

Appendix A

Western Pennsylvania Conservancy French Creek Watershed Conservation Plan Steering Committee

Steering Committee Coordinator and Author

Mr. Todd Sampsell

Western Pennsylvania Conservancy

Mr. Robert Anderson	U. S. Geological Survey
Mr. Charles Bier	Western Pennsylvania Conservancy
Dr. Mike Campbell	Mercyhurst College
Dr. Jonathan Chase	University of Pittsburgh
Ms. Sarah Galloway	Erie County Conservation District
Ms. Marnee Gormley	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Mr. James Grazio	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Mr. Brian Hill	French Creek Project
Mr. John Holden	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Mr. Michael Koryak	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
Mr. Jeff Lang	Conneaut Lake/French Creek Valley Conservancy
Dr. Henry Lawrence	Edinboro University
Mr. Budd Luce	French Creek Canoe & Kayak
Mr. Jack Lynch	Crawford County Planning Commission
Mr. Todd Marsteller	Venango County Planning Commission
Mr. Michael McCarthy	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Mr. Daniel Miller	McClure-Miller
Mr. Jim Mondock	Mercer County Conservation District
Mr. Brian Pilarcik	Crawford County Conservation District
Mr. Denny Puko	Mercer County Regional Planning Commission
Mr. David Skellie	Erie County Department of Planning
Ms. Cynthia Smith	PA Dept. of Transportation
Dr. Jay Stauffer	Pennsylvania State University
Mr. Jes Sunder	Venango County Conservation District
Mr. Robert Wellington	Erie County Department of Health
Mr. Allan Woomer	PA Fish & Boat Commission
Mr. Ron Wooster	Lord Corporation
Dr. Brian Zimmerman	Edinboro University

French Creek Project
Advisory Committee

Project Director

Mr. Brian Hill

Pennsylvania Environmental Council

Mr. David Anderson	Moody & Associates
Mr. Steve Beckman	MacDonald, Illig, Jones, & Britton
Ms. Bonnie Beightol	Borough of Sugar Creek
Ms. Marilyn Black	Oil Heritage Region
Ms. Jacquelyn Bonomo	Western Pennsylvania Conservancy
Dr. Robert Concilus	Conneaut Lake/French Creek Valley Conservancy
Ms. Joanne Denworth	10,000 Friends of PA
Mr. Calvin Ernst	Ernst Conservation Seeds
Mr. LeRoy Gross	Erie County Conservation District
Dr. Samuel Harrison	Harrison Hydrosciences
Mr. Lynn Hofius	Benchmark Surveying
Mr. John Holden	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection
Mr. Lynn Hoover	PPG Industries
Mr. Henry Ingram	PA Landowners Association
Mr. Mark Kulich	PA Dept. of Conservation and Natural Resources
Mr. Andrew McElwaine	PA Environmental Council
Mr. James Lang	Dad's Products
Dr. Susan McAlpine	The Nature Conservancy
Mr. Douglas Mehan	PPG Industries
Mr. James Mondock	Mercer County Conservation District
Mr. John Oliver, ex officio	Secretary, PA Dept. of Conservation and Natural Resources
Ms. Lynn Pacior-Malys	Graphic Artist
Dr. Eric Pallant	CEED & Allegheny College
Mr. Jeff Peters	Spruce Row Dairy
Mr. Denny Puko	Mercer County Regional Planning Commission
Mr. Marc Ricard	Venango County Conservation District
Ms. Lynn Sandieson	Crawford County Conservation District
Mr. Steven Tingley	Planning & Economic Development Assoc.
Mr. Mark Troyer	Troyer Farms
Mr. Ronald Wooster	LORD Corporation

Appendix B

Public Comments Received Throughout the French Creek Watershed Conservation Planning Process

Public Comments Received on the Draft French Creek Conservation Plan

Comments Received Via Mail or Electronic Mail

John A. Shaffer, landowner: “I live and own property in the French Creek watershed which includes two small streams so I have an interest in any public policy that will impact my property.”

Carlin Marsh, CLFCVC member: “Address rich spring wildflower habitat in mature hardwood forest. Specifically Deer Creek in Venango and Mercer counties, Big Sugar in the Townville area route 27, and Little Sugar near Pine Knoll-Roundknob Gap area. These areas are threatened by deforestation.”

“Address invasive exotics including: multiflora rose, privet, tatarian honeysuckle, reed canary grass, and giant hogweed.”

Bob Hetrick: “I have read the draft of the French Creek Conservation Plan and doubt that it could be made any better if the authors had two more years to work on it. It is a rather large volume that could be a chore for many individuals to read and/or remember important items and technical explanations.”

Ralph R. Caldwell, landowner: “I am a farmer by choice. I don’t believe you should be telling me how to farm. The green space you talk about – drive out route 99 Edinboro. It’s weed infested buildings falling down, it looks like disgrace to humanity. Road salt gets into waterways also. Too much run off of salt in winter salt in summer is ruining our waterways. Streambed fencing is going to put dairy farmers 6 ft under, then what? I believe you are trying to ruin the country forever.”

