

RULES AND REGULATIONS

Title 25—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

[25 PA. CODE CH. 93]

Stream Redesignations (Sobers Run, et al.)

The Environmental Quality Board (Board) amends §§ 93.9c, 93.9f and 93.9i (relating to Drainage List C; Drainage List F; and Drainage List I) to read as set forth in Annex A. This final-form rulemaking fulfills the Commonwealth's obligations under State and Federal laws to review and revise, as necessary, water quality standards that are protective of surface waters.

This final-form rulemaking is given under Board order at its meeting on August 15, 2017.

A. Effective Date

This final-form rulemaking will be effective upon publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

B. Contact Persons

For further information, contact Thomas Barron, Bureau of Clean Water, 11th Floor, Rachel Carson State Office Building, P.O. Box 8774, 400 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA 17105-8774, (717) 787-9637; or Michelle Moses, Assistant Counsel, Bureau of Regulatory Counsel, 9th Floor, Rachel Carson State Office Building, P.O. Box 8464, Harrisburg, PA 17105-8464, (717) 787-7060. Persons with a disability may use the Pennsylvania AT&T Relay Service, (800) 654-5984 (TDD users) or (800) 654-5988 (voice users). This final-form rulemaking is available on the Department of Environmental Protection's (Department) web site at www.dep.pa.gov (select "Public Participation," then "Environmental Quality Board (EQB)").

C. Statutory Authority

This final-form rulemaking is being made under the authority of sections 5(b)(1) and 402 of The Clean Streams Law (35 P.S. §§ 691.5(b)(1) and 691.402), which authorize the Board to develop and adopt rules and regulations to implement The Clean Streams Law (35 P.S. §§ 691.1—691.1001), and section 1920-A of The Administrative Code of 1929 (71 P.S. § 510-20), which grants to the Board the power and duty to formulate, adopt and promulgate rules and regulations for the proper performance of the work of the Department. In addition, section 303 of the Federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C.A. § 1313) sets forth requirements for water quality standards.

D. Background and Purpose

Water quality standards are in-stream water quality goals that are implemented by imposing specific regulatory requirements (such as treatment requirements, effluent limits and best management practices (BMP)) on individual sources of pollution. Section 303(c)(1) of the Federal Clean Water Act requires states to periodically review and revise, as necessary, water quality standards. Water quality standards include designated uses, numeric and narrative criteria, and antidegradation requirements for surface waters. This final-form rulemaking is the result of stream evaluations conducted by the Department.

The Department may identify candidate streams for redesignation of uses during routine waterbody investiga-

tions. Requests for consideration may also be initiated by other agencies. Members of the public may submit a rulemaking petition to the Board.

The Department considers candidates for High Quality (HQ) or Exceptional Value (EV) Waters and all other designations in its ongoing review of water quality standards. In general, HQ and EV waters must be maintained at their existing quality, and permitted activities shall ensure the protection of designated and existing uses. The purpose of this final-form rulemaking is to update the designated uses so that the surface waters of the Commonwealth are afforded the appropriate level of protection.

Existing use protection is provided when the Department determines, based on its evaluation of the best available scientific information, that a surface water attains water uses identified in § 93.3 (relating to protected water uses). Examples of water uses protected include Cold Water Fishes (CWF), Warm Water Fishes (WWF), HQ and EV. A final existing use determination is made on a surface water at the time the Department takes a permit or approval action on a request to conduct an activity that may impact surface water. If the determination demonstrates that the existing use is different than the designated use, the water body will immediately receive the best protection identified by either the attained uses or the designated uses. A stream will then be "redesignated" through the rulemaking process to match the existing uses with the designated uses. For example, if the designated use of a stream is listed as protecting WWF but the redesignation evaluation demonstrates that the water attains the use of CWF, the stream would immediately be protected for CWF prior to a rulemaking. After the Department determines the water uses attained by a surface water, the Department will recommend to the Board that the existing uses be adopted as "designated" uses, through rulemaking, and be added to the list of uses identified in § 93.9 (relating to designated water uses and water quality criteria).

