January 25, 2008 3:33:31 PM

Subject: RE: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report

Hello everyone,
Having received a final version of the Downstream Flow Assessment
Report in December, I am wondering what's next to be accomplished by
our Downstream Flows TWC. Shall we develop some
recommendations?

Bill

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Monday, December 17, 2007 12:35 PM

To: Tony Bebber; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave
Anderson; Guy Jones; J. Hamilton Hagood; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim
Cumberland ; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Mike
Waddell

Cc: Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill
Brebner ; Charlie Rentz; David Hancock; dchristie@comporium.net;
George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff
Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs;
Keith Ganz-Sarto; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Mark Leao; Marty
Phillips; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Randy Mahan; rparsons12@alltel.
net; Richard Mikell; sjones@imichotels.net; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes;
Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Bill Mathias; Bret Hoffman; David Price;
Edward Schnepel; Jay Schabacher ; Jerry Wise; Joel Huggins ; John and
Rob Altenberg; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Norm Nicholson; Roger
Hovis ; Lee (Skeet) Mills; Stephan Curry

Subject: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report

Hello Downstream Flow TWC,

Attached is the Final Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Report. For informational purposes, the Recreation and Safety RCG's are being CC'ed on this email as well. Take care, Alison

<<Final Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Report.zip>>

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone 803-951-2077

Fax 803-951-2124

Never miss a thing. [Make Yahoo your homepage.](#)

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Van Hoffman](#); [Alan Axson](#); [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#);
[Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Brebner](#) ; [Bill Marshall](#); [Charlene Coleman](#); [Charlie Rentz](#);
[Dave Anderson](#); [David Hancock](#); [Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#);
[George Duke](#); [Gerrit Jobsis \(American Rivers\)](#); [Guy Jones](#);
[Irvin Pitts \(ipitts@scprt.com\)](#); [Jeff Duncan](#); [Jennifer O'Rourke](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Jim Devereaux](#); [JoAnn Butler](#); [Joy Downs](#);
[Karen Kustafik](#); [Keith Ganz-Sarto](#); [Kelly Maloney](#);
[Larry Turner \(turnerle@dhec.sc.gov\)](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Mark Leao](#); [Marty Phillips](#); [Mike Waddell](#); [Miriam Atria](#); [Norman Ferris](#);
[Randy Mahan](#); [Regis Parsons \(rparsons12@alltel.net\)](#); [Richard Mikell](#);
[Stan Jones \(sjones@imichotels.net\)](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Suzanne Rhodes](#);
[Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebbler](#);
Subject: FW: Example Recreation Plans
Date: Thursday, September 06, 2007 3:17:15 PM

Recreation RCG Members,

I am reviewing my notes from previous meetings and noticed I was supposed to send this out to the entire RCG rather than just the TWC. Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 4:46 PM

To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart

Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'

Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

<ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>

From: [Alison Guth](#)
To: [Tony Bebber](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Charlene Coleman](#);
[Dave Anderson](#); [Guy Jones](#); [J. Hamilton Hagood](#); [Jennifer Hand](#);
[Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Karen Kustafik](#); [Kelly Maloney](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Mike Waddell](#);
cc: [Van Hoffman](#); [Alan Axson](#); [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#);
[Bill Brebner](#) ; [Charlie Rentz](#); [David Hancock](#);
[Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#);
[Gerrit Jobsis \(American Rivers\)](#); [Irvin Pitts \(ipitts@scprt.com\)](#); [Jeff Duncan](#);
[Jennifer O'Rourke](#); [Jim Devereaux](#); [JoAnn Butler](#); [Joy Downs](#); [Keith Ganz-](#)
[Sarto](#); [Larry Turner \(turnerle@dhec.sc.gov\)](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Mark Leao](#);
[Marty Phillips](#); [Miriam Atria](#); [Norman Ferris](#); [Randy Mahan](#);
[Regis Parsons \(rparsons12@alltel.net\)](#); [Richard Mikell](#);
[Stan Jones \(sjones@imichotels.net\)](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Suzanne Rhodes](#);
[Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Bill Mathias](#); [Bret Hoffman](#); [David Price](#);
[Edward Schnepel](#); [Jay Schabacher](#) ; [Jerry Wise](#); [Joel Huggins](#) ;
[John and Rob Altenberg](#); [Ken Uschelbec](#); [Kenneth Fox](#); [Norm Nicholson](#);
[Roger Hovis](#) ; [Skeet Mills](#) ; [Stephan Curry](#);
Subject: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report
Date: Monday, December 17, 2007 12:34:43 PM
Attachments: [Final Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Report.zip](#)

Hello Downstream Flow TWC,
Attached is the Final Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Report. For informational purposes, the Recreation and Safety RCG's are being CC'ed on this email as well. Take care, Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301
Lexington, SC 29072
Phone 803-951-2077
Fax 803-951-2124

Carl Bussells

From: Steve Bell [bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2007 9:08 AM
To: "Bill Marshall"; "Tony Bebbler"; Dave Anderson; "Van Hoffman"; "David Hancock"; "Dick Christie"; "George Duke"; Jennifer Hand; "Joy Downs"; Kelly Maloney; "Lee Barber"; "Malcolm Leaphart"; Marty Phillips; "Jim Cumberland "; "Steve Bell"; "Tim Vinson"; "Tommy Boozer"; Alison Guth; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com; Alan Stuart
Cc: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Subject: FERC doc. on recreaton plan



recreat-dev-hydro-I
icen.pdf (2...

FYI- Attached is FERC guidelines on developing a recreation plan. Note FERC suggest that lands and other recreational resources with the project boundary be included as part of the "inventory" . Also it suggest that safety hazards be identified and listed in the plan. This has some good info on why we should protect project lands that have recreational value.

Steve Bell
Lake Murray Watch

Carl Bussells

From: Steve Bell [bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2007 9:08 AM
To: "Bill Marshall"; "Tony Bebbler"; Dave Anderson; "Van Hoffman"; "David Hancock"; "Dick Christie"; "George Duke"; "Jennifer Summerlin"; "Joy Downs"; Kelly Maloney; "Lee Barber"; "Malcolm Leaphart"; Marty Phillips; "Jim Cumberland "; "Steve Bell"; "Tim Vinson"; "Tommy Boozer"; Alison Guth; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com; Alan Stuart
Cc: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Subject: FERC doc. on recreaton plan



recreat-dev-hydro-I
icen.pdf (2...

FYI- Attached is FERC guidelines on developing a recreation plan. Note FERC suggest that lands and other recreational resources with the project boundary be included as part of the "inventory" . Also it suggest that safety hazards be identified and listed in the plan. This has some good info on why we should protect project lands that have recreational value.

Steve Bell
Lake Murray Watch

Carl Bussells

From: Steve Bell [bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2007 9:08 AM
To: "Bill Marshall"; "Tony Bebbler"; Dave Anderson; "Van Hoffman"; "David Hancock"; "Dick Christie"; "George Duke"; "Jennifer Summerlin"; "Joy Downs"; Kelly Maloney; "Lee Barber"; "Malcolm Leaphart"; Marty Phillips; "Jim Cumberland "; "Steve Bell"; "Tim Vinson"; "Tommy Boozer"; Alison Guth; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com; Alan Stuart
Cc: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Subject: FERC doc. on recreaton plan



recreat-dev-hydro-I
icen.pdf (2...

FYI- Attached is FERC guidelines on developing a recreation plan. Note FERC suggest that lands and other recreational resources with the project boundary be included as part of the "inventory" . Also it suggest that safety hazards be identified and listed in the plan. This has some good info on why we should protect project lands that have recreational value.

Steve Bell
Lake Murray Watch

Subject: Recreation Management TWC

The Following Message is For the Recreation Management TWC: Tommy Boozer, Alan Stuart, Dave Anderson, David Hancock, Tony Bebbber, DNR, Steve Bell, Van Hoffman, George Duke, and Lee Barber

Hello Recreation Management TWC,

I just wanted to send you a reminder that you scheduled your Technical Working Committee meeting for tomorrow (Tuesday, Feb 28th) at 9:00 am. I was informed that you will meet at the Lake and Land Management Shed off of Old Bush River Road. If there have been any changes to this, let me know. I will be at a meeting for most of the day, but should be back in late this afternoon. 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

From: [Brandon Kulik](#)
To: [Shane Boring](#); ["Theresa Thom"](#); [Alison Guth](#); ["Amanda Hill"](#); ["Bill Argentieri"](#); ["Bud Badr"](#); ["Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)"](#); ["Gerrit Jobsis \(American Rivers\)"](#); ["Gina Kirkland"](#); ["Hal Beard"](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); ["Jim Glover"](#); ["Malcolm Leaphart"](#); ["Mark Giffin \(giffinma@dhec.sc.gov\)"](#); ["Mike Waddell"](#); ["Milton Quattlebaum \(mquattlebaum@scana.com\)"](#); ["Prescott Brownell"](#); ["Randy Mahan"](#); ["Ron Ahle"](#); ["Scott Harder"](#); [Shane Boring](#); ["Steve Summer"](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: Monthly median Project inflows, and some light reading and food for thought
Date: Thursday, January 17, 2008 10:58:45 AM
Attachments: [L and O 1988.doc](#)
[Leonard and Orth 1988.pdf](#)

Hello everyone,
Attached as requested, is a table of monthly median project inflows. It may suggest some alternative ways of lumping months other than that proposed on our call. Open for discussion at our workshop.

Month Median Value

Jan 2782
Feb 3188
March 3549
April 2387.5
May 1610
June 1315.5
July 1135
August 1109.5
Sept 1052.5
Oct 946
Nov 1166
Dec 1828

One possible mix based on both rough flow magnitudes and biological seasons could be:

Dec-Feb ("Winter")
March ("early spring")
April-May ("late spring")
June-Sept ("summer")
Oct-Nov ("fall")

Kevin has tallied the permutations and combinations of guilds, study sites, and seasonal month-combo flows for use in the habitat duration analysis and reports that it will be in the neighborhood of 1000+/- individual data sets, even with some months combined. In looking toward continuing to try to find ways to streamline some of the data we are generating without losing critical habitat-flow relationships, I have been giving further thought to how best to employ our guild data. I went back to what many consider to be the seminal paper on use of guilds in warmwater stream flow assessment, a 1988 paper by Paul Leonard and Don Orth (attached in the case you haven't already seen it). I also took the liberty of cutting and pasting the key elements of L&O into a word summary document, in the event you are pressed for time and can't wade through the entire paper.

Insofar as guilds are concerned, some of the take-home points are:

For large rivers, focus on riffle, run and also stream margin ("shallow slow" in Saluda lingo) guild representatives

Pool (deep slow) guild members offer the least decision information

Not a guild-specific point but L&O also note that there are basically 4 WUA curve patterns or classifications, classes I, II, and III are the most informative; conversely WUA curves corresponding to

type IV are the least informative. I think you will likely recognize these shape categories of the curves in our modeling data from the Saluda study.

If you have a chance to glance through the material, I would propose that as a group we consider these principles in guiding our guild choices during the workshop. Possibly consider eliminating various type IV and deep-slow curves, there may even be an opportunity to blend or eliminate a few species and lifestages with redundant curve shapes. Again, just food for thought for next week

Brandon

Brandon H Kulik

Senior Fisheries Scientist

Kleinschmidt Energy & Water Resource Consultants

141 Main Street

Pittsfield, Maine 04967

(207) 487-3328

From: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
To: [Dave Anderson](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [Mark Davis](#); [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ;
BARGENTIERI@scana.com; [Bill Marshall](#); [David Hancock](#);
dchristie@comporium.net; [George Duke](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ;
[Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#); RMAHAN@scana.com;
[Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Van Hoffman](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: Lake Murray Watch Comments on "strawman" rec plan
Date: Thursday, March 20, 2008 8:20:54 AM
Attachments: [LW comments to Rec. draft plan.doc](#)

Dave- Attached are my comments. Steve

----- Original message from "Dave Anderson" <Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com>: -----

[Yes, that is correct.](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Bebber [<mailto:tbebber@scprt.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 7:48 AM

To: Dave Anderson; Mark Davis; Vivianne Vejdani ;
BARGENTIERI@scana.com; [Bill Marshall](#); [David Hancock](#);
dchristie@comporium.net; [George Duke](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ;
[Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
RMAHAN@scana.com; [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#);
[Van Hoffman](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#)

Subject: RE: Recreation Management TWC Meeting, March 20

Dave, are you saying we WILL NOT meet on Wed, March 19, and only Thurs, March 20?