Crawford County Commissioners: “The Crawford County Commissioners would like to commend the efforts of those involved in the French Creek Conservation Plan. Truly an environmental, cultural, and recreational asset for Crawford County and Northwest Pennsylvania, the French Creek is a testament of the ability for nature’s best to coexist, and even thrive in the face of development and progress.

The research and information contained in this plan is an important step in maintaining the integrity of this watershed and the diverse ecology contained within it. We must all understand we are inextricably linked to our environment, and are responsible for it. From the wells that draw water from this watershed, to the streams that irrigate our farms, the people, industries, and governments each play a vital role in the conservation of our natural resources.

The Commissioners fully support efforts to educate the public on how their decisions and actions can impact the watershed, and inform them of better alternatives. The Commissioners support incentive based programs and policies for industries and landowners to help preserve this watershed and other natural resources of Northwest Pennsylvania. The Commissioners also support local level municipal planning that considers the balance between community development and the environment.

This Board of Crawford County Commissioners must unequivocally express their support for the private property rights of all residents of Crawford County. Policies and programs designed to forcibly take easements or buffer strips along our waterways should not be considered as the result of this Plan. The greatest success for the conservation of this watershed will come as the various elements of this community work together to implement a multitude of approaches.

As this century just begins, we hope the efforts initiated by this Plan continue for generations to come!”

Presque Isle Audubon Society: “On behalf of the Presque Isle Audubon Society let me congratulate you on the masterful conservation plan for the French Creek Watershed. I can’t see that you have neglected any facet of the stream or its surrounding ecosystems in your considerations. It is not only scientifically sound, but is presented in a well-organized manner that makes it easy to read and to comprehend.

If we can be of any assistance in the future please know that we stand ready to support your efforts relating to French Creek.”

Mike Easton, landowner: “If this plan goes through for French Creek and I own land adjacent to French Creek, will I still be able to build a fire for a wiener roast along the bank? Are there any plans that would infringe on my ability to use my land as I see fit? Are there any plans that in my opinion as a private landowner would actually constitute a “taking” of my property? If the answer is yes, how much do you intend to pay per acre? Thank you in advance for this information.”

“I just received a phone call from a friend of mine who claims to have documentation that the French Creek Conservancy has plans to meter well water on private property along French Creek and 26 tributaries. He also claims that it is the Conservancy’s intent to monitor use of wetlands in the same areas. He states that it will follow along the same lines as a U. N. Biosphere. He called me as he knows I am politically active in the area. His information, in the past, has always been accurate. But, I wish to check with you as to the accuracy of his information before I act. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.”

“I have not had time to meet with the friend that I earlier mentioned due to the holiday. But another friend had some material he picked up at the Crawford County Fair. It was the draft of a plan for French Creek. I found several items to be what I consider intrusive in nature. One recommendation was to work for permits for drilling wells on private

land. Another was inspection for septic systems. Another was inspection of drainage tiles. Another was permits for cutting timber on private land. Still another was limiting cattle drinking access to streams on private land. All of these proposals were to be accomplished by using various government agencies and working toward changing laws and regulations to accomplish the objective. Correct me if I am wrong, but it appears that what we private landowners are faced with is a organization of individuals who do not want to go through the expense of buying their own land and paying taxes on it. They rather tell those of us who have labored to purchase land, how we are to manage it. That is my read on the proposed plan. I am an old fashioned individual who does not like to be told what to do by government or anyone else. I take care of my land and it takes care of me. The only significant damage that ever occurs is because of severe storms. That is something that neither I nor the proposed plan can change. All the governmental and NGO's together cannot change a storm. Also, there was a map on the material that my friend got at the Fair. It seems the French Creek Project has expanded to include Tamarack Lake, Sugar Lake, Woodcock Lake, Union City Dam, Erie Wildlife Refuge and all land in between. This appears to be like one of those bio-spheres you read about popping up in the west with all the attached restrictions. I'm not saying this is the case, but it is starting to look like it. If this is the case, count me out as I want no part of any bio-sphere."

Denny Puko, Mercer County Regional Planning Commission, FCP Advisory Committee, Plan Steering Committee: "WPC should include in the conservation plan an overt statement that the French Creek Project should continue to be the lead facilitator/coordinator of conservation activities including implementation of the conservation plan. The WPC should acknowledge its role as complementary and supportive. Such statements would address the concerns of committee members and not really alter roles already established."

"WPC should describe certain more controversial recommendations as "tools for consideration by the French Creek Project and its partners in implementing the Plan." Have the plan refer to them as options that may be chosen through the Project's grassroots collaborative processes. Committee members may have to give here, especially those members who insist that regulations would never be promoted by the Project. It would be foolhardy to ignore options and choices where warranted and publicly supported. This does not mean the Project must compromise its preference and priority for voluntary, cooperative, stewardship measures."

Pennsylvania Landowners' Association: "The Pennsylvania Landowners' Association ("PLA") submits the following comments on the Draft Conservation Plan (the "Plan") for the French Creek Watershed prepared by the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy ("WPC").