The four streams in this final-form rulemaking that are candidates for redesignation to EV were all evaluated in response to petitions as follows:

<i>Stream</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Petitioner</i>
Swiftwater Creek	Monroe	Brodhead Creek Watershed Association
Sobers Run	Northampton	Bushkill Township
Mill Creek	Berks and Chester	Delaware Riverkeeper Network
Silver Creek	Susquehanna	Silver Lake Association

This final-form rulemaking is the result of stream evaluations conducted by the Department in response to the four petitions that were submitted. The physical, chemical and biological characteristics, and other information on these waterbodies were evaluated to determine the appropriateness of the current and requested designations using applicable regulatory criteria and definitions. In reviewing whether waterbodies qualify as HQ or EV waters, the Department considers the criteria in § 93.4b (relating to qualifying as High Quality or Exceptional Value Waters). Based upon the data and information collected on these waterbodies, the Department recommended the Board adopt this final-form rulemaking as described in this preamble and as set forth in Annex A.

E. Summary of Final-Form Rulemaking and Changes from Proposed to Final-Form Rulemaking

Data collection and rulemaking development

Prior to the development of the proposed rulemaking, the Department published notice in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* and on its web site that an evaluation was to be conducted on all or portions of the subject streams to determine the proper Aquatic Life Use or Special Protection designations for the Commonwealth's Water Quality Standards. As a part of the notice, the Department asked the public to submit technical data concerning the water quality, instream habitat or biological conditions of these stream sections for consideration in the assessment. The Department also notified municipalities in the watershed study areas by letter of the stream evaluations and asked them to provide any readily available data.

Data was not received for Swiftwater Creek. The Department received comments regarding Swiftwater Creek including a notice from Tobyhanna Township stating that they did not support the petition to upgrade Swiftwater Creek. The Department did receive data from Bushkill Township to augment the Department's assessment of Sobers Run. Hanover Engineering Associates submitted the latest Coldwater Conservation Plan (2009) completed for the Upper Bushkill Creek Watershed and the Northampton County Conservation District submitted water chemistry results collected by the Retired Senior Volunteer Program. This data was used as documentation and support for the Sobers Run special protection assessment. The Delaware Riverkeeper Network provided the Department with water quality data for Mill Creek including a copy of the 1994 Fish and Boat Commission Report, information pertaining to the Fish and Boat Commission "Natural Trout Reproduction Layer" and information pertaining to local angler observations. This data was used as supporting documentation of the water quality of the Mill Creek basin in conjunction with the findings of the Department's survey. The Department also received two supportive responses from local citizens regarding the redesignation of Mill Creek. The Department did not receive data regarding Silver Creek. The Department did receive one letter of support for the redesignation of Silver Creek.

The Department utilized submitted data and conducted its own evaluations of the subject streams to create draft stream evaluation reports and notified the affected municipalities, county planning commissions, county conservation districts, other State agencies and petitioners of the availability of a draft evaluation report for review and comment. The draft stream evaluation reports were also made available on the Department's web site for a minimum 30-day public review and comment period.

Comments were not received in response to the notice for Swiftwater Creek or Silver Creek. Nine commentators offered supportive comments for the Department's recommendation to redesignate Sobers Run. During the initial comment period, three stakeholders offered comments pertaining to the Mill Creek report, one in support and two in opposition. In addition, the Delaware Riverkeeper Network requested an extension of the original 30-day public comment period. In response, the Department provided a 30-day extension to the comment period for the Mill Creek stream report. The Delaware Riverkeeper Network provided additional comments in support of the Department's EV recommendation but stated opposition to the recommendation for the unnamed tributary to Mill Creek at 40°14'33.8"N; 75°43'49.6"W to remain unchanged.

The Department considered all data and comments received in response to these notifications and public comment periods in the determination of the Department's recommendations to the Board.

Copies of the Department's stream evaluation reports for these waterbodies are available on the Department's web site or from the contacts whose addresses and telephone numbers are listed in Section B of this preamble. The data and information collected on these waterbodies support this final-form rulemaking.

Rulemaking summary

This final-form rulemaking amends two stream names as they appear in § 93.9c. The United States Geologic Survey maintains the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) Flowline. The stream nomenclature and the fluvial geomorphology given in the *Pennsylvania Code* are governed by the NHD Flowline. These corrections are included to maintain consistency between the *Pennsylvania Code* and the NHD Flowline. Saw Kill Creek and Raymond Kill Creek are corrected to Sawkill Creek and Raymondskill Creek, respectively, to be consistent with the NHD Flowline.