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism

1205 Pendleton Street

Columbia, SC 29201

Phone 803-734-0189

Fax 803-734-1042

tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com
www.SCTrails.net

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Monday, March 17, 2008 6:33 PM

To: Mark Davis; Vivianne Vejdani ; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; dchristie@comporium.net; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Randy Mahan; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber; Van Hoffman; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart

Subject: Recreation Management TWC Meeting, March 20

Recreation Management TWC Members:

It appears most of you can meet on the 20th and are committed to preparing either written comments or "discussion points" for the meeting.

The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the initial draft Recreation Plan, specifically Section 5.0 and 6.0. I am interested in hearing any alternative improvements, facility needs, or prioritizations.

I have attached an agenda, although we will be discussing this one topic.

I invite you to revisit the "standard process questions" (most recent version attached), which I will use to guide the discussion.

The meeting room is 103A and we will start at 9:30 am. Please RSVP to Jeni Hand (jennifer.hand@kleinschmidtusa.com) if you are going to attend so we can get a count for lunch.

Dave

<<Recreation RCG Working Documents (2007-12-13).doc>>
<<2008-03-20 Recreation Management TWC Agenda.doc>>

Carl Bussells

Subject: Lake Murray Site Visit
Location: Meeting Point at Dreher Island State Park

Start: Fri 5/30/2008 9:00 AM
End: Fri 5/30/2008 3:30 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Required Attendees: Lake & Land Mgt TWC

Hello All,

As we discussed in our last Lake and Land Management TWC, we will be holding a site visit around Lake Murray, Friday, May 30th. There was an expressed desire to view various locations around the lake such as buffer zones, stabilization examples and ESA's. Tommy is working to develop a trip itinerary. After some discussion, it was thought that the best location to meet would be the **Bait and Tackle shop at Dreher Island State Park**. There is a fee to enter the park. However, Tony Bebbler is working hard to see if we could possibly park for no charge. I will keep you posted on the parking situation.

Carl Sundius of Southshore Marina has also volunteered to drive a boat and will be leaving from his marina. He noted that individuals can meet him there if they prefer not to drive to Dreher Island. However, he will need to leave in enough time to meet with Tommy and the crowd at Dreher Island by 9:00, and as I am not aware of the travel time from Southshore to Dreher Island, I will let Carl advise us of what time people would need to meet at his marina.

It is important that we have an EXACT head count for this trip by Tuesday for planning purposes, also please indicate if you will be meeting at Southshore or Dreher. Also, there is quite a bit to see, so it is important that we leave Dreher Island promptly at 9:00. We will not be able to wait on stragglers. That being said, I will keep you posted of the issue with Dreher Island Park admission and what time one would need to meet Carl if you are leaving from Southshore.

Thanks,
Alison

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 9:24 AM
To: 'Carl Sundius'
Subject: RE: Lake Murray Site Visit

Thanks Carl,

I will let you know who all to expect. So far, I know Roy Parker is going to meet you. But I will send you a complete list once everyone RSVP's. Hope you had a good (and busy) Memorial Day. Alison

-----Original Message-----

From: Carl Sundius [mailto:CSundius@SC.RR.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2008 9:27 AM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Lake Murray Site Visit

Alison

Lets say we need to leave by 8:30 am

Carl

-----Original Message-----

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 3:37 PM
To: Vivianne Vejdani ; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; ben@scwf.org; Bill Argentieri; Carl Sundius; David Hancock; dchristie@comporium.net; James Leslie ; Jim Cumberland ; John Frick; Joy Downs; Randy Mahan; Rhett Bickley; Ron Ahle; Ronald Scott; Roy Parker; lakewatchman@yahoo.com; Suzanne Rhodes; Tom Ruple; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Van Hoffman
Subject: Lake Murray Site Visit

When: Friday, May 30, 2008 9:00 AM-3:30 PM (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).

Where: Meeting Point at Dreher Island State Park

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

Hello All,

As we discussed in our last Lake and Land Management TWC, we will be holding a site visit around Lake Murray, Friday, May 30th. There was an expressed desire to view various locations around the lake such as buffer zones, stabilization examples and ESA's. Tommy is working to develop a trip itinerary. After some discussion, it was thought that the best location to meet would be the **Bait and Tackle shop at Dreher Island State Park**. There is a fee to enter the park. However, Tony Bebbler is working hard to see if we could possibly park for no charge. I will keep you posted on the parking situation.

Carl Sundius of Southshore Marina has also volunteered to drive a boat and will be leaving from his marina. He noted that individuals can meet him there if they prefer not to drive to Dreher Island. However, he will need to leave in enough time to meet with Tommy and the crowd at Dreher Island by 9:00, and as I am not aware of the travel time from Southshore to Dreher Island, I will let Carl advise us of what time people would need to meet at his marina.

It is important that we have an EXACT head count for this trip by Tuesday for planning purposes, also please indicate if you will be meeting at Southshore or Dreher. Also, there is quite a bit to see, so it is important that we leave Dreher Island promptly at 9:00. We will not be able to wait on stragglers. That being said, I will keep you posted of the issue with Dreher Island Park admission and what time one would need to meet Carl if you are leaving from Southshore.

Thanks,
Alison

From: Alison Guth
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#);
[Ben Gregg \(ben@scwf.org\)](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Carl Sundius](#); [David Hancock](#);
[Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [James Leslie](#) ; [Jim Cumberland](#) ;
[John Frick](#); [Joy Downs](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Rhett Bickley](#); [Ron Ahle](#);
[Ronald Scott](#); [Roy Parker](#); [Steve Bell \(lakewatchman@yahoo.com\)](#);
[Suzanne Rhodes](#); [Tom Ruple](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebbber](#); [Van Hoffman](#);
Subject: Lake Murray Site Visit
Start: Friday, May 30, 2008 9:00:00 AM
End: Friday, May 30, 2008 3:30:00 PM
Location: Meeting Point at Dreher Island State Park

Hello All,

As we discussed in our last Lake and Land Management TWC, we will be holding a site visit around Lake Murray, Friday, May 30th. There was an expressed desire to view various locations around the lake such as buffer zones, stabilization examples and ESA's. Tommy is working to develop a trip itinerary. After some discussion, it was thought that the best location to meet would be the Bait and Tackle shop at Dreher Island State Park. There is a fee to enter the park. However, Tony Bebbber is working hard to see if we could possibly park for no charge. I will keep you posted on the parking situation.

Carl Sundius of Southshore Marina has also volunteered to drive a boat and will be leaving from his marina. He noted that individuals can meet him there if they prefer not to drive to Dreher Island. However, he will need to leave in enough time to meet with Tommy and the crowd at Dreher Island by 9:00, and as I am not aware of the travel time from Southshore to Dreher Island, I will let Carl advise us of what time people would need to meet at his marina.

It is important that we have an EXACT head count for this trip by Tuesday for planning purposes, also please indicate if you will be meeting at Southshore or Dreher. Also, there is quite a bit to see, so it is important that we leave Dreher Island promptly at 9:00. We will not be able to wait on stragglers. That being said, I will keep you posted of the issue with Dreher Island Park admission and what time one would need to meet Carl if you are leaving from Southshore.

Thanks,
Alison

Recreation Management TWC Members,

I know things have been a little quiet in our group lately, but things are getting ready to pick up substantially. I have attached several draft "issue recommendations" for you to begin to review that will ultimately become part of the Recreation Plan. The issues come from our "Identified Issues" that are not covered under the Recreation Plan itself (facilities).

The first of these is the issue recommendation for "conservation of lands". We will be having a meeting on February 20th at 10 am at the Lake Murray Training Center to discuss this issue in light of the "focus group proposal" that Jim Cumberland sent around a couple of weeks ago.

<<Natural~Undeveloped Lands Issue Recommendation (2008-02-05;DRAFT).doc>>

The other two issue recommendations that I would like to introduce are for "protecting the coldwater fishery on the LSR" and "impacts of lake level".

<<Coldwater Fishery Issue Recommendation (2008-02-05;DRAFT).doc>> <<Lake Level Issue Recommendation (2008-02-05;DRAFT).doc>>

We can discuss these on the 20th, but I want to make sure we cover the focus group proposal first. If we don't get to them on the 20th, we have other meetings scheduled where we can discuss them.

Finally, we will be having meetings on March 3 and March 4. Right now, the Lake Murray Training Center is only available on March 3, but may be available on March 4. I will let everyone know the specifics of this meeting as it approaches. I will be sending out the draft Recreation Plan soon and we will use these two dates to present the Plan, hear any other recommendations from stakeholders (DNR, PRT, etc.), and answer any questions you may have on the Plan.

As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

Operations RCG and Operations TWC Members:

The Recreation RCG identified "impacts of lake levels on recreational use of the lake" as an issue we would provide recommendations on during the relicensing process. The Recreation Management TWC has finalized our "issue recommendation" and request that the associated lake level alternatives be modeled in conjunction with other constraints to determine the feasibility of our recommended scenarios.

We look forward to reviewing the results of the model. If there are any questions about our issue recommendation, please let us know.

Dave Anderson
Recreation RCG Facilitator

<<Lake Level Issue Recommendation (2008-03-24;FINAL).pdf>>

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 4:24 PM
To: Jim Cumberland; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Subject: RE: Rec focus group proposal and lake & land

Hello,

Ahh, there was some disconnect there (this is what happens when I miss meetings :)). You are correct, Thursday was set aside for your proposal on the Recreation Plan. Dave has already canceled the meeting on the 10th, however let me see if I can book a room and issue a rebuttal to the cancellation email that I sent out earlier. If Dave is available and we can get a room booked, would you two be ready to discuss this on the 10th?

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@ccccl.org]
Sent: Thu 4/3/2008 3:27 PM
To: Alison Guth; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Subject: RE: Rec focus group proposal and lake & land

Hi Alison,

I thought that meeting was Thursday, and that the Tuesday meeting was to be on Forest Management property & the dock permitting policy.

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@ccccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 2:09 PM
To: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Jim Cumberland
Subject: Rec focus group proposal and lake & land

Hello guys,

From what I understand took place at the last Lake and Land Management meeting, there were going to be further discussions on the proposal for future development lands made by the Recreation Focus Group. With you guys discussing this information with the Lake and Land group. I just wanted to email you make sure you would be ready to discuss this. Thanks, Alison

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 2:09 PM
To: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; jimc@scccl.org
Subject: Rec focus group proposal and lake & land

Hello guys,

From what I understand took place at the last Lake and Land Management meeting, there were going to be further discussions on the proposal for future development lands made by the Recreation Focus Group. With you guys discussing this information with the Lake and Land group. I just wanted to email you make sure you would be ready to discuss this. Thanks, Alison

From: [Alison Guth](#)
To: ["Suzanne Rhodes"; Tommy Boozer; Bill Argentieri; Dave Anderson; David Price; J. Hamilton Hagood; Joy Downs; Kenneth Fox; Norm Nicholson; Steve Bell; Alan Stuart;](#)
Subject: Navigational Aid Reporting Form FINAL
Date: Monday, October 29, 2007 1:43:19 PM
Attachments: [Nav Aids Marking Form.doc](#)

Hello All,
Attached is the Final navigational aid reporting form. Thanks, Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301
Lexington, SC 29072
Phone 803-951-2077
Fax 803-951-2124

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#);
[David Hancock](#); [Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Mark Davis \(mdavis@scprt.com\)](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#);
[Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [Van Hoffman](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: Proposal for Protection of Additional Lands for Recreation
Date: Monday, April 14, 2008 11:48:36 AM
Attachments: [Proposed Measure to protect recreational opportunities.doc](#)

Recreation Management TWC Members:

I am sending this around to make sure everyone is aware of the this proposal from Lake Watch, Lake Murray Homeowner's Coalition, Coastal Conservation League, and the SC Wildlife Federation. SCE&G is in the process of evaluating the costs of the alternatives submitted and hopes to be able respond to these alternatives by the end of May. In the meantime, we will continue to work on the "front end" of the recreation plan and incorporate the edits and comments received on the text of the plan. The next version of the plan should be available by the end of May as well.

