County Driven Approaches to Source Water Protection Implementation
Water systems develop source water protection plans and often struggle with implementation...why is this?
Challenge: Large Number of Community Water Systems
Challenge: Staff Resources

PA DEP Regions

PRWA SWP Staff
Challenge: A Change in Perspective

- EPA has goals in place for Source Water Protection – Substantial Implementation
  - Number of systems
  - Population reached
- PA Substantial Implementation definition
  - PA DEP Approved Plan
  - System addressing greatest Assessment Risk
- PA has money available for hydrogeologic work
- In PA, last five years has been trending toward program efficiency (i.e. ↑ numbers)
The “Old” Way to Plan

- Build a relationship with the system
- Form Steering Committee and discuss issues/risks
- Lengthy process to delineate sources (and $$) and identify all risks – detailed process
- Plans may take multiple years to develop
The Results?

- Small number of plans annually, high quality products
- Systems had attention beyond plan completion
- Implementation had a high success rate, even to date
- Long-term, substantial partnerships formed
Fast Forward to 2012...
The New Way to “Plan”

- PA still has money to pay for delineation work – more plans are being developed
- PRWA has been offering a “hands-on” SWP training course to reach more systems
- New for 2012: SWAP Assist
A New Focus... Implementation!
“Implementation is Hard!”

- Myth: “I don’t have the time to implement my plan”
- Myth: “Implementation takes a lot of money”
- Myth: “I need to create something new to implement my plan”
Strength in Numbers

The Situation

- Nearly 200 “approved” plans in PA
- 300-400 other systems that have a plan in place or some acknowledgment of implementation
- 600 vs. 10 – only so much attention to each system

The Answer (for now)

- Some counties had many of the “big” systems with approved plans in place
- More systems in conjunction with limited time, resources, and staff needed a different approach
- Good relationships with county agencies + a willingness to lead
Current Coalitions
Why County Level Coalitions?

- Utilize existing education and enforcement programs
- Rural systems are comfortable at this level of cooperation
- Approved plans require an annual report submitted to PA DEP – cooperation delivers a mechanism for systems to actually implement their SWP plans and submit this report
- NOT specifically Marcellus Shale driven
Triple Divide Watershed Coalition
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Susquehanna
Triple Divide Watershed Coalition

- 9 CWS in the county – all have DEP approved plans (last in 2005-6)
- Very rural county
- Many have one operator
- Mostly groundwater systems
- County is the headwaters for 3 different major watersheds – they need to lead by example
Efforts to Date

- Partner – Penn State Cooperative Extension
- All 3 County Commissioners actively involved
- Colcom grant recipient – residential well WQ testing
- Received Governor’s Award for Local Government Excellence in 2012
- Coalition is going beyond SWP
Tioga County
Tioga County

- ~25 CWS in County; 10 have approved plans
- Very rural county
- Combination of ground and surface water
- Heavy Marcellus Shale region
Efforts to Date

- WREN grant to enhance public education efforts
- County planning incorporating SWP areas into municipal planning
- County EMA and 911 now using SWP area in response GIS system
- Working with/training adjacent counties to build similar 911 systems
Northcentral Source Water Protection Alliance
Northcentral Source Water Protection Alliance

- Lycoming, Sullivan, and Clinton Counties
- 57 total CWS; most larger systems with plans in place
- Slightly more urbanized areas (Williamsport area)
- Periphery of heavy Marcellus activity
Efforts to Date

- Montoursville – reroute of stormwater along State Rt. 15 away from SWP area; i.e. working with PENNDOT
- USGS study building on previous work for Williamsport MWA; watershed effort into Tioga County
- TerrAqua Marcellus frac wastewater to water plant
Central PA SWAP
Central PA SWAP

- Watershed approach
- Led by Rush Township; supervisor is coalition chair
- About ½ of the systems have approved plans, others are in process
- History of gas drilling conflicting with PWS
Efforts to Date

- Formed in Spring 2012
- WREN grant for education to schools and public
- Partnering with State Parks
The Future of Coalitions?
More to Come?
Expanding on Success

- Create “Water Supplier Coalitions” – not just SWP
- Use the “big guys” to pull in the “little guys”
- Potter County moving this direction
- Sustainability
- Capability Enhancement
- System Efficiency
- Overall Coordination amongst CWS in a County/region
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