This final-form rulemaking also converts all references to river mile indexes (RMI) in Annex A to a set of coordinates (latitude and longitude), with the eventual goal to be the conversion of all RMIs in §§ 93.9a—93.9z to the coordinate system. Department staff recognizes the RMI system to be antiquated. When determining the RMI, it is possible to derive differing RMIs depending on the technique used. It is easy to consistently determine the latitude and longitude along any point of a stream or river while in the field with a hand-held GPS unit or using a geographical information system (GIS) software application (the Department standard projected coordinate system is PA_Albers_Equal_Area_Conic; the geographic coordinate system is North American Datum 1983 or NAD 1983). It is very difficult to determine the RMI while in the field. Referring to the latitude and longitude will make it much easier for the regulated community and others to apply the zone description in § 93.9 to a particular project or activity, and determine whether the project discharges within or the activity is otherwise related to the referenced stream zone.

Changes from proposed to final-form rulemaking

This final-form rulemaking includes no changes to the proposed rulemaking.

F. Summary of Major Comments and Responses

The Board approved the Sobers Run, et al., stream redesignation proposed rulemaking at its April 19, 2016, meeting. The proposed rulemaking was published at 46 Pa.B. 2970 (June 11, 2016), with a 45-day public comment period that closed on July 25, 2016.

Five commentators submitted comments. Two commentators offered support of the entire proposed rulemaking, one commended the Department in its efforts and one commentator offered support for the redesignation of Mill Creek. All public comments were supportive of the proposed rulemaking. The Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC) submitted comments requesting amendments to the Regulatory Analysis Form for this final-form rulemaking. The Regulatory Analysis Form was amended accordingly and is included as part of this

final-form rulemaking package. A more detailed summary of the comments submitted to the Board and the Department's responses to those comments are available in the comment and response document that accompanies this final-form rulemaking package.

G. Benefits, Costs and Compliance

Benefits

Overall, the Commonwealth, its citizens and natural resources will benefit from this final-form rulemaking because it provides the appropriate level of protection to preserve the integrity of existing and designated uses of surface waters in this Commonwealth. Protecting water quality provides economic value to present and future generations in the form of a clean water supply for human consumption, wildlife, livestock, industrial use and irrigation; recreational opportunities such as fishing (also for consumption), water contact sports and boating; and aquatic life protection. It is important to realize these benefits and to ensure opportunities and activities continue in a manner that is environmentally, socially and economically sound. Maintenance of water quality ensures its future availability for all uses.

The Department identified three public water supply facilities with raw water intakes that are no further downstream than 17.0 stream miles of the redesignated stream sections in this final-form rulemaking. These 3 public water suppliers, which serve over 103,000 citizens, will benefit from this final-form rulemaking because their raw source water will be afforded a higher level of protection. This is an economic benefit because the source water treatment costs for the drinking water will be less costly to customers if less treatment is needed due to the maintenance of water quality in EV waters.

Small businesses in the outdoor recreation industry will be positively affected by this final-form rulemaking. The maintenance and protection of the water quality will ensure the long-term availability of these outdoor recreation opportunities in pristine waters.

Compliance costs

This final-form rulemaking may impose additional compliance costs on the regulated community. This final-form rulemaking is necessary to improve total pollution control. The expenditures necessary to meet new compliance requirements may exceed that which is required under existing regulations.

The redesignations will be implemented through the Department's permit and approval actions. Persons who presently are operating under a general permit will need to apply for an individual permit upon permit expiration. Persons expanding a discharge or adding a new discharge point to a stream could be adversely affected if they need to provide a higher level of treatment or BMPs to meet the designated and existing uses of the stream. For example, these increased costs may take the form of higher engineering, construction or operating cost for point source discharges. Treatment costs and BMPs are site-specific and depend upon the size of the discharge in relation to the size of the stream and many other factors. It is therefore not possible to predict the actual change in costs. Economic impacts would primarily involve the potential for higher treatment costs for new or expanded discharges to streams that are redesignated. The initial costs resulting from the installation of technologically advanced wastewater treatment processes and BMPs may be offset by potential savings from an increased value of improved water quality through more cost-effective and efficient treatment over time.