Dave

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Van Hoffman](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [David Hancock](#); [Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebbler](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: FW: RM TWC focus group proposal
Date: Friday, January 18, 2008 12:03:20 PM

I forwarded the Focus Group Proposal to those Recreation Management TWC members that weren't on the original distribution list (that I could tell). Per Randy's suggestion, we will be having a meeting on either February 4th or 6th, depending on when the majority of TWC members can make it.

-----Original Message-----

From: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R [mailto:RMAHAN@scana.com]
Subject: RE: RM TWC focus group proposal

While the proposal coming out of what apparently is an ad hoc sub-group seems to have some merit, it has features clearly unacceptable to some if not all of excluded members of the TWC. I am one of those apparently excluded TWC members, as also Bill Argentieri seems to be. In any case, any proposal must be reviewed by the full TWC before being reported out to the RCG as something being considered and proposed by the TWC. This was not a case where a proposal was made to the TWC and some folks simply weren't at the meeting. It seems to have been done purposely, entirely outside the TWC process, and hence must not be given any semblance of TWC endorsement. There must be at least the opportunity for all TWC members to sit with and to question the members of the ad hoc group who took it upon themselves to initiate an exclusionary side process and develop a proposal outside the TWC process. I shouldn't have to **assume** that I fully understand the details and the underlying reasoning of their proposals.

As to when we might meet for a presentation by this group to the full TWC, I am available February 4 and 6.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@scccl.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 9:15 AM

To: Dave Anderson

Cc: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Gerrit Jobsis; Matt Rice; Tony Bebbler; Bill Marshall; kayakduke@bellsouth.net; dhancock@scana.com; Jennifer Hand; elymay2@aol.com; Malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu; suzrhodes@juno.com; tboozier@scana.com

Subject: RM TWC focus group proposal

Hi Dave,

Thanks for your offer to forward the focus group proposal to the LLM TWC. I think it would be ideal if the proposal could come from the RM TWC, so I propose, because of everyone's schedules being so busy, that, in lieu of a meeting, the attached summary of recommendations, and the entire focus group proposal, be sent to the RM TWC members for comment and where possible approval of the recommendations. I suggest a date of early next week for comments/indications of approval. Is that course of action acceptable?

I have attached a document containing the recommendations contained in the focus group proposal, and the entire proposal.

Thanks for your consideration.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@ccccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

From: [Alison Guth](#)
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#);
[Ben Gregg \(ben@scwf.org\)](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Carl Sundius](#); [David Hancock](#);
[Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [James Leslie](#) ; [Jim Cumberland](#) ;
[John Frick](#); [Joy Downs](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Rhett Bickley](#); [Ron Ahle](#);
[Ronald Scott](#); [Roy Parker](#); [Steve Bell \(lakewatchman@yahoo.com\)](#);
[Suzanne Rhodes](#); [Tom Ruple](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebbler](#); [Van Hoffman](#);
Subject: Friday Site Visit Info
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 3:29:50 PM
Attachments: [SCE&Gcarpermit.doc](#)

Hello all,

Below are details regarding the site visit on Lake Murray this Friday. Please let me know ASAP (i.e. Today preferably) if you plan on attending.

Parking at Dreher Island:

Tony Bebbler has pulled some strings so that we may park at Dreher Island State Park for no charge. I have attached a flyer to print off and place in the dash of your car so that the staff will not issue you a ticket. Also, we are meeting at the Bait and Tackle shop at 9:00 so please park in the car parking spaces if available. If the only parking available is in the full boat parking spaces, please park so that two cars can park in the full boat parking spaces.

Leaving from Southshore Marina:

If you have opted to leave with Carl from Southshore Marina, please meet him at 8:15 so that there is enough time to drive to Dreher Island by 9:00.

Thanks and if you have any questions please feel free to email me.

Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301
Lexington, SC 29072
Phone 803-951-2077
Fax 803-951-2124

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Van Hoffman](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [David Hancock](#); [Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebbler](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: FW: RM TWC focus group proposal
Date: Friday, January 18, 2008 12:03:20 PM

I forwarded the Focus Group Proposal to those Recreation Management TWC members that weren't on the original distribution list (that I could tell). Per Randy's suggestion, we will be having a meeting on either February 4th or 6th, depending on when the majority of TWC members can make it.

-----Original Message-----

From: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R [mailto:RMAHAN@scana.com]
Subject: RE: RM TWC focus group proposal

While the proposal coming out of what apparently is an ad hoc sub-group seems to have some merit, it has features clearly unacceptable to some if not all of excluded members of the TWC. I am one of those apparently excluded TWC members, as also Bill Argentieri seems to be. In any case, any proposal must be reviewed by the full TWC before being reported out to the RCG as something being considered and proposed by the TWC. This was not a case where a proposal was made to the TWC and some folks simply weren't at the meeting. It seems to have been done purposely, entirely outside the TWC process, and hence must not be given any semblance of TWC endorsement. There must be at least the opportunity for all TWC members to sit with and to question the members of the ad hoc group who took it upon themselves to initiate an exclusionary side process and develop a proposal outside the TWC process. I shouldn't have to **assume** that I fully understand the details and the underlying reasoning of their proposals.

As to when we might meet for a presentation by this group to the full TWC, I am available February 4 and 6.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@scccl.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 9:15 AM

To: Dave Anderson

Cc: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Gerrit Jobsis; Matt Rice; Tony Bebbler; Bill Marshall; kayakduke@bellsouth.net; dhancock@scana.com; Jennifer Hand; elymay2@aol.com; Malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu; suzrhodes@juno.com; tboozier@scana.com

Subject: RM TWC focus group proposal

Hi Dave,

Thanks for your offer to forward the focus group proposal to the LLM TWC. I think it would be ideal if the proposal could come from the RM TWC, so I propose, because of everyone's schedules being so busy, that, in lieu of a meeting, the attached summary of recommendations, and the entire focus group proposal, be sent to the RM TWC members for comment and where possible approval of the recommendations. I suggest a date of early next week for comments/indications of approval. Is that course of action acceptable?

I have attached a document containing the recommendations contained in the focus group proposal, and the entire proposal.

Thanks for your consideration.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@ccccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#);
[David Hancock](#); [Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Randy Mahan](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebbler](#);
[Van Hoffman](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: Final Drafts of Recommendations from Last Week
Date: Monday, March 10, 2008 12:58:18 PM
Attachments: [Lake Level Issue Recommendation \(2008-03-07 DRAFT\).doc](#)
[Trout Fishery Issue Recommendation \(2008-03-07 DRAFT\).doc](#)

Recreation Management TWC Members:

Attached are the "final drafts" of the lake level and trout fishery recommendations. We don't need any more discussion on these, but I said I would send them out for any "grammatical edits" that I may have missed.

I will send these recommendations to the other RCGs (Fish and Wildlife, Operations) next week.

Dave

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 11:28 AM
To: 'Tony Bebber'
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

sorry, I sent my email without finishing :), Everyone seems to want to go out on the lake

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebbber@scprt.com]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 11:14 AM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

How many do we anticipate attending?

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone 803-734-0189
Fax 803-734-1042
tbebbber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2008 1:45 PM
To: Tony Bebber
Subject: Dreher Island

Hey Tony,

Just a friendly reminder to see if you could check on Dreher Island gate access for May 30th. Thanks so much!

Alison

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2008 1:45 PM
To: Tony Bebber (Tbebber@SCPRT.com)
Subject: Dreher Island

Hey Tony,

Just a friendly reminder to see if you could check on Dreher Island gate access for May 30th. Thanks so much! Alison

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 11:27 AM
To: 'Tony Bebber'
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

15 to 20 probably... Everyone seems

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 11:14 AM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

How many do we anticipate attending?

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone 803-734-0189
Fax 803-734-1042
tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2008 1:45 PM
To: Tony Bebber
Subject: Dreher Island

Hey Tony,

Just a friendly reminder to see if you could check on Dreher Island gate access for May 30th. Thanks so much!

Alison

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 2:57 PM
To: 'Tony Bebber'
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

Thanks Tony

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 2:42 PM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

Have a call into Seth Kaufman, Sr. Ranger. Hope to hear today.

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone 803-734-0189
Fax 803-734-1042
tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 11:27 AM
To: Tony Bebber
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

15 to 20 probably... Everyone seems

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 11:14 AM

To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

How many do we anticipate attending?

Tony Bebber, AICP
Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone 803-734-0189
Fax 803-734-1042
tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2008 1:45 PM
To: Tony Bebber
Subject: Dreher Island

Hey Tony,

Just a friendly reminder to see if you could check on Dreher Island gate access for May 30th. Thanks so much!
Alison

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 9:26 AM
To: 'Tony Bebber'
Cc: 'ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R'; Alan Stuart; 'BOOZER, THOMAS C'
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

Thanks so much Tony! I will send out an email later today to the TWC with all of this information and an attachment of a dashboard slip for everyone to use. Your help with this is much appreciated. Alison

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebbber@scprt.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 8:20 AM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

Alison,

I talked to Seth at Dreher Island (Sr. Ranger). He said to issue everyone a slip of paper to put on their dashboard that says something like:

SCE&G Lake/Land Management Committee

5/30/08

Make it in large type/bold so the staff won't issue a warning ticket.

If we are meeting at the tackle shop, remind folks use car spaces if available and to try not to take up a full boat parking space for one car (put two cars in each pull through space).

Glad it worked out.

Tony Bebber, AICP
Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone 803-734-0189
Fax 803-734-1042
tbebbber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 11:27 AM
To: Tony Bebber
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

15 to 20 probably... Everyone seems

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 11:14 AM
To: Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Dreher Island

How many do we anticipate attending?

Tony Bebber, AICP
Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone 803-734-0189
Fax 803-734-1042
tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2008 1:45 PM
To: Tony Bebber
Subject: Dreher Island

Hey Tony,

Just a friendly reminder to see if you could check on Dreher Island gate access for May 30th. Thanks so much!
Alison

Recreation Management TWC Members,

Attached is the agenda for the meeting on February 20, 2008 at 10 am at the Lake Murray Training Center. I have also attached the spreadsheets that contain the draft "scores" assigned to undeveloped parcels by the Lake and Land Management TWC. These spreadsheets are still up for discussion in the L&LM TWC. In case you are not familiar with the spreadsheets, they are simply the ratings that a group gave each parcel and are still up for discussion in the L&LM TWC. No hard and fast decisions on what parcels shall be set aside have been made at the L&LM TWC level yet.

I also encourage you (in case you haven't seen it), to review the presentation made by SCE&G in the L&LM TWC regarding land reclassification. Tommy Boozer will provide us with a condensed version of this presentation on the 20th. Here is the link:

[http://www.saludahydrorelicense.com/documents/
ProposedMgmtPlanFutureDevelopmentProperty4_000.pdf](http://www.saludahydrorelicense.com/documents/ProposedMgmtPlanFutureDevelopmentProperty4_000.pdf)

Let me know if you need another copy of the "focus group proposal" that was sent around previously.

Please reply back to Alison if you are planning on attending so we can get a count for lunch.

