

South Carolina Department of Natural Resources

ORIGINAL



Paul A. Sandifer, Ph.D.
Director

October 20, 2003

Mr. Tommy Boozer
Lake Management Programs
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
Columbia, SC 29218

Re: Lake Murray
Lake Murray Five-Year Review
FERC Project Number 516 - 318

FILED
THE SECRETARY
03 OCT 27 PM 3:21
FEDERAL ENERGY
REGULATORY COMMISSION

Dear Mr. Boozer:

As you know, the Department, along with other resource agencies and interested parties have expressed a concern with the amount of developed lands surrounding Lake Murray (see FERC Environmental Assessment for "Sale of Land For Future Private Development" dated September 2002). Because of concerns with the continuing development, the Department and others have recommended a re-balancing of shoreline classifications with a substantial modification of future development lands to natural and recreation areas (SCDNR letters dated 8/29/89, 6/7/90, 3/28/00, 2/16/01, 11/1/02; USFWS letters dated 5/17/90, 3/23/99, 5/26/00, 3/26/03). Our recommendation was, and still is to include this re-balancing of the shoreline classifications in the five-year update of the shoreline management plan. In the submitted Five-year update, dated 3/26/02, the amount of lands designated for future development could result in Lake Murray development exceeding 75% of the shoreline. If fully built out in the manner of current development around the lake, future development could result in lower water quality. Nutrients are of particular concern, and are already producing impairment in western portions of the reservoir. In addition, very little shoreline would be left for fish and wildlife habitat, recreational usage, and scenic values. With continued development, limited fish spawning and nursery habitat will be left to sustain the fisheries, plus opportunities for waterfowl hunting and other recreation will be diminished.

Because of these and other considerations, the SCDNR, in association with USFWS, SCDHEC and SCPRT, have looked closely at shoreline areas designated for future development. It is abundantly clear that certain areas slated for future development need to be protected for their natural,

Page 2

FERC Project Number 516; Lake Murray Five-Year Review

October 20, 2003

recreational, and scenic values. A few years ago, a group of resource professionals met and made some shoreline protection priorities for the primary purpose of identifying fringelands to be donated in the land transfer to the State of South Carolina. Since that time we have received new Shoreline Management Maps (SMP) maps, shoreline development has continued, and the status of the proposed land transfer is unknown. There is also the continuing issue of fringeland sales, which leads to the inevitable problems with vegetative buffer management. Recent site inspections of vegetated buffers leaves one with the impression that buffers are poorly maintained and do not provide the intended and/or needed resource function and values.

To resolve shoreline management issues on Lake Murray, we suggested that SCE&G meet with the agencies to review the maps, make field inspections and make needed changes to the SMP. In order to get this process started, various State and Federal resource agencies have made an effort to identify priority sites. To make this as accurate and efficient as possible, local reservoir experts from the various agencies were consulted. Staff from State resource agencies met with the goal of evaluating shoreline areas slated for future development and selecting from those areas the shoreline with the highest and best resource values. Some of the selection criteria used included habitat quality, available fish nursery habitat, length of undeveloped shoreline, waterfowl usage, habitat availability in the surrounding region, aesthetic and recreational value, adjacent shoreline usage (forest management, state park, etc.), and public access. Lands not selected as priority sites were typically small fragmented tracts adjacent to existing development. The analysis was completed independent of, and without consideration to, any pending fringeland sales. The results of our meeting are listed in Table 1.

Locations of priority areas have been scribed onto the 2002 SMP maps provided to us by SCE&G. The locations data have not been digitized and is only "penciled in" on one set of maps. Approximately 59 miles of the 106.25 miles of shoreline slated for future development were selected as priority areas. The shoreline measurements are based on manual measurements taken from the 2002 Management Prescriptions / Environmentally Sensitive Maps. Total estimated shoreline lengths considered priority by our current analysis is 309,936 linear feet. The numbers are likely to change somewhat when the data is refined using GIS digital map data. Our intention is to have the priority lands locations transferred to digital maps to be presented to FERC. Using the digital data, accurate shoreline lengths and acreage figures will be presented.