Ten National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitted facilities are located within the portions of the streams that are redesignated in this final-form rulemaking. The types of NPDES discharges identified include industrial stormwater, sewage and pesticides. Discharges in existence at the time of the stream surveys have been factored into the evaluations of the existing water quality of the four streams and the subsequent recommendations for redesignation to EV waters. Since the presence of these discharge activities did not preclude the attainment of EV status, no changes to the discharge treatment technology are necessary as long as the discharge characteristics (both quality and quantity) remain the same. Thus, redesignation to EV does not automatically impose any additional special technology requirements on the ten NPDES permitted entities.

Any person, business, small business or organization proposing a new, additional or increased point source discharge would need to satisfy the requirements in § 93.4c(b)(1) (relating to implementation of antidegradation requirements). Any new, additional or increased point source discharge to special protection waters must evaluate nondischarge alternatives and use an alternative that is environmentally sound and cost-effective when compared with the cost of the proposed discharge. If an alternative is not available, the discharge must use a nondegrading treatment technology that is designed to protect the existing water quality. The permit applicant shall demonstrate in the permit application that its new or expanded activities will not lower the existing water quality of special protection streams. Point source discharge activities to special protection streams do not qualify for general permits issued under Chapter 92a (relating to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permitting, monitoring and compliance). Therefore, these new discharges will require an individual permit. Where onlot sewage systems are planned, the Department's sewage facilities planning and permitting process, as implemented by the Department under Chapters 71—73 (relating to administration of sewage facilities planning program; administration of sewage facilities permitting program; and standards for onlot sewage treatment facilities), is protective of water quality.

Other permitted activities and approvals, such as those required under Chapter 102 (relating to erosion and sediment control) for erosion and sediment control during construction activities and under Chapter 105 (relating to dam safety and waterway management) in water obstructions and encroachments, must utilize antidegradation BMPs to satisfy the requirements in § 93.4c. These sets of BMPs may be designed to provide a higher degree of protection than those utilized in other waters.

The Department cannot accurately estimate who will be affected by these stream redesignations because: 1) persons and businesses will not be impacted until a future activity requiring a new or modified permit or approval action is proposed; 2) effluent discharges and receiving stream characteristics are unique; and 3) generic technology and cost equations are not available for purposes of comparing the costs or savings, or both, of a future permitted activity.

Compliance assistance plan

This final-form rulemaking has been developed as part of an established program that has been implemented by the Department since the early 1980s. This final-form rulemaking is consistent with and based on existing Department regulations. This final-form rulemaking extends additional protection to selected waterbodies that

exhibit exceptional water quality and are consistent with antidegradation requirements established by the Federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C.A. §§ 1251—1388) and The Clean Streams Law. All surface waters in this Commonwealth are afforded a minimum level of protection through compliance with the water quality standards, which prevent pollution and protect existing water uses.

The redesignations in this final-form rulemaking will be implemented through the Department's permit and approval actions. For example, the NPDES permitting program bases effluent limitations on the uses of a stream. These permit conditions are established to assure water quality is protected and maintained. New and expanded dischargers will receive permit conditions with water quality based effluent limitations that are required to provide effluent treatment according to the water quality standards.

Paperwork requirements

This final-form rulemaking will not impose any new paperwork requirements on persons engaged in regulated activities under existing permits or approvals from the Department. This final-form rulemaking is based on existing Department regulations and simply mirror the existing use protection that is already in place for these streams. Some paperwork may be necessary for new or expanding dischargers to streams upgraded to HQ or EV. For example, NPDES general permits are not available for discharges to these streams. Thus, an individual permit, and its associated paperwork, would be required. Additionally, paperwork associated with evaluating nondischarge alternatives and nondegrading discharges is required for all new, additional or increased discharges to HQ or EV Waters.

H. Pollution Prevention

The Federal Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C.A. §§ 13101—13109) established a National policy that promotes pollution prevention as the preferred means for achieving state environmental protection goals. The Department encourages pollution prevention, which is the reduction or elimination of pollution at its source, through the substitution of environmentally-friendly materials, more efficient use of raw materials and the incorporation of energy efficiency strategies. Pollution prevention practices can provide greater environmental protection with greater efficiency because they can result in significant cost savings to facilities that permanently achieve or move beyond compliance. This final-form rulemaking has incorporated the following pollution prevention incentives.