Dave

<<Land Rebalancing comparison chart - grouped scoring 11-7.xls>> <<2008-02-20 Recreation Management TWC Agenda.doc>>

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2008 5:23 PM
To: Dave Anderson; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Bill Argentieri'; 'Bill Marshall'; Dave Anderson; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net)'; 'George Duke'; Jennifer Hand; 'Jim Cumberland'; 'Joy Downs'; 'Lee Barber'; 'Malcolm Leaphart'; 'Randy Mahan'; 'Steve Bell'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tommy Boozer'; 'Tony Bebbber'; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Subject: RE: Draft Recreation Plan

All:

Just to let you know, we have finalized the meeting dates of March 19 and 20 to have meetings to hear/discuss comments on the draft Recreation Plan. The meeting place will be the Lake Murray Training Center. Details of these meetings will be forthcoming.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2008 8:50 AM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland; Joy Downs; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Randy Mahan; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Subject: Draft Recreation Plan

Recreation Management TWC Members:

Attached you will find the initial draft of the Recreation Plan for the Saluda Hydroelectric Project. I realize there is a lot of work left to be done to finalize this, but wanted to get out the "meat" of the document (Section 5.0) to begin our discussion. For example, you will notice that Section 4.0 is largely unwritten. These sections will be finalized after receiving your initial comments on the Plan.

As far as your comments and our upcoming schedule, I would like to receive any written comments on the draft Plan by March 14. We do have a meeting on March 3, but this meeting will simply be a presentation of the plan by Tommy Boozer and a "Q&A" session to clarify any parts of the plan. For those of you that were not there last week, we have tentatively scheduled meetings on March 20 and March 21 to discuss any comments received and listen to any other proposals for recreation improvements at the Project. We will also use this two day meeting to further discuss the "issue recommendations" that have been circulated.

As always, let me know if you have any questions and I will see y'all on March 3rd. The meeting agenda and specifics will be sent out later this week.

<< File: Saluda Project Recreation Plan (2008-02-20;DRAFT).doc >>

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2008 5:23 PM
To: Dave Anderson; 'Van Hoffman'; 'Bill Argentieri'; 'Bill Marshall'; Dave Anderson; 'David Hancock'; 'Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net)'; 'George Duke'; Jennifer Hand; 'Jim Cumberland'; 'Joy Downs'; 'Lee Barber'; 'Malcolm Leaphart'; 'Randy Mahan'; 'Steve Bell'; 'Tim Vinson'; 'Tommy Boozer'; 'Tony Bebbber'; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Subject: RE: Draft Recreation Plan

All:

Just to let you know, we have finalized the meeting dates of March 19 and 20 to have meetings to hear/discuss comments on the draft Recreation Plan. The meeting place will be the Lake Murray Training Center. Details of these meetings will be forthcoming.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2008 8:50 AM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland; Joy Downs; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Randy Mahan; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Subject: Draft Recreation Plan

Recreation Management TWC Members:

Attached you will find the initial draft of the Recreation Plan for the Saluda Hydroelectric Project. I realize there is a lot of work left to be done to finalize this, but wanted to get out the "meat" of the document (Section 5.0) to begin our discussion. For example, you will notice that Section 4.0 is largely unwritten. These sections will be finalized after receiving your initial comments on the Plan.

As far as your comments and our upcoming schedule, I would like to receive any written comments on the draft Plan by March 14. We do have a meeting on March 3, but this meeting will simply be a presentation of the plan by Tommy Boozer and a "Q&A" session to clarify any parts of the plan. For those of you that were not there last week, we have tentatively scheduled meetings on March 20 and March 21 to discuss any comments received and listen to any other proposals for recreation improvements at the Project. We will also use this two day meeting to further discuss the "issue recommendations" that have been circulated.

As always, let me know if you have any questions and I will see y'all on March 3rd. The meeting agenda and specifics will be sent out later this week.

<< File: Saluda Project Recreation Plan (2008-02-20;DRAFT).doc >>

Carl Bussells

From: Tim Vinson [VinsonT@dnr.sc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 10:06 AM
To: Dave Anderson
Subject: RE: Draft Recreation Plan

Hey Dave,

What's the time and place for March 3rd?

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2008 9:50 AM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; dchristie@comporium.net; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Randy Mahan; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Subject: Draft Recreation Plan

Recreation Management TWC Members:

Attached you will find the initial draft of the Recreation Plan for the Saluda Hydroelectric Project. I realize there is a lot of work left to be done to finalize this, but wanted to get out the "meat" of the document (Section 5.0) to begin our discussion. For example, you will notice that Section 4.0 is largely unwritten. These sections will be finalized after receiving your initial comments on the Plan.

As far as your comments and our upcoming schedule, I would like to receive any written comments on the draft Plan by March 14. We do have a meeting on March 3, but this meeting will simply be a presentation of the plan by Tommy Boozer and a "Q&A" session to clarify any parts of the plan. For those of you that were not there last week, we have tentatively scheduled meetings on March 20 and March 21 to discuss any comments received and listen to any other proposals for recreation improvements at the Project. We will also use this two day meeting to further discuss the "issue recommendations" that have been circulated.

As always, let me know if you have any questions and I will see y'all on March 3rd. The meeting agenda and specifics will be sent out later this week.

<<Saluda Project Recreation Plan (2008-02-20;DRAFT).doc>>

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2008 9:50 AM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Randy Mahan; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Subject: Draft Recreation Plan

Recreation Management TWC Members:

Attached you will find the initial draft of the Recreation Plan for the Saluda Hydroelectric Project. I realize there is a lot of work left to be done to finalize this, but wanted to get out the "meat" of the document (Section 5.0) to begin our discussion. For example, you will notice that Section 4.0 is largely unwritten. These sections will be finalized after receiving your initial comments on the Plan.

As far as your comments and our upcoming schedule, I would like to receive any written comments on the draft Plan by March 14. We do have a meeting on March 3, but this meeting will simply be a presentation of the plan by Tommy Boozer and a "Q&A" session to clarify any parts of the plan. For those of you that were not there last week, we have tentatively scheduled meetings on March 20 and March 21 to discuss any comments received and listen to any other proposals for recreation improvements at the Project. We will also use this two day meeting to further discuss the "issue recommendations" that have been circulated.

As always, let me know if you have any questions and I will see y'all on March 3rd. The meeting agenda and specifics will be sent out later this week.



Saluda Project
Recreation Plan...

Carl Bussells

From: Dave Anderson
Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2008 9:50 AM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Randy Mahan; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart
Subject: Draft Recreation Plan

Recreation Management TWC Members:

Attached you will find the initial draft of the Recreation Plan for the Saluda Hydroelectric Project. I realize there is a lot of work left to be done to finalize this, but wanted to get out the "meat" of the document (Section 5.0) to begin our discussion. For example, you will notice that Section 4.0 is largely unwritten. These sections will be finalized after receiving your initial comments on the Plan.

As far as your comments and our upcoming schedule, I would like to receive any written comments on the draft Plan by March 14. We do have a meeting on March 3, but this meeting will simply be a presentation of the plan by Tommy Boozer and a "Q&A" session to clarify any parts of the plan. For those of you that were not there last week, we have tentatively scheduled meetings on March 20 and March 21 to discuss any comments received and listen to any other proposals for recreation improvements at the Project. We will also use this two day meeting to further discuss the "issue recommendations" that have been circulated.

As always, let me know if you have any questions and I will see y'all on March 3rd. The meeting agenda and specifics will be sent out later this week.



Saluda Project
Recreation Plan...

From: [Dick Christie](#)
To: [Dave Anderson;](#)
cc: [Tim Vinson; Bill Marshall; Amanda Hill; Prescott Brownell; Vivianne Vejdani;](#)
[Bob Perry; Tony Bebber;](#)
Date: Friday, March 14, 2008 9:56:26 AM
Attachments: [DNR comments on draft recreation plan 3-14-08.doc](#)

Hi Dave - SCDNR comments on the proposed SCE&G Recreation Plan are attached for your information. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

From: [Tony Bebber](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#);
Subject: Draft Recreation Plan Comments
Date: Friday, March 14, 2008 4:58:03 PM

Dave,
I haven't finished the review of the draft Recreation Plan and can't complete it today (was busy with the Draft Application, meetings, and other activity this week). I will try to get my comments early next week.

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone 803-734-0189
Fax 803-734-1042
tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: [Alison Guth](#)
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#);
[Ben Gregg \(ben@scwf.org\)](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Carl Sundius](#); [David Hancock](#);
[Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [James Leslie](#) ; [Jim Cumberland](#) ;
[John Frick](#); [Joy Downs](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Rhett Bickley](#); [Ron Ahle](#);
[Ronald Scott](#); [Roy Parker](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Suzanne Rhodes](#); [Tom Ruple](#);
[Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [Van Hoffman](#);
Subject: Public Marina Application Procedures - Strawman
Date: Friday, February 15, 2008 2:17:20 PM
Attachments: [Public Marina Dock Application Procedure Strawman 2-15-08.doc](#)

Hello TWC,
As noted at the February 6th TWC meeting, the Public Marina Application Procedures strawman has been revised to include discussion of the various committees discussed and the shoreline footage revised on those marinas desiring accommodations for more than 100 watercraft. Please have comments on the strawman back to me by the 29th of this month. Thanks, Alison

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301
Lexington, SC 29072
Phone 803-951-2077
Fax 803-951-2124

From: Alison Guth
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#);
[Ben Gregg \(ben@scwf.org\)](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Carl Sundius](#); [David Hancock](#);
[Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [James Leslie](#) ; [Jim Cumberland](#) ;
[John Frick](#); [Joy Downs](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Rhett Bickley](#); [Ron Ahle](#);
[Ronald Scott](#); [Roy Parker](#); [Steve Bell \(lakewatchman@yahoo.com\)](#);
[Suzanne Rhodes](#); [Tom Ruple](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [Van Hoffman](#);
cc: ["ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R"](#); ["MAHAN, RANDOLPH R"](#); ["Tony Bebber"](#);
[Alan Stuart](#); ["HANCOCK, DAVID E"](#); ["BOOZER, THOMAS C"](#);
Subject: Canceled: Postponed - Lake Murray Site Visit
Start: Friday, May 30, 2008 9:00:00 AM
End: Friday, May 30, 2008 3:30:00 PM
Location: Meeting Point at Dreher Island State Park

Hello All,

I was able to reach all of the individuals who had RSVP'ed for this trip by phone. However, I wanted to send out an email to the entire group. The float trip for tomorrow has been cancelled due to the unavailability of a boat. We will reschedule this meeting at a later date.

Thanks,
Alison

Previous Message:

Hello All,

As we discussed in our last Lake and Land Management TWC, we will be holding a site visit around Lake Murray, Friday, May 30th. There was an expressed desire to view various locations around the lake such as buffer zones, stabilization examples and ESA's. Tommy is working to develop a trip itinerary. After some discussion, it was thought that the best location to meet would be the Bait and Tackle shop at Dreher Island State Park. There is a fee to enter the park. However, Tony Bebber is working hard to see if we could possibly park for no charge. I will keep you posted on the parking situation.

Carl Sundius of Southshore Marina has also volunteered to drive a boat and will be leaving from his marina. He noted that individuals can meet him there if they prefer not to drive to Dreher Island. However, he will need to leave in enough time to meet with Tommy and the crowd at Dreher Island by 9:00, and as I am not aware of the travel time from Southshore to Dreher Island, I will let Carl advise us of what time people would need to meet at his marina.

It is important that we have an EXACT head count for this trip by Tuesday for planning purposes, also please indicate if you will be meeting at Southshore or Dreher. Also, there is quite a bit to see, so it is important that we leave Dreher Island promptly at 9:00. We will not be able to wait on stragglers. That being said, I will keep you posted of the issue with Dreher Island Park admission and what time one would need to meet Carl if you are leaving from Southshore.