Page 3

FERC Project Number 516; Lake Murray Five-Year Review

October 20, 2003

Based on our current analysis, the approximate total shoreline lengths within each County are as follows:

Lexington County - 118,800 feet (22.5 miles)

Newberry County - 102,300 feet (19.38 miles)

Richland County - 6534 feet (1.24 miles)

Saluda County - 78,870 (14.94 miles)

In closing, it would be very beneficial to the natural resources of Lake Murray to get these priority shoreline areas included in a natural area or recreational area designation. We hope you will consider this request for shoreline protection and be willing to meet with State and Federal resource agencies to discuss the application of these recommendations. Ron Ahle will be the DNR point of contact for further discussions on the SMP. If you have any questions regarding this information, please feel free to contact Ron (phone # 734-2728). Thank you for your attention and consideration of this important issue.

Sincerely,

Ed Duncan

Robert E Duncan

Environmental Programs Director

cc: Roger Banks – USFWS

Thomas Eppink – SCEG

Jack Hannula – FERC

Tony Bebber – SCPRT

Rheta Geddings – SCDHEC

Attachments

Table 1 - Lake Murray Proposed Natural Areas

July 24, 2003

Map Sheet #	County	Tract #	Shore length (in)	Shore length (ft)	Significance
5	Newberry	1	2	1320	adj to for mnngt
5	Newberry	2	5.7	3762	Adjacent to Big Creek environmental area
6	Newberry, Lexington	1	10	6600	Lots of EA, contiguous to for mnngt; easy access
6	Newberry	2	24.8	16368	Surrounded by WMA lands; lots of ESA; long continuous shoreline; regional import.
6	Newberry	3	4.2	2772	Adj to for mnngt; lots of ESA; contin on Map 13, # 8; Buffalo Creek cove
7	Richland	1	1.6	990	Lots of ESA; reg important
7	Lexington	2	2.7	1782	regionally important; some ESA
7	Lexington	3	0.7	462	good access; back of cove
7	Lexington	6	0.6	330	good access; lots of ESA
7	Lexington	7	4.5	2970	Bear Creek; lots of ESA; nice coves; regional importance; long, contin shoreline
8	Saluda	1	5.8	3828	Adj to For mnngt; lots of ESA
9	Saluda	1	3.5	2310	Indian Creek Cove; Adj to For mnngt; lots of ESA
9	Saluda	2	3	1980	Big Creek cove; adj to for mnngt; bottomland hardwoods & wet flats; waterfowl
10	Saluda	1	5.5	3830	Clouds Creek cove; adj to for mnngt; public access
10	Saluda	2	0.5	330	Clouds Creek cove; adj to for mnngt; public access
10	Saluda	3	3.1	2046	public access; regional importance; Clouds Creek cove
10	Saluda	4	1.5	990	easy access; adj to for mnngt
10	Saluda	5	0.7	462	contin. from Map 14
10	Saluda	6	2.3	1518	lots of ESA; contin. from Map 14, # 8
11	Newberry	1	3.9	2574	Hawleek Creek cove; lots of ESA; adj to for mnngt
11	Newberry	2	6.3	4158	Hawleek Creek cove; lots of ESA, vegetated point
11	Newberry	3	7.5	4950	lots of ESA; long contin shoreline
11	Newberry	3A	4.8	3168	nice cove with lots of ESA
11	Newberry	4	12.4	8184	long, continuous shoreline; lots of ESA
11	Newberry	5	4	2640	back of cove; spawning area
11	Newberry	6	2.4	1584	small area adj to for mnngt; shallow cove
11	Newberry	7	0.4	264	adj to For mnngt; continuous with WMA on Map #5
11	Newberry	7A	5.4	3584	buttonbush flats; excellent waterfowl habitat; long, continuous ESA
11	Saluda	8	3.7	2442	buttonbush flats; excellent waterfowl habitat; lots of ESA
11	Saluda	9	14.9	9834	public access; large continuous track; spawning habitat; lots of ESA