Interest of PLA

PLA is a statewide, non-profit, volunteer organization of individuals whose livelihoods are dependent on the use and development of privately owned land in the

Commonwealth. PLA's objective is to advance the interests of private landowners, particularly those individuals who have limited resources in comparison to those of state, local and federal agencies which are frequently arrayed against landowners in matters involving environmental and land-use regulation.

PLA's guiding principles are set forth on the attached Appendix.

PLA is greatly concerned about the proliferation of legislative and regulatory initiatives dealing with water resource management and statewide watershed management and appreciates the opportunity to present this testimony.

PLA recognizes the importance of sound land use of Pennsylvania's land, water and abundant natural resources and good stewardship in land use practices. Indeed, the members of the organization are dependent on land and water resources for their livelihoods. PLA also recognizes the importance of protecting our streams but want to make sure that regulatory measures for such protections account for and enhance economic development and individual liberty with as little government intrusion as possible.

PLA members are understandably concerned when they see so many legislative and regulatory initiatives emerging and even converging at the same time. The DEP is well into the process of implementing watershed management across the state, which we understand to be the comprehensive and holistic approach contemplated by or responsive to, wholly or substantially, the recommendations of the 21st Century Environment Commission (see Report pages 42-45).

At the same time, rural landowners are engaged in assessing and responding to the impacts of the USEPA's new TMDL regulations which DEP is also in the process of implementing as part of the NPDES point source control program. This is important to PLA because flows of surface water runoff, not heretofore considered point source discharges, are coming into the regulatory equation and will be accounted for in ascertaining whether streams are impaired and for the purpose of establishing TMDLs, i.e. effluent limitations based on actual water quality and intended to restore impaired streams.

These concerns mount as landowners, somewhat apprehensively, observe the evolution of Pennsylvania's antidegradation or special waters protection program and related policies, following the alarming takeover of the program by the Federal government several years ago.

Specific Interest in French Creek Watershed

As the Plan points out, about 96% of the land in the French Creek Watershed is privately owned. These landowners formed a natural constituency for the PLA, which although a state-wide organization, was literally founded on the banks of French Creek and PLA has

many members who would be directly affected by the implementation of the recommendations of the Plan.

PLA's early activities included educating watershed citizens on the impacts of wetlands and endangered species protection initiatives by government agencies that were proliferating at the time. PLA had regular contacts with organizations such as the WPC and Pennsylvania Environmental Council, locking horns on many issues and conducting joint public information programs on some. In any event PLA's positions on issues were well known in the watershed.

At the time of the initiation of the French Creek Project (the "Project"), John Oliver and Brian Hill and others were aware of concerns of private landowners over impacts of expanding government regulation on property rights and correctly recognized that the interests and concerns of French Creek riparian landowners had to be considered and respected if the Project was to succeed.

PLA's opposition to invasive state and federal environmental regulation, particularly relating to wetlands and endangered species protection, was well known in Northwest Pennsylvania at the time. Indeed, at about the same time the DER had appointed a French Creek coordinator whose task it was, PLA understood, to identify any and all regulatory tools that could be used to "protect" French Creek and any government agencies which could be enlisted in the effort to expand environmental regulation as the principal means of protecting French Creek. At this time, as many as seven government agencies: DER, the Fish Commission, the Game Commission, EPA, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Engineers might be involved in heavy-handed wetlands enforcement against small landowners and farmers and only a few committed individuals could devote the time and resources necessary to resist what was, from the landowner's perspective, a government lockdown on normal land use activity which had, until then, been entirely acceptable¹

PLA Footnote: You may be assured that the over-representation of those same agencies on the WPC's Steering Committee for the Plan is disturbing to PLA members whose property and lives have been devastated by such regulation.

Messrs. Oliver and Hill approached the PLA leadership to explain their vision for the Project and encouraged PLA to support it and invited PLA leaders to participate on the Advisory Committee to represent the interests of that critical stakeholder group, private landowners, particularly those who did not have the resources to stand up against the collective resources of the government. PLA was assured that the fundamental purpose of the Project was to protect French Creek through enhanced public awareness of its unique characteristics and value. Through education of individuals and institutions, the Creek could be protected by volunteerism and consensus rather than by expansion of government coercion.

PLA understood, with good reason, based on assurances from the Project leaders that the Project did not and would not advocate additional “command and control” regulation as part of public outreach or the call for action in its efforts to preserve French Creek.

Based on those assurances and understanding of the Project, individuals from the PLA leadership joined the Advisory Committee and perhaps most importantly, PLA endorsed the Project in reliance on the Project’s underlying commitment to volunteerism as opposed to coercion and its recognition of the need to protect private property rights and to accommodate the obvious interests of private landowners.

With only a few bumps along the road, until recently, the Project has kept its commitments and stayed on message, as far as PLA is concerned. To the extent that the Project will continue its responsibility for public participation and outreach for the Plan, which clearly contemplates the vigorous use of existing command and control regulatory techniques and strongly advocates new laws and regulations, PLA, would of course, have no choice but to vigorously oppose the Plan and withdraw its endorsement of the French Creek Project.