Thanks,
Alison

From: Alison Guth
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#);
[Ben Gregg \(ben@scwf.org\)](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Carl Sundius](#); [David Hancock](#);
[Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [James Leslie](#) ; [Jim Cumberland](#) ;
[John Frick](#); [Joy Downs](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Rhett Bickley](#); [Ron Ahle](#);
[Ronald Scott](#); [Roy Parker](#); [Steve Bell \(lakewatchman@yahoo.com\)](#);
[Suzanne Rhodes](#); [Tom Ruple](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [Van Hoffman](#);
[Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [George Duke](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Lee Barber](#);
[Malcolm Leaphart](#); [Mark Davis \(mdavis@scprt.com\)](#); [Tim Vinson](#);
[Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
cc: ["ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R"](#); ["MAHAN, RANDOLPH R"](#); ["Jim Cumberland"](#);
[Alan Stuart](#); ["BICKLEY, RHETT"](#); ["HANCOCK, DAVID E"](#); ["Vivianne Vejdani"](#);
["BOOZER, THOMAS C"](#); ["Tony Bebber"](#);
Subject: Updated: Lake & Land and Recreation Management TWC's
Start: Tuesday, June 10, 2008 9:30:00 AM
End: Tuesday, June 10, 2008 3:00:00 PM
Location: Lake Murray Training Center - 103 A

Hello All,

After the cancellation of the lake and land meeting for May 28th, the proposed new meeting date is June 10th. The meeting will begin at 9:30 and we will be discussing the SCE&G counter proposal. This meeting will be a joint meeting with the Recreation Management TWC. Please let me know if you plan on attending by next Friday so that I can order the appropriate number of lunches. Thanks, Alison

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#);
[David Hancock](#); [Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Mark Davis \(mdavis@scprt.com\)](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#);
[Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [Van Hoffman](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: Recreation Plan and Alternatives
Date: Thursday, March 27, 2008 11:24:48 AM
Attachments: [Saluda Project Recreation Plan Summary and Alternatives \(2008-03-24\).doc](#)

Recreation Management TWC Members:

Attached is a list of the proposed actions in the Recreation Plan and the alternative proposals submitted. The plan from here is to have an engineer provide cost estimates for each of these actions so we can move forward with prioritization and scheduling. If there are any remaining alternatives that you would like to be considered (including specific additional lands that you think should be set aside for recreation), please get them to me as soon as possible.

If you see any errors, or if I have misstated the already submitted alternatives, please let me know that too.

Dave

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: ["Jim Cumberland"; Alan Stuart](#);
cc: ["gjobsis@americanrivers.org"](mailto:gjobsis@americanrivers.org); [Alison Guth](#);
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal
Date: Tuesday, January 15, 2008 12:34:59 PM

Jim,

I am fine with providing the L&LM TWC with the proposal and can have Alison send it out for you if you don't have the list of members. However, I do not think it is appropriate to send it from the RM TWC as some members were not present at the focus group; I don't want it to seem like the proposal is consensus based coming from the RM TWC. If you send it, or if you want us to, then it should be clear that the proposal comes from a focus group of stakeholders that met outside of the formal relicensing process.

Let me know how you want to proceed.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [<mailto:jimc@scccl.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2008 9:22 AM
To: Dave Anderson; Alan Stuart
Cc: gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Hi guys,

Yes, I did make that presentation, but the document was in a draft form at the time of the presentation. It since has been revised. Dave- because you're busy working on the Recreation Plan draft, and if everyone agrees, I suggest that the RM TWC forward the focus group's revised proposal to the LLM TWC ASAP fir its consideration. I think that having the proposal will be a big help to the LLM TWC as it moves ahead. I think it is more useful and efficient to provide the proposal now than to wait until the LLM TWC is finished.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager

Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 5:34 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Jim Cumberland
Cc: gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

I'm also somewhat confused...The recommendation you are referring to from the Recreation Management TWC will still be included in the Recreation Plan, but it deals with recreational use of natural/undeveloped land (basically, passive recreation activities should continue on natural/undeveloped lands). I have always stated that any actual land reclassification will take place in L&LM and will be reviewed in our TWC from a recreation perspective.

-----Original Message-----

From: Alan Stuart
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 4:27 PM
To: 'Jim Cumberland'; Dave Anderson
Cc: gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Jim,

Correct me if I'm mistaken but I thought you gave the presentation to the L&LM TWC ? I recall a L&LM Meeting where you gave the presentation and I assumed we would use the proposal as a tool in rebalancing process. I'm very confused now by your email. Help me out here...thanks...Alan

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@scccl.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 4:56 PM
To: Dave Anderson
Cc: Alan Stuart; gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Hi Dave,

Thanks for the quick reply to my inquiry. I'm a little puzzled though: I looked back through the Recreation Management TWC meeting notes, and found that back at the September 13 meeting (which I was unable to attend) those present agreed that the TWC would prepare recommendations for the protection of lands in the future development classification, which then would be sent to the LLM TWC. The LLM TWC would use this information in preparation of its draft re-balancing proposal. I read your email to say that this approach will not be followed.

The recreation focus group met and developed a recommendation to help expedite the decision by the RM TWC to provide recommendations to the LLM TWC on shoreline re-balancing. It sounds as if your decision is not to send anything on rebalancing from the Recreation TWC to the LLM TWC. I think, however, that it would be helpful to that TWC to have for its review and consideration the focus group's proposal. I will send the proposal to the LLM TWC on behalf of the focus group. Given that the LLM TWC still is working on the rebalancing issue, it seems timely to put something before it that may assist the members in their deliberations.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 2:54 PM
To: Jim Cumberland
Cc: Alan Stuart
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Jim,

We are currently working on the draft Recreation Plan and I do not foresee having a meeting of the Recreation Management TWC until there is a draft available and members have had a chance to review it.

As for the rebalancing proposal, from my understanding, this is being handled in the Lake and Land TWC and the Recreation RCG will provide input into any final rebalancing proposal coming out of Lake and Land. I am planning on a "recommendation" in the Recreation Plan of continuing to allow passive recreation activities on natural/undeveloped lands.

Hope this helps,

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@scccl.org]

Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 1:54 PM
To: Dave Anderson
Subject: Recreation committee
rebalancing proposal

Hi Dave,

I hope that you & yours had a great holidays!

Would you please advise as to when the next Recreation committee meeting will be, and when we will see a draft of your rebalancing proposal? Time's getting short, and I'm hoping we can meet soon.

Thanks in advance,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Alan Stuart](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#);
[Charlene Coleman](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [Guy Jones](#); [J. Hamilton Hagood](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Karen Kustafik](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Matthew Rice](#) ; [Mike Waddell](#); [Randy Mahan](#); [Tony Bebbler](#);
Subject: Recreation Flow Spreadsheet
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2008 10:20:19 PM
Attachments: [Rec Flows Calculations with Hours \(2009-04-25\).xls](#)
[rec flow schedule response \(2\).doc](#)
[Response to SCE&G counterproposal.doc](#)

Downstream Flows TWC Members:

Here is the edited spreadsheet we were working on at the meeting last week. This schedule is still draft pending approval of the revised hours for wade fishing in the winter months and flow hours on holidays.

I have also attached the documents from Matt Rice that were mentioned at the meeting.

I will be back in touch when I hear from Bill A. and will probably see most of you at the operations meetings in a couple of weeks. In the meantime, don't forget we will still need to prioritize these flows for the low inflow protocol.

Dave

<<Rec Flows Calculations with Hours (2009-04-25).xls>> <<rec flow schedule response (2).doc>> <<Response to SCE&G counterproposal.doc>>

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Van Hoffman](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [David Hancock](#);
[Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#); [Jennifer Hand](#);
[Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Kelly Maloney](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Marty Phillips](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#);
[Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: Recreation Plan "Straw Man"
Date: Monday, September 17, 2007 1:24:03 PM
Attachments: [Recreation Plan Straw Man \(07-21-06\).doc](#)

Recreation Management TWC Members,
As per our meeting last week, I am sending around the Recreation Plan "straw man" that we have looked at previously. If you go back to the July 21, 2006 RCG notes, you can see where we discussed it. This version was the one we worked on that day and includes the track changes we made at the meeting.
I have made the CDs of the example recreation plans and will be getting them in the mail tomorrow. Let me know if you have any questions.
Dave

Carl Bussells

From: Jim Cumberland [jimc@scccl.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 4:56 PM
To: Dave Anderson
Cc: Alan Stuart; gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Hi Dave,

Thanks for the quick reply to my inquiry. I'm a little puzzled though: I looked back through the Recreation Management TWC meeting notes, and found that back at the September 13 meeting (which I was unable to attend) those present agreed that the TWC would prepare recommendations for the protection of lands in the future development classification, which then would be sent to the LLM TWC. The LLM TWC would use this information in preparation of its draft re-balancing proposal. I read your email to say that this approach will not be followed.

The recreation focus group met and developed a recommendation to help expedite the decision by the RM TWC to provide recommendations to the LLM TWC on shoreline re-balancing. It sounds as if your decision is not to send anything on rebalancing from the Recreation TWC to the LLM TWC. I think, however, that it would be helpful to that TWC to have for its review and consideration the focus group's proposal. I will send the proposal to the LLM TWC on behalf of the focus group. Given that the LLM TWC still is working on the rebalancing issue, it seems timely to put something before it that may assist the members in their deliberations.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 2:54 PM
To: Jim Cumberland
Cc: Alan Stuart
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Jim,

We are currently working on the draft Recreation Plan and I do not foresee having a meeting of the Recreation Management TWC until there is a draft available and members have had a chance to review it.

As for the rebalancing proposal, from my understanding, this is being handled in the Lake and Land TWC and the Recreation RCG will provide input into any final rebalancing proposal coming out of Lake and Land. I am planning on a "recommendation" in the Recreation Plan of continuing to allow passive recreation activities on natural/undeveloped lands.

Hope this helps,

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@scccl.org]

Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 1:54 PM

To: Dave Anderson

Subject: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal
Hi Dave,

I hope that you & yours had a great holidays!

Would you please advise as to when the next Recreation committee meeting will be, and when we will see a draft of your rebalancing proposal? Time's getting short, and I'm hoping we can meet soon.

Thanks in advance,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

Carl Bussells

From: Jim Cumberland [jimc@scccl.org]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 2:54 PM
To: Dave Anderson
Subject: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Hi Dave,

I hope that you & yours had a great holidays!

Would you please advise as to when the next Recreation committee meeting will be, and when we will see a draft of your rebalancing proposal? Time's getting short, and I'm hoping we can meet soon.

Thanks in advance,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

Carl Bussells

From: Alan Stuart
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 5:27 PM
To: 'Jim Cumberland'; Dave Anderson
Cc: 'gjobsis@americanrivers.org'
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Jim,

Correct me if I'm mistaken but I thought you gave the presentation to the L&LM TWC ? I recall a L&LM Meeting where you gave the presentation and I assumed we would use the proposal as a tool in rebalancing process. I'm very confused now by your email. Help me out here...thanks...Alan

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@scccl.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 4:56 PM
To: Dave Anderson
Cc: Alan Stuart; gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Hi Dave,

Thanks for the quick reply to my inquiry. I'm a little puzzled though: I looked back through the Recreation Management TWC meeting notes, and found that back at the September 13 meeting (which I was unable to attend) those present agreed that the TWC would prepare recommendations for the protection of lands in the future development classification, which then would be sent to the LLM TWC. The LLM TWC would use this information in preparation of its draft re-balancing proposal. I read your email to say that this approach will not be followed.

The recreation focus group met and developed a recommendation to help expedite the decision by the RM TWC to provide recommendations to the LLM TWC on shoreline re-balancing. It sounds as if your decision is not to send anything on rebalancing from the Recreation TWC to the LLM TWC. I think, however, that it would be helpful to that TWC to have for its review and consideration the focus group's proposal. I will send the proposal to the LLM TWC on behalf of the focus group. Given that the LLM TWC still is working on the rebalancing issue, it seems timely to put something before it that may assist the members in their deliberations.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 2:54 PM

To: Jim Cumberland

Cc: Alan Stuart

Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Jim,

We are currently working on the draft Recreation Plan and I do not foresee having a meeting of the Recreation Management TWC until there is a draft available and members have had a chance to review it.

As for the rebalancing proposal, from my understanding, this is being handled in the Lake and Land TWC and the Recreation RCG will provide input into any final rebalancing proposal coming out of Lake and Land. I am planning on a "recommendation" in the Recreation Plan of continuing to allow passive recreation activities on natural/undeveloped lands.