The water quality standards and antidegradation program are major pollution prevention tools because the objective is to prevent degradation by maintaining and protecting existing water quality and existing uses. Although the antidegradation program does not prohibit new or expanded wastewater discharges, nondischarge alternatives must be evaluated and are required when environmentally sound and cost effective. Nondischarge alternatives, when implemented, remove impacts to surface water and may reduce the overall level of pollution to the environment. In addition, if environmentally sound and cost-effective alternatives are not available, discharges must be nondegrading in most circumstances.

I. Sunset Review

The Board is not establishing a sunset date for these regulations because they are needed for the Department to carry out its statutory authority. The Department will

continue to closely monitor these regulations for their effectiveness and recommend updates to the Board as necessary.

J. Regulatory Review

Under section 5(a) of the Regulatory Review Act (71 P.S. § 745.5(a)), on May 26, 2016, the Department submitted a copy of the notice of proposed rulemaking, published at 46 Pa.B. 2970, to IRRC and the Chairpersons of the House and Senate Environmental Resources and Energy Committees for review and comment.

Under section 5(c) of the Regulatory Review Act, the Department submitted to IRRC and the House and Senate Committees copies of comments received during the public comment period, as well as other documents when requested. In preparing the final-form rulemaking, the Department has considered all comments from IRRC, the House and Senate Committees, and the public.

The Chairperson of the House Committee notified IRRC that the House Committee intended to review the final-form rulemaking. The Board did not promulgate this final-form rulemaking for 14 days after the House Committee received IRRC's approval order. Since the House Committee did not take action during the 14-day period, the Board proceeded to promulgate this final-form rulemaking.

Under section 5.1(j.2) of the Regulatory Review Act (71 P.S. § 745.5a(j.2)), on November 15, 2017, the final-form rulemaking was deemed approved by the House and Senate Committees. Under section 5.1(e) of the Regulatory Review Act, IRRC met on November 16, 2017, and approved the final-form rulemaking.

K. Findings

The Board finds that:

(1) Public notice of proposed rulemaking was given under sections 201 and 202 of the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L. 769, No. 240) (45 P.S. §§ 1201 and 1202) and regulations promulgated thereunder, 1 Pa. Code §§ 7.1 and 7.2.

(2) A public comment period was provided as required by law, and all comments were considered.

(3) This final-form rulemaking does not enlarge the purpose of the proposed rulemaking published at 46 Pa.B. 2970.

(4) This final-form rulemaking is necessary and appropriate for administration and enforcement of the authorizing acts identified in Section C of this preamble.

(5) This final-form rulemaking does not contain standards or requirements that exceed requirements of the companion Federal regulations.

L. Order

The Board, acting under the authorizing statutes, orders that:

(a) The regulations of the Department, 25 Pa. Code Chapter 93, are amended by amending §§ 93.9c, 93.9f, and 93.9i to read as set forth in Annex A, with ellipses referring to the existing text of the regulations.

(b) The Chairperson of the Board shall submit this order and Annex A to the Office of General Counsel and the Office of Attorney General for approval and review as to legality and form, as required by law.

(c) The Chairperson shall submit this order and Annex A to IRRC and the Senate and House Environmental Resources and Energy Committees as required under the Regulatory Review Act (71 P.S. §§ 745.1—745.14).

(d) The Chairperson shall certify this order and Annex A, as approved to legality and form, and deposit them with the Legislative Reference Bureau, as required by law.

(e) This order shall take effect immediately upon publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

PATRICK McDONNELL,
Chairperson

(*Editor's Note:* See 47 Pa.B. 7402 (December 2, 2017) for IRRC's approval order.)

Fiscal Note: Fiscal Note 7-535 remains valid for the final adoption of the subject regulations.

Annex A

TITLE 25. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

PART I. DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Subpart C. PROTECTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

ARTICLE II. WATER RESOURCES

CHAPTER 93. WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

DESIGNATED WATER USES AND WATER QUALITY CRITERIA

§ 93.9c. Drainage List C.

