

## **DRAFT Technical Subcommittee Recommendation to the Statewide Water Resources Committee**

The Technical Subcommittee of the Statewide Water Resources committee met on August 6, 2010, to review the list of watersheds recommended by the Regional Water Resources Committees for possible designation as Critical Water Planning Areas. The Subcommittee will recommend to the Statewide Committee three watersheds that have an urgent need for designation based on the severity of the water availability problem in the watershed, the pressure for the problem to get worse if it is not addressed soon, and the availability of funding for development of a Critical Area Resource Plan. The following chart summarizes the recommendations of the committee.

Watershed (Basin)	Notes	Notes
Laurel Hill Ck (Ohio)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem = public water supply use</li> <li>• We are in the dark as the amt. of water from Somerset co. Authority</li> <li>• Meets criteria on current use</li> </ul>
Back Ck (Ohio)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highest WQ in watershed in Indian Creek- Main Source of Water Authority</li> <li>• Does meet criteria</li> <li>• Residents Support</li> <li>• Used for Snow making</li> </ul>
Marsh Ck/Rock Ck (Potomac)	Yes. Tim Weston abstained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant hydrologic connectivity</li> <li>• 20,000 new homes plotted and approved but not built yet</li> <li>• Proposed importation from Susq. York/Gettysburg</li> <li>• Exportation thru wastewater discharges</li> <li>• Much interest from advisory committee</li> </ul>
Little Lehigh Ck (Delaware)	Maybe Have Cons. Dist, LCA, LVPC and Berks Co. get together to discuss.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High development, water supply industry withdrawals</li> <li>• Includes withdrawals outside of the watershed</li> <li>• Originally part of Jordan Creek</li> <li>• Carbonate Rock</li> <li>• HQ-CWF designation</li> <li>• SSM study indicates further study needed</li> <li>• LCA doesn't want CARP designation; however they aren't interested in a plan.</li> <li>• Dry streams, flashy streams</li> <li>• Defiantly 2 sides to the story. Area needs help to bring two sides together.</li> </ul>
Brodhead Creek (Delaware)	Maybe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High growth potential</li> <li>• HQ-CWF Designation</li> <li>• Residents want to protect what they have for the future</li> <li>• Area is self supplied – Residential/Commercial</li> <li>• CARP would meet future challenges, not necessarily existing</li> <li>• Study underway on lower end by water authority</li> <li>• Very divergent testimony- conflicting viewpoint</li> </ul>

Sugar Creek (Upper/Middle Susquehanna)	Maybe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agriculture based. Little manufacturing</li> <li>• Every pour point is negative</li> <li>• Low groundwater, low base flow is a natural condition</li> <li>• High Marcellus shale activity</li> <li>• No active stream gages</li> <li>• CARP would give better understanding of existing conditions and useful for future new water demand.</li> </ul>
Spring Creek (Upper/Middle Susquehanna)	Maybe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many studies have been done</li> <li>• USGS Study is very specific not equivalent to CARP</li> <li>• Declining base flows</li> <li>• Very little flow away, Slab Run = Water Supply withdrawal</li> </ul>
Little Conewago Ck (Lower Susquehanna)	No. Watch for next SWP update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not part of original nomination</li> <li>• Golf Courses, quarry, industrial, ag</li> <li>• Couple water suppliers</li> <li>• “Water Challenged” by SRBC</li> <li>• Urgency =?, no advocacy</li> </ul>
Tributaries to the Conestoga River (Lower Susquehanna)	No. Table and send back to Regional Committee. Check with county planning. Separate two watersheds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes- A number of unknowns and there is value in pulling the groups together</li> <li>• No-Plan already underway. Should the watersheds be split out separated?</li> </ul>
Tributaries to the Swatara Creek (Lower Susquehanna)	No. Table. Send back to Regional Committee. Remove Mill Ck or re-explain it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looks like pockets, should each done on own merits or together?</li> <li>• ACOE study on Swatara points to water shortages under drought conditions.</li> </ul>
Tributaries to the Connoquenessing Ck (Ohio)	No. Watch, return to regional committee. More data for future SWP update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreation – golf course, commercial development, Marcellus shale withdrawals and rapid residential growth.</li> <li>• Have stormwater/WQ issues. WS company importing water from outside watershed. (Use has decreased)</li> <li>• Urgency is unclear. No local interest. Is this a sleeper problem?</li> <li>• Artifact of infrastructure.</li> </ul>

Toby Creek (Upper/Middle Susquehanna)	No. Return pending SRBC decision on plan between PWS's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PWS 84% of use</li> <li>• Urbanizing area</li> <li>• Huntsville reservoir in center</li> <li>• Well levels appear to be lowering</li> <li>• Marcellus shale withdrawals</li> <li>• Water suppliers worked together to address depletion issues</li> </ul>
Tributaries to the Neshaminy Creek (Delaware)	No.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly urbanized</li> <li>• Interconnection of water suppliers</li> <li>• Part of DRBC Groundwater Protection Area</li> </ul>
Alloway Ck (Potomac)	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Predominantly agriculture, golf course</li> <li>• More quality concerns than quantity</li> </ul>
Temple Ck (Great Lakes)	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary issue and water user is an over capacity high use prison.</li> </ul>