Hope this helps,

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@ccccl.org]

Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 1:54 PM

To: Dave Anderson

Subject: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Hi Dave,

I hope that you & yours had a great holidays!

Would you please advise as to when the next Recreation committee meeting will be, and when we will see a draft of your rebalancing proposal? Time's getting short, and I'm hoping we can meet soon.

Thanks in advance,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@ccccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

From: Amanda_Hill@fws.gov
To: [Gerrit Jobsis](#);
cc: [Ron Ahle](#); [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Bud Badr](#); BARGENTIERI@scana.com;
[Hal Beard](#); [Brandon Kulik](#); dchristie@comporium.net; giffinma@dhec.sc.gov;
[Jim Glover](#); [Scott Harder](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Gina Kirkland](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
mquattlebaum@scana.com; [Mike Waddell](#); [Prescott Brownell](#);
RMAHAN@scana.com; [Shane Boring](#); [Steve Summer](#); [Theresa Thom](#);
Subject: RE: Reschedule of this week's IFIM conference call
Date: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 10:48:41 AM

<

From: [Jim Cumberland](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#);
cc: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; [Gerrit Jobsis](#); [Matt Rice](#); [Tony Bebber](#);
[Bill Marshall](#); kayakduke@bellsouth.net; dhancock@scana.com;
[Jennifer Hand](#); elymay2@aol.com; Malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu;
suzrhodes@juno.com; tboozier@scana.com;
Subject: RM TWC focus group proposal
Date: Thursday, January 17, 2008 10:15:09 AM
Attachments: [Rec. Focus group sum. proposal.pdf](#)
[Recreation Focus Group Proposal - 12-11-2007.pdf](#)

Hi Dave,

Thanks for your offer to forward the focus group proposal to the LLM TWC. I think it would be ideal if the proposal could come from the RM TWC, so I propose, because of everyone's schedules being so busy, that, in lieu of a meeting, the attached summary of recommendations, and the entire focus group proposal, be sent to the RM TWC members for comment and where possible approval of the recommendations. I suggest a date of early next week for comments/indications of approval. Is that course of action acceptable?

I have attached a document containing the recommendations contained in the focus group proposal, and the entire proposal.

Thanks for your consideration.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

From: [Bill Marshall](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#); BARGENTIERI@scana.com; [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#);
cc: [Tony Bebber](#); [Charlene Coleman](#); [Guy Jones](#); [J. Hamilton Hagood](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Karen Kustafik](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Matthew Rice](#) ; [Mike Waddell](#);
Subject: Report - Downstream Recreational Flows
Date: Friday, February 22, 2008 10:02:33 AM

Bill, Alan, Dave, or Alison -- On page 30 (I think) of the Final Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Report, the document is missing a table ; it's Table 3-5. Historic Hourly Average Flow Ranges (October 2000 to October 2007) for USGS Gage 02168504 Saluda River Below Lake Murray Dam. This table is missing in the document you all distributed to me and in the version posted on the Saluda relicensing website. It would be helpful to have that table included. Thanks. -- Bill

From: [Alison Guth](#)
To: [Kelly Maloney](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [Alan Stuart](#); [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#);
[Charlene Coleman](#); [Dave Anderson](#); [Guy Jones](#); [J. Hamilton Hagood](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Karen Kustafik](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Matthew Rice](#) ; [Mike Waddell](#); [Randy Mahan](#);
Subject: Updated - Downstream Recreational Flow Assessment Report
Date: Friday, February 22, 2008 11:50:42 AM

Hello All,

It has been brought to our attention that a table was missing from the Downstream Recreational Flow Assessment Report (Table 3-5). An updated version of the report is now available on the website http://www.saludahydrorelicense.com/documents/FinalFlowAssessmentStudyReport_10-26-07__000.pdf .

Thanks and have a great weekend.

Alison

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone 803-951-2077

Fax 803-951-2124

From: [Jim Cumberland](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#); [Van Hoffman](#); BARGENTIERI@scana.com; [Bill Marshall](#); [David Hancock](#); dchristie@comporium.net; [George Duke](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#); RMAHAN@scana.com; [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebbler](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: RE: RM TWC focus group proposal
Date: Friday, January 18, 2008 4:27:41 PM

Dave,

Thanks for forwarding the proposal. I thought I had a complete list: any omissions were unintended.

I think Joy stated the issues and desired procedures very succinctly and accurately: I too wish to follow that path. I want the LLM TWC to have the best and most complete information before it when it is developing its rebalancing proposal, which is why I think it is extremely important to get the focus group's proposal before the LLM TWC. Ideally, of course, it would be sent from the RM TWC with the approval of the Committee: I think we all agree on that point. If that is not possible, though, the LLM TWC should have the focus group's proposal to consider as it develops its rebalancing proposal.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@ccccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 12:03 PM
To: Van Hoffman; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; dchristie@comporium.net; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland; Joy Downs; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Randy Mahan; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart

Subject: FW: RM TWC focus group proposal

I forwarded the Focus Group Proposal to those Recreation Management TWC members that weren't on the original distribution list (that I could tell). Per Randy's suggestion, we will be having a meeting on either February 4th or 6th, depending on when the majority of TWC members can make it.

-----Original Message-----

From: MAHAN, RANDOLPH R [mailto:RMAHAN@scana.com]

Subject: RE: RM TWC focus group proposal

While the proposal coming out of what apparently is an ad hoc sub-group seems to have some merit, it has features clearly unacceptable to some if not all of excluded members of the TWC. I am one of those apparently excluded TWC members, as also Bill Argentieri seems to be. In any case, any proposal must be reviewed by the full TWC before being reported out to the RCG as something being considered and proposed by the TWC. This was not a case where a proposal was made to the TWC and some folks simply weren't at the meeting. It seems to have been done purposely, entirely outside the TWC process, and hence must not be given any semblance of TWC endorsement.

There must be at least the opportunity for all TWC members to sit with and to question the members of the ad hoc group who took it upon themselves to initiate an exclusionary side process and develop a proposal outside the TWC process. I shouldn't have to **assume** that I fully understand the details and the underlying reasoning of their proposals.

As to when we might meet for a presentation by this group to the full TWC, I am available February 4 and 6.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@scccl.org]

Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 9:15 AM

To: Dave Anderson

Cc: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Gerrit Jobsis; Matt Rice; Tony Bebbler; Bill Marshall; kayakduke@bellsouth.net; dhancock@scana.com; Jennifer Hand; elymay2@aol.com; Malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu; suzrhodes@juno.com;

tboozer@scana.com

Subject: RM TWC focus group proposal

Hi Dave,

Thanks for your offer to forward the focus group proposal to the LLM TWC. I think it would be ideal if the proposal could come from the RM TWC, so I propose, because of everyone's schedules being so busy, that, in lieu of a meeting, the attached summary of recommendations, and the entire focus group proposal, be sent to the RM TWC members for comment and where possible approval of the recommendations. I suggest a date of early next week for comments/indications of approval. Is that course of action acceptable?

I have attached a document containing the recommendations contained in the focus group proposal, and the entire proposal.

Thanks for your consideration.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@ccccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Vivianne Vejdani](#) ; [Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Marshall](#); [Dave Anderson](#);
[David Hancock](#); [Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#); [George Duke](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Randy Mahan](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#);
[Van Hoffman](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: Rec Mgmt TWC Meeting This Week
Date: Monday, March 17, 2008 10:11:17 AM

Recreation Management TWC Members:

As you are aware, I had asked to receive comments on the initial draft of the Recreation Plan by March 14, with meetings possibly scheduled for the 19th and/or 20th of this week to discuss the comments. Thus far, I have received comments from the DNR. I thought I would ask everyone if they will have comments prepared by the 19th or 20th so we can get together and discuss the Plan. Formal written comments are not necessary, but I do need a commitment from everyone that they will be prepared by the 19th or 20th. If you want to bring your comments to the meeting we can record them there. Please let me know by the end of the day if you can commit to a meeting on the 19th or 20th and be prepared with comments on the Plan.

Thanks,

Dave

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 4:24 PM
To: Jim Cumberland; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Subject: RE: Rec focus group proposal and lake & land

Hello,

Ahh, there was some disconnect there (this is what happens when I miss meetings :)). You are correct, Thursday was set aside for your proposal on the Recreation Plan. Dave has already canceled the meeting on the 10th, however let me see if I can book a room and issue a rebuttal to the cancellation email that I sent out earlier. If Dave is available and we can get a room booked, would you two be ready to discuss this on the 10th?

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@ccccl.org]
Sent: Thu 4/3/2008 3:27 PM
To: Alison Guth; bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net
Subject: RE: Rec focus group proposal and lake & land

Hi Alison,

I thought that meeting was Thursday, and that the Tuesday meeting was to be on Forest Management property & the dock permitting policy.

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@ccccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 2:09 PM
To: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; Jim Cumberland
Subject: Rec focus group proposal and lake & land

Hello guys,

From what I understand took place at the last Lake and Land Management meeting, there were going to be further discussions on the proposal for future development lands made by the Recreation Focus Group. With you guys discussing this information with the Lake and Land group. I just wanted to email you make sure you would be ready to discuss this. Thanks, Alison

Carl Bussells

From: Alison Guth
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 2:09 PM
To: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net; jimc@scccl.org
Subject: Rec focus group proposal and lake & land

Hello guys,

From what I understand took place at the last Lake and Land Management meeting, there were going to be further discussions on the proposal for future development lands made by the Recreation Focus Group. With you guys discussing this information with the Lake and Land group. I just wanted to email you make sure you would be ready to discuss this. Thanks, Alison

From: [Bill Marshall](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#);
cc: [Alison Guth](#);
Subject: RE: Recreational Flow Recommendations and Meeting
Date: Monday, February 11, 2008 8:32:06 AM

Okay, Dave, I can make the change and will plan to attend on Feb 25.

Bill

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Friday, February 08, 2008 2:58 PM
To: Tony Bebber; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones; J. Hamilton Hagood; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Mike Waddell
Cc: Randy Mahan; Ben Gregg; Suzanne Rhodes; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth
Subject: RE: Recreational Flow Recommendations and Meeting

I did realize that was a holiday (even for us non-public employees), so in the interest of getting everyone to attend the meeting, let's meet on February 25th at 10 am at the Lake Murray Training Center (rm. 103A).

See y'all then.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Bebber [mailto:tbebber@scprt.com]
Sent: Friday, February 08, 2008 1:08 PM
To: Dave Anderson; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Guy Jones; J. Hamilton Hagood; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland ; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Mike Waddell
Cc: RMAHAN@scana.com; Ben Gregg; Suzanne Rhodes
Subject: RE: Recreational Flow Recommendations and Meeting

That's a holiday and if all goes well I'll be out on the river doing some fish sampling that day J and not attending the meeting. So, if whitewater interests are comfortable with the high flows provided, my comments are to add some portions of days where flows will be "no more than 1,000 cfs." State holidays and a couple of weekends per month would be appreciated (something wade anglers could "count on" to be relatively safe). Half days are fine (mornings in warm weather, maybe 11 to mid-afternoon in cold

weather). Some of those December-February days can be great for fishing – since DNR usually stocks in early December. Spring months definitely need some “wade fishing time periods.” If I was going to leave out some days for wade fishing, it’d be Sept-Nov., but if the DO levels continue to improve, that may be hard to give up too.

Let me know if you reschedule.

Tony Bebber, AICP

Planning Manager, Recreation, Planning & Engineering Office
SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone 803-734-0189
Fax 803-734-1042
tbebber@scprt.com

Shaping & Sharing a Better South Carolina

websites: www.DiscoverSouthCarolina.com www.SouthCarolinaParks.com www.SCTrails.net

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2008 3:39 PM

To: Tony Bebber; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; J. Hamilton Hagood; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Mike Waddell

Cc: Randy Mahan

Subject: Recreational Flow Recommendations and Meeting

Downstream Flows TWC Members,

Attached is the initial draft issue recommendation that includes a recreational flow schedule for the lower Saluda River. This schedule is based on flow requests submitted by American Whitewater.