Delaware River Basin in Pennsylvania
Delaware River

<i>Stream</i>	<i>Zone</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Water Uses Protected</i>	<i>Exceptions To Specific Criteria</i>
	* * * *	*		
2—Vandermark Creek	Basin, Deep Brook to Mouth	Pike	HQ-CWF, MF	None
2—Sawkill Creek	Basin, Source to Vantine Brook	Pike	EV, MF	None
3—Vantine Brook	Basin	Pike	HQ-CWF, MF	None
2—Sawkill Creek	Basin, Vantine Brook to Mouth	Pike	EV, MF	None
2—Raymondskill Creek	Basin	Pike	HQ-CWF, MF	None
2—Conashaugh Creek	Basin	Pike	HQ-CWF, MF	None
	* * * *	*		
4—Devils Hole Creek	Basin, South Boundary of State Game Lands No. 221 to Mouth	Monroe	HQ-CWF, MF	None
3—Paradise Creek	Basin, Devils Hole Creek to Forest Hills Run	Monroe	HQ-CWF, MF	None
4—Forest Hills Run	Basin, Source to Swiftwater Creek	Monroe	HQ-CWF, MF	None
5—Swiftwater Creek	Basin, Source to UNT 04960 at 41°5'58.5"N; 75°20'4.8"W	Monroe	EV, MF	None
6—UNT 04960	Basin	Monroe	HQ-CWF, MF	None
5—Swiftwater Creek	UNT 04960 to Mouth	Monroe	HQ-CWF, MF	None
4—Forest Hills Run	Basin, Swiftwater Creek to Mouth	Monroe	HQ-CWF, MF	None
3—Paradise Creek	Basin, Forest Hills Run to Mouth	Monroe	HQ-CWF, MF	None
3—Michael Creek	Basin	Monroe	HQ-CWF, MF	None
	* * * *	*		
2—Mud Run	Basin	Northampton	CWF, MF	None
2—Bushkill Creek	Basin, Source to Sobers Run	Northampton	HQ-CWF, MF	None
3—Sobers Run	Basin	Northampton	EV, MF	None
2—Bushkill Creek	Basin, Sobers Run to Shoeneck Creek	Northampton	HQ-CWF, MF	None
3—Shoeneck Creek	Basin	Northampton	WWF, MF	None
2—Bushkill Creek	Basin, Shoeneck Creek to Mouth	Northampton	HQ-CWF, MF	None

§ 93.9f. Drainage List F.

**Delaware River Basin in Pennsylvania
Schuylkill River**

<i>Stream</i>	<i>Zone</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Water Uses Protected</i>	<i>Exceptions To Specific Criteria</i>
* * * * *				
3—Leaf Creek	Basin	Berks	WWF, MF	None
3—Mill Creek	Basin, Source to UNT at 40°14'33.8"N; 75°43'49.6"W	Berks	EV, MF	None
4—UNT at 40°14'33.8"N; 75°43'49.6"W	Basin	Berks	WWF, MF	None
3—Mill Creek	Basin, UNT at 40°14'33.8"N; 75°43'49.6"W to Mouth	Berks	EV, MF	None
3—UNTs Schuylkill River	Basins (all UNTs along Montgomery County shore), Berks-Chester-Montgomery County Border to Valley Creek	Montgomery	WWF, MF	None
* * * * *				

§ 93.9i. Drainage List I.

**Susquehanna River Basin in Pennsylvania
Susquehanna River**

<i>Stream</i>	<i>Zone</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Water Uses Protected</i>	<i>Exceptions To Specific Criteria</i>
* * * * *				
2—Unnamed Tributaries to Susquehanna River	Basins (all sections in PA), PA-NY State Border near Great Bend to PA-NY State Border near Milltown	Susquehanna-Bradford	CWF, MF	None
2—Snake Creek	Basin, Source to Silver Creek	Susquehanna	CWF, MF	None
3—Silver Creek	Basin, Source to Laurel Lake Creek	Susquehanna	EV, MF	None
4—Laurel Lake Creek	Basin, Source to McCormick Run	Susquehanna	CWF, MF	None
5—McCormick Run	Basin	Susquehanna	EV, MF	None
4—Laurel Lake Creek	Basin, McCormick Run to Mouth	Susquehanna	CWF, MF	None
3—Silver Creek	Basin, Laurel Lake Creek to Mouth	Susquehanna	EV, MF	None
2—Snake Creek	Basin, Silver Creek to PA-NY State Border (all sections in PA)	Susquehanna	CWF, MF	None
2—Little Snake Creek	Basin (all sections in PA)	Susquehanna	CWF, MF	None
* * * * *				

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 18-215. Filed for public inspection February 9, 2018, 9:00 a.m.]