General Comments on the Plan

As is obvious from the overall tone of the Plan, the interests of private landowners by and large have been ignored. You can read the Plan and come away with the impression either that no one really lives in the watershed or that every human activity creates a problem which the Plan has to address. This tone is more than a little chilling because the Steering Committee is loaded with planners and other bureaucrats and the reader wonders how all this fits into the framework of comprehensive planning that affects real people. Put another way, the Plan is patronizing in tone and seems to be devoid of any concern for the ordinary citizens who live and earn their livelihoods in the watershed. To a degree, that might be a function of the fact that no individual who PLA would recognize as representing the interest of landowners and private property rights, served on the Steering Committee.

It is obvious from reading the Plan that the WPC did what most all other government contractors do in projects like this: the contractor consults existing data bases, does a literature search, regurgitates data already collected and slaps together a bunch of recommendations consistent with the goal of getting “follow-on” contracts or grants to do more work or to advance some private agenda. With all due respect to its authors, there seems to be nothing in the Plan that provides new information or ideas and anyone even remotely interested in the watershed would learn nothing new about the Creek and indeed, might wonder why ten or twelve year-old data is cited at all. There is really nothing new but the call for more laws and red tape.

The language and recommendations for actions are conclusionary and often based on speculation or plain, old gibberish. For example:

“...of greater importance in French Creek with regards to elevated water temperatures might be the increase in incident light reaching the stream as a result of loss of riparian buffer.”

“...because fossil fuel combustion is a wide-spread issue and Pennsylvania receives much of its air born pollutants from other states, it is difficult to implement strategies to combat this threat without federal and state cooperation and goal setting to limit air emissions.”

What are the authors saying? Where is the documentation?

Specific Comments²

PLA Footnote: Page references are to the appropriate page in Section VIII of the Plan, “Potential Threats and Recommendations.”

**authors note: table and page numbers may have changed due to edits to the Plan*

Table 12 illustrates graphically the call for more red tape, regulation and bureaucracy across the board.

On page 12, the Plan advocates DEP as water withdrawal Czar. What happens to 200 years of common law? Will landowners cede control to Harrisburg?

On page 12, the Plan recommends promotion of forest easements. Apart from PLA’s concerns about conservation easements generally, experience in the Forest Legacy Project reveals that the easement concept involved there has attracted the opposition of the entire forest products industry. Action based on offhand recommendations, without the details, including assurances that landowners are made aware of the economic consequences of granting such easements are certain to draw similar opposition.

On page 12, the Plan advocates a statewide forest practices act. This is contrary to the spirit of the French Creek Project³ and is specifically opposed by PLA.

PLA Footnote: PLA is not suggesting that the Plan of the WPC planners paid any attention to the spirit of vision of the French Creek Project or were obligated to do so. Indeed, the Plan represents a totally alien, contrary spirit.

On page 12, the Plan suggests the promotion of “conservation” easements to limit unnecessary development. Who decides what is “necessary” – faceless, planning bureaucrats or the people? The WPC should proceed judiciously with conservation easements. It took a lot of cooperation by affected parties just to get legislation passed. Overly aggressive use of this particular tool will lead to problems.

On page 13, the Plan recommends increasing bond amounts. There is no discussion or data in the Plan that suggests a need, let alone documents one. What shelf was this pulled from or did the author intend to abolish sand and gravel operations by having punitively high bond amounts established?

On page 17, Table 16, to address “potential threats of excessive water withdrawal (undocumented in the Plan but converted in the next sentence from potential to excessive) in the... watershed.” The Plan proposes and advocates a drastic alteration in Pennsylvania water law and would give the government ironclad control over peoples’ most essential resource. Among other things, this is a public policy issue of great importance and clearly a political issue. At best, the recommendation is typical planner’s doodling – suggesting big government solution in search of a problem. One wonders how fulsomely this was described during “public outreach” portion of the planning process.

On page 22, Table 19, the Plan recommends permits, bonds and new regulations and restrictions to address “incompatible” logging practices. PLA, along with the forest products industry, opposes old style, command and control, business as usual, regulation of forestry practices. Here the Plan comes down on one side of issues being addressed collegially by various forestry industry stakeholders. It appears to be intended to improperly influence or bias the outcome of that process.

On page 22, the Plan speculates about potential problems arising from mineral extraction. It then recommends obviously standard, shelf-item solutions (i.e., more restrictions) to address undocumented, potential problems.

On page 24, rail-to-trail development is advocated. PLA’s concerns about rail-to-trail projects is well known. PLA is opposed to rail-to-trail projects where the rights of reversionary owners and contiguous property owners are not fully protected.

On page 28, and only half a page at that, the Plan purports to address problems associated with “Urbanization.” The Plan goes on to recite the “sprawl control” mantra. Protection of the French Creek Watershed is a different enterprise and except to address actual threats identified as sewage and run-off, the WPC should stay out of local or even multi-municipal land use issues. Large land transaction entities like the WPC should be aware that local governments still have some control over land use within their boundaries. As is pointed out on page III-5 of the Plan (somewhat arrogantly and condescendingly), the French Creek Watershed is an area comprised of “largely conservative private landowners, many who can be quick to oppose land use regulations.” The authors of the Plan go on to point out that this can be a double edged sword. The WPC would be well advised to bear that in mind itself. There is no constitutionally protected right to have large areas in a municipality gobbled up by seemingly well-heeled conservancies for a conservation area. The locals may want a growth area there instead! Local land use regulation is, indeed, a double edged sword.

