

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 22, 2000 4:36 PM
To: mike buckley
Subject: the [REDACTED] letter to you dated 10/26/00

Mike,

I have reviewed the November, 2000 League of Women Voters of the Columbia Area newsletter. In the newsletter, it had excerpts from the letter to you and Doug Bellomo from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] dated October 26, 2000 regarding FEMA's recent maps for the Congaree River. Several of the excerpts in the newsletter make specific reference to me.

I am providing FEMA the correct information on the issues raised in the [REDACTED] letter in the two paragraphs that made reference to me. It is as follows:

- 1 - The representations that I made regarding information from FERC were based on written information from FERC. I forwarded the documents from FERC to FEMA.
- 2 - The basis for the statement that the Saluda Dam has been increased in size twice up to an effective height of 377 feet (not 376 feet as stated in the Rhodes' excerpts) since the 1936 flood at Columbia has been validated in writing by SCE&G and FERC; and provided to FEMA.
- 3 - On the basis of reports prepared for SCE&G beginning in the mid-80's and

presented to FERC for the updated analysis of the Probable Maximum Flood, FERC advised me in writing that the Probable Maximum Flood Peak Inflow is 518,000 cfs and the Probable Maximum Flood Peak Outflow is 197,000 cfs (again, this documentation was provided to FEMA). The Probable Maximum Flood was defined in "Feasibility of Assigning A Probability to the Probable Maximum Flood", Hydrology Subcommittee of the Interagency Advisory Committee on Water Data, Office of Water Data Coordination, June 1986 in the Glossary, page 78 as " The most severe flood that is considered reasonably possible at a site as a result of hydrologic and meteorologic conditions".

Hopefully, the [REDACTED] understand that the information from FERC represents an analysis of the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) information from SCE&G. However, the highest water elevation in the reservoir during a flood event was approximately 361.5 feet during the 1936 flood. It is my understanding that SCE&G would attempt to prevent the lake level from exceeding its flowage easements of 366 feet during a flood event without causing damage to the reservoir.

The reason I presented information from FERC and SCE&G to FEMA was that others were making contentions to FEMA that the reservoir did not appear

to impede the peak flow at Gervais Street for the 1936 flood. As a result, their contentions are that the Saluda Dam does not provide flood control benefits for higher events. The increase in height of the Dam by 17 feet and impedance of the flow during the PMF from 518,000 to 197,000 cfs should cause an appreciation that using the 1936 experience as a baseline for flood control at the Dam is without technical merit. Furthermore, SCE&G has operating procedures in place for flood events that has been developed since 1936.

If the [REDACTED] will provide me a statement in writing of the "previous non-sequiturs" they attribute to me, I will also correct those misunderstandings (with a copy to FEMA).

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

Copies: the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]