We will be meeting on Monday, February 18th at 10 am at the Lake Murray Training Center to discuss these requests and recommendation.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

<<Recreational Flow Releases Recommendation (2008-02-05;DRAFT).
doc>>

From: [Bill Marshall](#)
To: BARGENTIERI@scana.com; [Dave Anderson](#); [Vivianne Vejdani](#); [Alan Stuart](#); [Charlene Coleman](#); [Guy Jones](#); [HAMILTON, J. HAGOOD JR](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Karen Kustafik](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#); [Matthew Rice](#) ; [Mike Waddell](#); RMAHAN@scana.com; [Tony Bebber](#);
Subject: RE: Recreation Flow Spreadsheet
Date: Wednesday, June 04, 2008 3:50:25 PM

Friends, I'm glad that we are progressing well in determining a recreational flow schedule. In regards to the request for ramping, I'd like to offer the following personal comments.

Members of the TWC requested ramping on all hydro releases that are not reserve calls, yet this request is not accepted for the reasons explained by Bill A. For what it's worth, I continue to think that ramping of flows (reducing the potential rate of rising water) will only enhance safety on the river. Here is my simple analogy: An ambulance travels down city streets at high speeds with sirens blaring when there is an emergency; and when it does so, this imposes some higher risks to the safety of other motorists and pedestrians on the street. Typically, the ambulance does not travel this same way, for obvious safety reasons, when there is not an emergency. I can think of hydro operations in the same way. When the option is available to slow the rate of rising water then why not increase the margins of safety for those at risk?

The "false sense of security" argument does not make sense to me because in my experience of the river there is no definite, expected condition that results after the sirens are sounded, that is, the rate of rise at any point is highly variable depending on the operations at the dam, so when the sirens go off a wide range of flow scenarios may follow.

From the rate of change studies, we do know the Saluda hydro is capable of producing very rapid changes in water levels downstream. It seems reasonable to me that sensible safety procedures in operating the dam would include releasing water at slower rates (ramping) when that option is available to the operator.

Thanks for your consideration,

Bill Marshall

From: ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R [mailto:BARGENTIERI@scana.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2008 5:17 PM
To: Dave Anderson; Vivianne Vejdani; Alan Stuart; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman;

Guy Jones; HAMILTON, J. HAGOOD JR; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm Leaphart; Matthew Rice ; Mike Waddell; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; Tony Bebber

Subject: RE: Recreation Flow Spreadsheet

Downstream Flow TWC Members,

I have received comments from our System Control and Economic Resource Commitment Departments and Fossil Hydro Management in response to the attached stakeholders counterproposal. Please see the attachment for our response to each of the items on the document. I believe we are pretty close to finalizing the recreation plan. The final language might take a little while to resolve, but we seem to be close to completing this relicensing activity.

There is one more action item we need to keep in mind. These flow releases are acceptable during normal and high inflow periods. We still need to address reduction and/or elimination of the recreational flows as part of a low inflow protocol.

Bill

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2008 10:20 PM

To: Vivianne Vejdani ; Alan Stuart; ARGENTIERI, WILLIAM R; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; HAMILTON, J. HAGOOD JR; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Karen Kustafik; Malcolm Leaphart; Matthew Rice ; Mike Waddell; MAHAN, RANDOLPH R; Tony Bebber

Subject: Recreation Flow Spreadsheet

Downstream Flows TWC Members:

Here is the edited spreadsheet we were working on at the meeting last week. This schedule is still draft pending approval of the revised hours for wade fishing in the winter months and flow hours on holidays.

I have also attached the documents from Matt Rice that were mentioned at the meeting.

I will be back in touch when I hear from Bill A. and will probably see most of you at the operations meetings in a couple of weeks. In the meantime, don't forget we will still need to prioritize these flows for the low inflow protocol.

Dave

<<Rec Flows Calculations with Hours (2009-04-25).xls>> <<rec flow schedule response (2).doc>> <<Response to SCE&G counterproposal.doc>>

From: [Bill Marshall](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#); mdavis@scprt.com; [Vivianne Vejdani](#);
BARGENTIERI@scana.com; [David Hancock](#); dchristie@comporium.net;
[George Duke](#); [Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Joy Downs](#); [Lee Barber](#);
[Malcolm Leaphart](#); RMAHAN@scana.com; [Steve Bell](#); [Tim Vinson](#);
[Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebber](#); [Van Hoffman](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Alan Stuart](#);
Subject: RE: Recreation Management TWC Meeting, March 20
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 11:24:54 PM

Hello everyone -- here is some additional input for consideration.

I would like to offer suggestions for additional access facilities on the Lower Saluda Scenic River.

As you know, the Lower Saluda Scenic River Corridor Plan Update of 2000 presents the concept of a Saluda River Greenway Trail, a walking/biking path along the river that would connect Saluda Shoals Park, Gardendale Landing, Riverbanks Zoo, and Lake Murray Dam. The greenway trail concept presents opportunities to greatly enhance recreational access to the river and significantly improve safety egress options for river users during hydro operations that produce rapidly rising water.

Since 2000, the Irmo-Chapin Recreation Commission has completed about 1 ½ - miles of this greenway within the boundaries of Saluda Shoals Park. At the lower end of the Saluda, the River Alliance and the City of Columbia have plans, funding, and construction contracts in place to begin a 2 ½-mile section of the Three Rivers Greenway extending from the 1-26 Bridge to Riverbanks Zoo. Beyond these projects there is an additional 6 miles of greenway trails to be constructed in order to accomplish the vision presented in the Plan Update.

I recommend that development of the Saluda Greenway Trail be considered for inclusion in the recreation plan for Saluda Hydro. Potential cost-sharing partners for trail construction include local governments, Irmo-Chapin Recreation Commission, and the Department of Transportation.

The additional sections of the Saluda River Greenway Trail to completed include the following:

- § Saluda Shoals Park to Gardendale Landing, a 2-mile section.
- § Gardendale Landing to the I-26 Bridge, a 2-mile section to connect with the Three Rivers Greenway.
- § Saluda Shoals Park to Lake Murray Dam. The Plan Update proposes two route alternatives (2 or 2 ½ miles in length) for this section: (1) from the park, route the trail along the river towards the dam for about one mile near to where the Scenic River begins, then turn north to Old Bush River

Road and on to the dam; or (2) to avoid conflict with the park's upstream neighbors, route the trail from the park entrance along Old Bush River Road to the dam.

If it's not feasible to route a greenway along the river from Saluda Shoals Park to Lake Murray Dam, then I would recommend developing walk-in trail access to the river in the area below the dam by creating a visitor parking area at the entrance gate to the Saluda power plants off Old Bush River Road, route a half mile trail down to the river then extend the trail downstream to the Sandy Beach area and upstream to the Scenic River boundary.

For those interested, I have some cost estimates on greenway trail construction that I can share later.

Thanks for your consideration.

Bill Marshall

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Monday, March 17, 2008 6:33 PM

To: mdavis@scprt.com; Vivianne Vejdani; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; dchristie@comporium.net; George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Randy Mahan; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebber; Van Hoffman; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart

Subject: Recreation Management TWC Meeting, March 20

Recreation Management TWC Members:

It appears most of you can meet on the 20th and are committed to preparing either written comments or "discussion points" for the meeting.

The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the initial draft Recreation Plan, specifically Section 5.0 and 6.0. I am interested in hearing any alternative improvements, facility needs, or prioritizations.

I have attached an agenda, although we will be discussing this one topic.

I invite you to revisit the "standard process questions" (most recent version

attached), which I will use to guide the discussion.

The meeting room is 103A and we will start at 9:30 am. Please RSVP to Jeni Hand (jennifer.hand@kleinschmidtusa.com) if you are going to attend so we can get a count for lunch.

Dave

<<Recreation RCG Working Documents (2007-12-13).doc>> <<2008-03-20
Recreation Management TWC Agenda.doc>>

From: [Bill Marshall](#)
To: [Dave Anderson](#); [C Coleman](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Tony Bebber](#);
[BARGENTIERI@scana.com](#); [Guy Jones](#); [J. Hamilton Hagood](#); [Jennifer Hand](#);
[Jim Cumberland](#); [Karen Kustafik](#); [Kelly Maloney](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Mike Waddell](#);
Subject: RE: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report
Date: Thursday, January 31, 2008 10:45:10 AM

Dave -- Thanks for the reply. I was wondering, too, if the video is available, the one that records the rate of change during the study last year? I'd be interested to see a condensed version, as I don't think I'd last watching all hours of the video. Thanks for your consideration.

Bill

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 27, 2008 7:04 PM
To: C Coleman; Bill Marshall; Alison Guth; Tony Bebber; Bill Argentieri; Guy Jones; J. Hamilton Hagood; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Mike Waddell
Subject: RE: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report

Bill,

Alan told me you were interested in a meeting and I agree it's time to have one. I have drafted some draft recommendations that are being reviewed internally and hope to have them out soon. Sit tight and we'll let everyone know when they are ready and meet to discuss.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: C Coleman [mailto:cheetahtk@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2008 2:46 PM
To: Bill Marshall; Alison Guth; Tony Bebber; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; J. Hamilton Hagood; Jennifer Hand; Jim Cumberland; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Mike Waddell
Subject: Re: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report

yes

When you have decided what you believe, what you feel must be done, have the courage to stand alone and be counted.

- Eleanor Roosevelt

Charlene Coleman

American Whitewater
Regional Coordinator

----- Original Message -----

From: Bill Marshall <MarshallB@dnr.sc.gov>

To: Alison Guth <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>; Tony
Bebber <tbebber@scprt.com>; Bill Argentieri <bargentieri@scana.
com>; Charlene Coleman <cheetahtrk@yahoo.com>; Dave Anderson
<dave.anderson@kleinschmidtusa.com>; Guy Jones <guyjones@sc.rr.
com>; J. Hamilton Hagood <jhamilton@scana.com>; Jennifer
Summerlin <Jennifer.Hand@KleinschmidtUSA.com>; Jim
Cumberland <jimc@scccl.org>; Karen Kustafik
<kakustafik@columbiasc.net>; Kelly Maloney <Kelly.
Maloney@KleinschmidtUSA.com>; Malcolm Leaphart
<malcolml@mailbox.sc.edu>; Mike Waddell <mwaddell@esri.sc.
edu>

Sent: Friday, January 25, 2008 3:33:31 PM

Subject: RE: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report

Hello everyone,

Having received a final version of the Downstream Flow Assessment Report in December, I am wondering what's next to be accomplished by our Downstream Flows TWC. Shall we develop some recommendations?