Conclusion

PLA has limited its specific comments to those recommendations in the Plan which are directly contrary to PLA’s position on the particular issue or where the recommendations are inconsistent with or contrary to assurances given to PLA by particular organizations or interest groups.

PLA does not accept and will vigorously oppose the centrally planned, command and control approach to important land use and environmental issues, the approach taken in the Plan. PLA urges the WPC to go back to the drawing board and try to come up with a watershed conservation plan which is consistent with the philosophy and vision serving as the foundation of the French Creek Project when it was initiated.”

Sam Harrison, Harrison Hydrosociences, FCP Advisory Committee: “I read over the packet sent by (PLA) in hopes of being able to skim it, toss it aside, and forget it. I have been a totally inactive member of the French Creek Project Advisory Committee and at this time in my life I am not looking for campaigns, causes, or controversy. I left Allegheny College burned out on fighting for what I believed in and chose to spend the rest of my efforts doing positive things (i.e., doing science to provide facts that might help settle controversies, individually supporting selected groups and activities I believed were good and beneficial, fixing up dilapidated buildings by myself, and avoiding serving on committees). So I am not at all anxious to wade into a controversy or end up on another committee. But (PLA’s) packet just wouldn’t go away. I found myself thinking back on it and re-reading it several times.

I had skimmed over the Draft Conservation Plan some time ago and none of it stuck with me. I didn’t even keep my copy so I could refer to it now. So what is in front of my mind now is not the details of even the tone of the Plan, but rather, what I’ve read in (PLA’s) packet.

Before agreeing to serve on the Advisory Committee, I, too, asked what the goals for the French Creek Project were and what means would be used to try to attain them. My recollection was that the means by which the Project hoped to protect and perhaps improve the watershed were education and awareness. Although I questioned how long a project based on “soft” approach such as this could survive, I thought it could do no harm, might do some good, and in the final analysis felt confident that whatever Brian Hill did would be done very well and with the best intentions. Viewing the Project from some distance, I think it has achieved a good measure of success in increasing the knowledge about and appreciation of French Creek. And as one who drives along French Creek every day, I think there has been a marked increase in recreational use of the stream over the past decade. That, to me, is the biggest benefit of all for the general public.

If, as the packet provided by (PLA) suggests, the French Creek Project is now considering moving beyond education and awareness and into the realm of land-use control and regulations, I have very serious reservations. I realize every group needs to have new goals and challenges and it could very well be that the Project feels it has done what there is to be done with education and awareness. If so, I suggest for their consideration an alternative challenge. I am not aware of any organized effort to gather basic data on the watershed. And not just basic water quality data for the sake of making measurements, but studies that address or can be used to evaluate hypotheses. I am not aware that we know any more about the “science” of the stream than we did 15 years ago.

I know a lot of data has been collected through projects with the public schools. My impression is that that work has been done very well, but its focus was, necessarily, education not establishing and addressing hypotheses.

When I first came to Allegheny in 1970 and we started up the Environmental Science majors, there were a series of in-house publications that were based almost entirely on senior theses. Many of them dealt with the aquatic biology of French Creek or its tributaries. It would be difficult to find these “Allegheny College Environmental Studies” even in Pelletier Library, so I can’t cite them as an example of science that has been of much value to our understanding of the watershed, but if an organization such as the French Creek Project had been around then and championed the printing, dissemination, and preservation of these studies, they would be useful to us today.

So what I see lacking, if we choose to do something more to try to “benefit” French Creek, is an organized effort to actually learn more about its basic science. We may think it would be good if we enacted stricter discharge limits for sewage treatment plants, such as Saegertown’s, but what actual data do we have to help us make that decision. More than likely, our best effort would be computer modeling, which in turn would be based on very sparse actual data.

Having made my pitch for channeling effort into actually learning more about the science of the stream, I’d now like to back off and take a broader view. I can well remember when I started doing research in the French Creek basin as a green, young, professor in 1970. Looking back, I think I thought everything we people did would have a bad impact on our streams. Three decades later, I’ve come to believe that natural systems are amazingly resilient, despite the temporal antics of human inhabitants. I look at photos of Pithole and Oil Creek and wonder how the land and streams ever survived or recovered. But they did. As I drive along the French Creek valley up toward Venango I think about 80% of the land being cleared for agricultural use a century ago, with no thought of conservation practices. Yet I question that I could find any evidence today in the stream of whatever those impacts were, no matter how closely I studied the stream channel or its sediment deposits.

Through my work as a consulting hydrogeologist I have worked with many clients whose use or intended use of private property has been impacted by state and federal regulations. I have often found myself brought into controversial situations regarding land use. Those who hire me hope that I will have a professional opinion that will favor their goals. But I figure that my job is to collect and evaluate data and then make my best effort to provide an understanding of that data to both parties, regardless of which “side” it favors. Perhaps that’s a role that the Project could consider.”