11	Saluda	10	4.5	2970	Spring Creek cove; some ESA, some encroachments
11	Saluda	11	7.7	5082	Spring Creek shore; lots of ESA, long, continuous shoreline
11	Saluda	12	12.9	8514	Hurton Branch shoreline; lots of ESA
11	Saluda	13	19.5	12870	Adj to boy scouts camp; long, continuous shoreline, lots of ESA
11	Saluda	8A	8.2	5412	lots of ESA, spawning cove
11	Saluda	14	12.7	8382	lots of continuous ESA and cove habitat
11	Saluda	16	2.2	1452	adj to For mnngt; some ESA
11	Saluda	17	3.7	2442	stream fed cove; some ESA
11	Saluda	18	8.1	5346	adj to for mnngt; long, continuous shoreline
12	Lexington	1	23.2	15312	continuation of #4 on Map 13, long, continuous shoreline; lots of ESA
12	Lexington	2	5.4	3564	next to Willow's End; lots of ESA & spawning habitat
12	Lexington	3	2.9	1914	narrow cove with reg importance; easy access
12	Lexington	4	13.8	9108	Hollow Creek cove; good waterfowl area, adj to GMA; lots of ESA
12	Lexington	5	4.2	2772	Little Horse Creek; lots of continuous ESA
12	Lexington	6	2.2	1452	regionally important
12	Lexington	7	1	660	Cove habitat continued from Map 13; lots of ESA
12	Lexington	8	30.1	19866	Rocky Creek Cove; public access; Adj to State Park; large, contin shoreline, lots of ESA
13	Lexington	2	9.5	6270	public access, regional importance; lots of ESA
13	Lexington	4	14.2	9372	big contin tract (may include Hurricane Cove); extends to Map 12; aesthetics; recreation
13	Lexington	5	8.5	5610	lots of ESA; extends to map 13
13	Lexington	6	3.6	2376	includes island; lots of ESA; recreation
13	Newberry	1	4.8	3168	some ESA; regionally important
13	Newberry	2	2.9	1914	good cover, but fragmented; lots of ESA
13	Newberry	3	7.1	4686	large cove at Plantation Point with lots of ESA
13	Newberry	4	21.1	13926	lots of continuous shoreline with scattered ESA's; public access
13	Newberry	5	9.4	6204	3 coves with lots of ESA; long contin shoreline
13	Newberry	6	5	3300	3 coves with moderate amounts of ESA
13	Newberry	7	10.5	6630	lots of continuous ESA; easy access
13	Newberry	8	1.1	726	continuation from Map 6, #3; lots of ESA
14	Lexington	1	6.8	4356	two coves with lots of ESA; regional importance; fish spawning habitat
14	Lexington	2	1	660	regional importance
14	Lexington	3	2.2	1452	regional importance; waterfowl habitat; cove habitat with lots of ESA
14	Lexington	4	5.7	3762	Beaverdam Creek cove; lots of ESA; long, contin shoreline
14	Lexington	5	1.6	1056	good buttonbush and spawning habitat
14	Lexington	6	1.8	1188	regional importance; some ESA
15	Richland	1	2.2	1452	regional importance; some ESA
15	Lexington	1	2.8	1716	regional importance; lots of ESA
15	Lexington	2	2.3	1518	public access; adj to public recreation; cove habitat with lots of ESA; contin shoreline
15	Lexington	3	0.9	594	some ESA
15	Lexington	4	12.5	8250	Stinking Creek cove; lots of ESA; regional importance; adj to public recreation
15	Lexington	5	4.7	3102	good continuous shoreline
15	Lexington	6	5.3	3498	lots of ESA; good spawning; regional importance
16	Lexington	1	3.3	2178	Jake's Cove; regional importance; long, contin shoreline
17	Richland	1	1.3	858	adj to public recreation
17	Richland	2	3.5	2310	regional importance; should be public recreation; some ESA
17	Richland	4	1.2	792	back of cove; spawning area; regional importance
17	Richland	5	0.2	132	adj to public recreation; some ESA
18	Lexington	1	2.5	1650	adj to Forest mnngt; continuation from Map 12; lots of ESA
TOTALS			469.6	309936	