Bill

From: Alison Guth [mailto:Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com]

Sent: Monday, December 17, 2007 12:35 PM

To: Tony Bebber; Bill Argentieri; Bill Marshall; Charlene Coleman; Dave Anderson; Guy Jones; J. Hamilton Hagood; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Karen Kustafik; Kelly Maloney; Malcolm Leaphart; Mike Waddell

Cc: Van Hoffman; Alan Axson; Alan Stuart; Alison Guth; Amanda Hill; Bill Brebner ; Charlie Rentz; David Hancock; dchristie@comporium.net; George Duke; Gerrit Jobsis (American Rivers); ipitts@scprt.com; Jeff Duncan; Jennifer O'Rourke; Jim Devereaux; JoAnn Butler; Joy Downs; Keith Ganz-Sarto; turnerle@dhec.sc.gov; Lee Barber; Mark Leao; Marty Phillips; Miriam Atria; Norman Ferris; Randy Mahan; rparsons12@alltel.net; Richard Mikell; sjones@imichotels.net; Steve Bell; Suzanne Rhodes; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Bill Mathias; Bret Hoffman; David Price; Edward Schnepel; Jay Schabacher ; Jerry Wise; Joel Huggins ; John and Rob Altenberg; Ken Uschelbec; Kenneth Fox; Norm Nicholson; Roger Hovis ; Lee (Skeet) Mills; Stephan Curry

Subject: Final Downstream Flow TWC Report

Hello Downstream Flow TWC,

Attached is the Final Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Report. For informational purposes, the Recreation and Safety RCG's are being CC'ed on this email as well. Take care, Alison

<<Final Downstream Recreation Flow Assessment Report.zip>>

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone 803-951-2077

Fax 803-951-2124

Never miss a thing. [Make Yahoo your homepage.](#)

From: Elymay2@aol.com
To: [Alison Guth](#);
Subject: Re: Public Marina Application Procedures - Strawman
Date: Friday, February 15, 2008 5:02:21 PM

Alison

Are these what we were calling public private marinas (parking lots) or are these the commercial marinas like Lighthouse, etc. Joy

In a message dated 2/15/2008 2:17:48 P.M. Eastern Standard Time, Alison. Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com writes:

Hello TWC,

As noted at the February 6th TWC meeting, the Public Marina Application Procedures strawman has been revised to include discussion of the various committees discussed and the shoreline footage revised on those marinas desiring accommodations for more than 100 watercraft. Please have comments on the strawman back to me by the 29th of this month. Thanks, Alison

<<Public Marina Dock Application Procedure Strawman 2-15-08.doc>>

Alison Guth
Licensing Coordinator
Kleinschmidt Associates
204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301
Lexington, SC 29072
Phone 803-951-2077
Fax 803-951-2124

The year's hottest artists on the red carpet at the Grammy Awards. [AOL Music takes you there.](#)

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: ["Jim Cumberland"; Alan Stuart](#);
cc: ["gjobsis@americanrivers.org"](mailto:gjobsis@americanrivers.org); [Alison Guth](#);
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal
Date: Tuesday, January 15, 2008 12:34:59 PM

Jim,

I am fine with providing the L&LM TWC with the proposal and can have Alison send it out for you if you don't have the list of members. However, I do not think it is appropriate to send it from the RM TWC as some members were not present at the focus group; I don't want it to seem like the proposal is consensus based coming from the RM TWC. If you send it, or if you want us to, then it should be clear that the proposal comes from a focus group of stakeholders that met outside of the formal relicensing process.

Let me know how you want to proceed.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [<mailto:jimc@scccl.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2008 9:22 AM
To: Dave Anderson; Alan Stuart
Cc: gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Hi guys,

Yes, I did make that presentation, but the document was in a draft form at the time of the presentation. It since has been revised. Dave- because you're busy working on the Recreation Plan draft, and if everyone agrees, I suggest that the RM TWC forward the focus group's revised proposal to the LLM TWC ASAP fir its consideration. I think that having the proposal will be a big help to the LLM TWC as it moves ahead. I think it is more useful and efficient to provide the proposal now than to wait until the LLM TWC is finished.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager

Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 5:34 PM
To: Alan Stuart; Jim Cumberland
Cc: gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

I'm also somewhat confused...The recommendation you are referring to from the Recreation Management TWC will still be included in the Recreation Plan, but it deals with recreational use of natural/undeveloped land (basically, passive recreation activities should continue on natural/undeveloped lands). I have always stated that any actual land reclassification will take place in L&LM and will be reviewed in our TWC from a recreation perspective.

-----Original Message-----

From: Alan Stuart
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 4:27 PM
To: 'Jim Cumberland'; Dave Anderson
Cc: gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Jim,

Correct me if I'm mistaken but I thought you gave the presentation to the L&LM TWC ? I recall a L&LM Meeting where you gave the presentation and I assumed we would use the proposal as a tool in rebalancing process. I'm very confused now by your email. Help me out here...thanks...Alan

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@scccl.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 4:56 PM
To: Dave Anderson
Cc: Alan Stuart; gjobsis@americanrivers.org
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Hi Dave,

Thanks for the quick reply to my inquiry. I'm a little puzzled though: I looked back through the Recreation Management TWC meeting notes, and found that back at the September 13 meeting (which I was unable to attend) those present agreed that the TWC would prepare recommendations for the protection of lands in the future development classification, which then would be sent to the LLM TWC. The LLM TWC would use this information in preparation of its draft re-balancing proposal. I read your email to say that this approach will not be followed.

The recreation focus group met and developed a recommendation to help expedite the decision by the RM TWC to provide recommendations to the LLM TWC on shoreline re-balancing. It sounds as if your decision is not to send anything on rebalancing from the Recreation TWC to the LLM TWC. I think, however, that it would be helpful to that TWC to have for its review and consideration the focus group's proposal. I will send the proposal to the LLM TWC on behalf of the focus group. Given that the LLM TWC still is working on the rebalancing issue, it seems timely to put something before it that may assist the members in their deliberations.

Regards,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson [mailto:Dave.Anderson@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 2:54 PM
To: Jim Cumberland
Cc: Alan Stuart
Subject: RE: Recreation committee rebalancing proposal

Jim,

We are currently working on the draft Recreation Plan and I do not foresee having a meeting of the Recreation Management TWC until there is a draft available and members have had a chance to review it.

As for the rebalancing proposal, from my understanding, this is being handled in the Lake and Land TWC and the Recreation RCG will provide input into any final rebalancing proposal coming out of Lake and Land. I am planning on a "recommendation" in the Recreation Plan of continuing to allow passive recreation activities on natural/undeveloped lands.

Hope this helps,

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Cumberland [mailto:jimc@scccl.org]

Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 1:54 PM
To: Dave Anderson
Subject: Recreation committee
rebalancing proposal

Hi Dave,

I hope that you & yours had a great holidays!

Would you please advise as to when the next Recreation committee meeting will be, and when we will see a draft of your rebalancing proposal? Time's getting short, and I'm hoping we can meet soon.

Thanks in advance,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

Alison- Regarding the draft Public Marina Application Procedures, I would recommend that we emphasize the set back requirements are "guidelines" and that the LMAC may be either more restrictive or possibly less restrictive based on the specific location taking in to account potential impacts to existing uses, homeowners, boating congestion and safety concerns, fish and wildlife etc.

Steve Bell

Lake Murray Watch

----- Original message from "Alison Guth" <Alison.Guth@KleinschmidtUSA.com>: -----

Hello TWC,

As noted at the February 6th TWC meeting, the Public Marina Application Procedures strawman has been revised to include discussion of the various committees discussed and the shoreline footage revised on those marinas desiring accommodations for more than 100 watercraft. Please have comments on the strawman back to me by the 29th of this month.
Thanks, Alison

<<Public Marina Dock Application Procedure Strawman 2-15-08.doc>>

Alison Guth

Licensing Coordinator

Kleinschmidt Associates

204 Caughman Farm Lane, Suite 301

Lexington, SC 29072

Phone 803-951-2077

Fax 803-951-2124

From: [Jim Cumberland](#)
To: [Alison Guth;](#)
cc: [bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net;](mailto:bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net)
[Dave Anderson;](#)
Subject: rebalancing proposal
Date: Tuesday, February 19, 2008 3:07:39 PM
Attachments: [Rec. Focus group sum. proposal.pdf](#)

Alison,

Could you please do me a big favor & print 20 or so copies of this document: it is the summary of the "focus group" rebalancing proposal. I'll have it w/me in electronic form tomorrow, but don't have access to a copy machine.

Thanks,

Jim

Jim Cumberland
Project Manager
Coastal Conservation League
2231 Devine Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29205
803.771.7750 (telephone)
803.771.7580 (facsimile)
jimc@scccl.org
www.coastalconservationleague.org

From: [regis parsons](#)
To: [Alison Guth](#);
Subject: Recreation Map
Date: Monday, September 17, 2007 4:42:10 PM

Alison,

The working document that was distributed at the Recreation RCG meeting last week referred to the fact that 23 informal recreation sites have been designated. It referenced a Recreation Map which shows the sites. Dave said that he would try to get a copy of this map posted on the web site. Please let me know how I can find it.

Thanks!

Regis
Rparsons12@alltel.net

From: [Steve Bell](#)
To: ["Bill Marshall"; "Tony Bebber"; Dave Anderson; "Van Hoffman"; "David Hancock"; "Dick Christie"; "George Duke"; Jennifer Hand; "Joy Downs"; Kelly Maloney; "Lee Barber"; "Malcolm Leaphart"; Marty Phillips; "Jim Cumberland "; "Steve Bell"; "Tim Vinson"; "Tommy Boozer"; Alison Guth; BARGENTIERI@scana.com; RMAHAN@scana.com; Alan Stuart;](#)
cc: bellsteve9339@bellsouth.net;
Subject: FERC doc. on recreaton plan
Date: Wednesday, September 26, 2007 9:28:25 AM
Attachments: [recreat-dev-hydro-licen.pdf](#)

FYI- Attached is FERC guidelines on developing a recreation plan. Note FERC suggest that lands and other recreational resources with the project boundary be included as part of the "inventory" . Also it suggest that safety hazards be identified and listed in the plan. This has some good info on why we should protect project lands that have recreational value.

Steve Bell
Lake Murray Watch

From: [Dave Anderson](#)
To: [Van Hoffman](#); [Alan Axson](#); [Alan Stuart](#); [Alison Guth](#); [Amanda Hill](#);
[Bill Argentieri](#); [Bill Brebner](#) ; [Bill Marshall](#); [Charlene Coleman](#); [Charlie Rentz](#);
[Dave Anderson](#); [David Hancock](#); [Dick Christie \(dchristie@comporium.net\)](#);
[George Duke](#); [Gerrit Jobsis \(American Rivers\)](#); [Guy Jones](#);
[Irvin Pitts \(ipitts@scprt.com\)](#); [Jeff Duncan](#); [Jennifer O'Rourke](#);
[Jennifer Hand](#); [Jim Cumberland](#) ; [Jim Devereaux](#); [JoAnn Butler](#); [Joy Downs](#);
[Karen Kustafik](#); [Keith Ganz-Sarto](#); [Kelly Maloney](#);
[Larry Turner \(turnerle@dhec.sc.gov\)](#); [Lee Barber](#); [Malcolm Leaphart](#);
[Mark Leao](#); [Marty Phillips](#); [Mike Waddell](#); [Miriam Atria](#); [Norman Ferris](#);
[Randy Mahan](#); [Regis Parsons \(rparsons12@alltel.net\)](#); [Richard Mikell](#);
[Stan Jones \(sjones@imichotels.net\)](#); [Steve Bell](#); [Suzanne Rhodes](#);
[Tim Vinson](#); [Tommy Boozer](#); [Tony Bebbler](#);
Subject: FW: Example Recreation Plans
Date: Thursday, September 06, 2007 3:17:15 PM

Recreation RCG Members,

I am reviewing my notes from previous meetings and noticed I was supposed to send this out to the entire RCG rather than just the TWC. Let me know if you have any questions.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Anderson

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 4:46 PM

To: Van Hoffman; Bill Marshall; Dave Anderson; David Hancock; Dick Christie (dchristie@comporium.net); George Duke; Jennifer Summerlin; Jim Cumberland ; Joy Downs; Kelly Maloney; Lee Barber; Malcolm Leaphart; Marty Phillips; Steve Bell; Tim Vinson; Tommy Boozer; Tony Bebbler; Alison Guth; Alan Stuart

Cc: 'Bill Argentieri'

Subject: Example Recreation Plans

Recreation Management TWC Members:

I have compiled several recreation plans that have been submitted to, and approved by, the FERC. I thought this may give you some idea of what to expect out of our recreation plan and give us some discussion points for next week (i.e., what do you like/dislike about these?). If anyone has any others they would like to distribute to the group, feel free.

Since most recreation plans include lots of maps and images, the file sizes of sending all of these is huge (23 mb). I have compiled them into one zip file to download from our FTP site. You should be able to click on this link and choose "save it to disk" or something like that depending on your operating system. If you have any trouble retrieving the file, let me know.

<ftp://ftp.kleinschmidtusa.com/Saluda_Rec_Report/Example_Rec_Plans.zip>