Marilyn Black, Oil Heritage Region, FCP Advisory Committee: *(Initial submission)*
“The title of the document should be changed to Conservation Plan for French Creek Watershed, to emphasize that the plan covers not just the main stem of this waterway but its entire watershed. There appear to be two different titles on the draft that I received.

Please insert a recommendation to identify and preserve special historic and cultural sites along the waterway, with potential partners listed as at least the Planning Commissions, Municipalities, and Nonprofits. I'm not sure the best cluster for this item, perhaps Transportation corridors, or perhaps some new overall category.

Because I have not read the full plan, just the summary, if there is not already a listing of willing partners, that would be a good appendix for the complete plan. In such a listing, please be sure to include the Oil Heritage Region, Inc., an official Pa. Heritage Park, using the address as shown on this letterhead.

Otherwise the balance of the plan is sound and consistent with the Oil Heritage Region's Management Action Plan and Interpretive Plan.

(Second submission) Our earlier comments on the draft conservation plan were based on a reading of just the chart of recommendations as published in the recent newsletter for the French Creek Project. Now that I've read the draft narrative of the Plan, here are additional comments, corrections, and minor edits for the consideration of those preparing the final version of this important document. Comments are arranged in the same sequence as the narrative pages. However, because I lack copies of the appendices, I cannot provide detailed comments on them. **minor editorial comments were addressed but not included here*

Title should reflect is for entire French Creek Watershed.

Page III-9; on this entire page, because 2000 census data is available now, it would be much better to use 2000 information rather than the 1996 estimates.

Page III-10; paragraph 1; unemployment rates should be gleaned for the same time period as the 2000 census, in order to be able to draw more useful parallels, rather than 1997 average annualized figures for unemployment rates. Also, it would be very odd to 'average' Erie County with the other counties, and therefore, I'd suggest list each county's unemployment rate, because the rates are greatly influenced by volume.

Page V-15; paragraph 4; lines 2 and 3; the 'excellent opportunities to catch trophy size largemouth bass and muskellunge' quotation was in 1995, prior to the complete lake drawdown; this statement is no longer descriptive of the angling opportunities at Tamarack Lake; suggest rework or delete the statement.

Page V-27; second paragraph; You may want to point out even more obviously the ironic situation that the same municipality who uses French Creek as the source of their drinking water supply is also the municipality that returns the most untreated effluent into French Creek at peak times!!

Page VI-1; paragraph 3; suggest rework this paragraph; black bears and river otters are both definitely within the French Creek watershed, based on multiple sightings of the animals, their tracks, and their droppings.

Page VI-3; after current section on Birds and before the Reptile section, suggest add a paragraph about the private bird sanctuary of 200+ acres at Buttermilk Hill near Utica; it is being managed by its owners for nesting and migratory birds.

Page VI-5; At Table 7, because trout stockings vary greatly by year, it would be appropriate to indicate the year for which that chart was accurate.

Page VI-13; somewhere, perhaps under Natural Communities of Special Concern, it would be important to mention the declining numbers of crayfish and hellgrammites in the southern portions of French Creek. Multiple anglers and biology teachers have mentioned this trend to me, apparent now for at least two years.

Page VII-5; middle of page; suggest add paragraph about the Allegheny Valley Trails Association, the non-profit managers of trails throughout Venango County, including the planned segment from downtown Franklin upstream along French Creek on a former rail line and then turning west to Polk, Pa.

Page VII-6; at top of page, suggest also add paragraph about easements in Venango County at Takeitezy and Sugar Creek Station.

Page VII-8; at bottom of page, please add paragraph about preserving and interpreting key historic sites in the watershed, especially along the main waterway.

Page IX-1; paragraph 4; entire paragraph questioned; why not use the French Creek Project Advisory Council? Forcing a geographical subdivide would result in smaller thinking instead of system-wide solutions and information sharing.

Page IX-1, #1 under Action Plans; see above; I seriously question the wisdom of organizing a new entity of multiple sub-basin committees with designated liaison to the overall Steering Committee. Plus, why not utilize the French Creek Project Advisory Council, an existing systemwide group of interested citizens from many sectors?

Page IX-3; #6 at top of page; again, unsure about the wisdom of dividing people up into tiny areas and the focus at the sub-basin level.

Page IX-3; #3 under Action Plans for Biological Resource Protection; why include the goby in this list?

Page IX-4; under D, Action Plans for Cultural Resource Protection, please add #3 – Key historic sites in the French Creek watershed should be inventoried and mapped.

Appendices – Because I lack copies of the appendices, I cannot provide detailed comments on those. BUT, I did glance at a set and the historic resources list for Venango County portion of French Creek lacks several important sites and buildings; I could give specific suggestions if a copy were furnished to me for corrections.

Douglas G. Mehan, PPG Industries, Inc., FCP Advisory Committee: “Why does the French Creek Project Advisory Committee appear to have been replaced by a new organization (French Creek Steering Committee)? Section one (Introduction) should have the successes of the French Creek Project noted and emphasized. The French Creek Project has high local visibility and is linked locally to the protection and education of French Creek!

Page I-3 – The Western Pennsylvania Conservancy and the French Creek Steering Committee do not need to reevaluate and revise this plan as this function should be the role of the French Creek Project and the French Creek Project Advisory Committee.

Section II on public participation does not note the participation of industry and other members of the “regulated community”. Although the section notes the importance of “watershed citizens”, there are many other stakeholder groups that should be included in the process and appear missing. Page VII-1 notes “...it is the responsibility of planners, municipal leaders, and recreational organizers to ensure that activities in the French Creek watershed...” Are these groups represented?

Section II – move “the data” contained in the unlabeled table on pages II’1 through II’15 to an appendix.

Section V, Water Resources, Watershed Hydrology, Groundwater, Page V-18 – The importance of this section is the relationship between the shallow groundwater systems and surface water (French Creek) including the movement of groundwater to French Creek and visa versa. Last paragraph, second sentence needs to be modified to include something to the effect that not only do the soils need to be permeable to allow flow but that you need to have a hydraulic gradient (head) for the movement to occur.

Section V, Water Resources, Water Quality, Natural Water Chemistry, Page V-19/20 – This section includes discussion items that are not part of natural water chemistry. Specifically, the 3rd through the 6th paragraph contain references to itmes that are more related to anthropogenic or contamination issues and not natural water chemistry. Although the last paragraph is interesting, much of it should not be part of this section as it is not natural water chemistry (move to history or groundwater?).

Page V-22, 5th complete paragraph, third sentence spelling error...field biologist. Page V-23, remove that last sentence, as it is a commentary and not appropriate for this section of the plan (“None of these impairments are scheduled to have TMDLs implemented by 2002”). If the DEP is not meeting required TMDL schedules, then this deficiency can be addressed as a recommendation elsewhere in the report.

Section V, Water Resources, Water Quality, Monitoring – According to the title, this section should only be about “Water Quality”...page V-25 contains a paragraph with information on the water quantity from a well in Erie County. Although it is an interesting relationship about the change in water level, it is not related to water quality.

Page V-26 the final two paragraphs appear to be recommendations for additional information. Should this information be moved to the recommendations section portion of the document? The other sections do not have similar recommendations for additional data yet additional data must be needed.

Page V-27, Figure 17 is not available electronically (Internet on 8/13) or in hard copy.

Page V-27, Safe Drinking Water Act not “Federal Safe Drinking Water Act”. The first paragraph implies that the DEP is required to protect all wellheads from contamination. The title spells “Well Head” and the text is “wellhead”. Is it one word or two words?

Section V, Water Supply, Water Withdrawal – Here is a significant data gap! We need data to get a better understanding of the total water balance including surface and groundwater interaction and withdrawal!

Page VIII-2 airborne not “air born”

Page VIII-4/5 – Table 11 lists Air Quality Monitoring under “On-lot Septic System”...not likely a good return on your investment. Increased air quality monitoring would be better for use in other areas and other pollutants.

Section “Toxins” – The efforts contained in this section should be directed at the general public as noted in item 10 on Table 12. Existing regulations target industry, however, the other part of the “toxins” issue are those used (and demanded) by the general public and non-regulated entities.

The document notes the importance of public participation in the planning process yet the French Creek watershed “Potential Partners” (Tables 11 through 24) do not include representatives from industry, the public, municipalities and others. The primary “partners” identified in this plan are regulatory-type agencies (PA DEP) and “non-profits”. For any successful project to function in northwestern Pennsylvania, it will require partnering with a representative cross section of the community.

Similar to the above comment...The third paragraph in Section IX “Action Plans” it is noted the importance of the success of the French Creek Conservation Plan is support from these select groups (“watershed agencies, municipalities, organizations and residents”). Is this all-inclusive or are there others that should be included?

Page IX-2 Item B1 add French Creek Project to sentence 3 as a potential water quality data acquisition group.

PPG Industries, Inc. has been a contributing member of the French Creek Project and to the French Creek Project Advisory Committee for over 5-years. There appears to be an effort to remove a future role of the French Creek Project Advisory Committee and to replace or eliminate the French Creek Project. The French Creek Project has been successful by including all stakeholders and has the support of residents and “non-

profits” such as the Conneaut Lake French Creek Valley Conservancy. This can not be said of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy who has little or no name recognition in the area and who has no track record of including all local stakeholders as equal project team members.”

John J. Bell, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau: “I have looked over the aforementioned draft. My general reaction is that the draft seems to point the finger at agriculture as being a significant culprit in the degradation or potential degradation of the French Creek watershed and connected lakes. However, the recommendations offered in the Draft for agriculture would seem to suggest a pattern of encouraging farmers to voluntarily implement conservation practices on their farms and providing financial incentives for implementation of these practices, rather than attempting to impose regulatory requirements on farm operations.

Comments on Impacts of Agriculture on French Creek Ecosystems.

Numerous negative comments on agricultural practices being performed in the French Creek watershed appear throughout the draft:*

**Author’s note: Several examples are cited from throughout the Draft Plan.*

Analysis of Agricultural Impacts on the French Creek Watershed

Although the Draft makes numerous general comments on the adverse impacts that agriculture has and may have on the French Creek watershed, the Draft makes little effort to identify the actual extent in which agricultural practices have impacted the watershed or the quantitative analysis which has been performed to assess the degree of agriculture’s impacts. The Draft concedes:

There has been no water budget or hydrologic model developed for the watershed. (V-16)

Comprehensive groundwater data does not exist. (V-19)

An ongoing, watershed-wide, comprehensive monitoring program is lacking. (V-23)

Monitoring in the French Creek watershed has not adequately addressed some of the most basic questions regarding water quality and aquatic organisms. (V-26)

It is not known where the most significant sources of nutrients are, even though the watershed is highly rural and largely agricultural. (V-26)

Data gaps exist with regards to groundwater quality, quantity, and identification of important recharge areas. (V-26)

Diversion of water by agricultural operations is not adequately researched. (VIII-17)

Furthermore, the Draft makes little effort to describe in detail the degree to which the watershed is impacted by agricultural practices. Data that is cited by the Draft as evidencing adverse impacts from agriculture are based on studies and estimates that are more than a decade old:

The Draft's statement of 1.41 million gallons of daily water use for livestock and 0.55 million gallons of daily water use for irrigation is based on U. S. Geological Service estimates in 1990.

The Draft's statement of nitrogen produced by livestock farms (1.93 pounds per acre per year) and crop farms (1.39 pounds per acre per year) is based on estimates performed by EPA in 1987.

Finally, although the Draft cites the Department of Environmental Protection's assessment of streams to demonstrate that agricultural activity is a "major" source of impairment of several French Creek tributaries, the Draft fails to identify DEP's quantitative analysis of the degree in which agricultural activities contributes to impairment of these streams.

Recommendations for Improvement May Not Necessarily Be Onerous for Agriculture.

The Draft's recommendations for agriculture are, for the most part, positive. Some recommendations will not be positively received by the agriculture community:

Encourage better monitoring/permitting of individuals withdrawing water from streams and groundwater. (V-17)

Promote setback regulations for development along waterways and wetlands. (VIII-25)

Encourage counties to develop stormwater management plans and municipalities to adopt stormwater development ordinances. (VIII-16)

Phosphorous and nitrogen levels should be used to develop a budget for the watershed. (VIII-4)

BMPs should be implemented for agriculture. (VIII-4)

Livestock should not have free access to streams. (VIII-21)

But numerous others would implement a voluntary, incentive-driven approach in carrying out conservation practices on farms:

Sub-watershed associations should seek out funding to help local landowners with conservation activities. (VIII-21)

Promote agricultural BMPs and NMPs and supply assistance to encourage farmers to implement projects. (VIII-21)

Promote more incentive programs for streambank fencing and riparian buffer/streambank restoration. (VIII-19)

Soil testing should be encouraged before fertilizer application. Soil testing can be done through County Conservation Districts or Penn State Cooperatives. (VIII-5)

Promote no-till farming and organic methods in appropriate areas. Most appropriate areas can be determined through research of nutrient and sediment inputs. Incentive programs should be established. (VIII-11)

Encourage agricultural operations to make surface reservoirs for withdrawals. Identify funding to help farmers develop reservoirs. (VIII-18)

The community can engage in successful stream restoration projects and BMPs can be implemented to benefit farmer, livestock and natural communities. (VIII-18)

Conclusion

Although local farmers may wish to raise questions regarding the allegations of agriculture's contribution to pollution of French Creek contained in the Draft, I do not think the Draft should be totally dismissed. It would be helpful if the Draft could reflect a more positive attitude toward agriculture and admit, where applicable, that data is unavailable to confirm what the Draft suspects are adverse environmental effects resulting from agricultural practices in the French Creek watershed. Local farmers should also work toward softening (or flushing out) the recommendations in the Draft to enhance local zoning and land use control and stormwater management in the French Creek watershed. These actions can result in extensive restriction of land use in general and extensive restriction in farming practices in particular. But many of the recommendations contained in the Draft reflect a direction in governmental action that we want to be taken. We want government to develop voluntary, incentive driven programs and to provide adequate funding of these programs to participating farmers in the form of grants."

French Creek Project Advisory Committee: "Overall recommendations of the Group:

Generally the plan provides a very good summary of existing information on the Creek. There was some concern by Mark Troyer about the trout stream that runs through his property and how it was described.

The sections of the report that discuss farming should point out that agriculture is an important part of the cultural and economic landscape of this region. Additionally, it is desirable to maintain agricultural and silvicultural because these operations generally have less impact on the stream than more intensive development and industrial activities.

In regards to agricultural, the report should recognize the good work that is already occurring by the many groups in the watershed. Significant progress is being made on non-point source pollution through a cooperative program with farmers and this work should continue.

The importance of private land ownership and private property rights should be noted.

The plan would be strengthened if some of the recommendations were combined, reorganized, prioritized, and fleshed out with action steps.

Throughout the recommendations, potential partners are listed with state agencies specifically noted, while non-profits are not. State agencies are also listed as the first partner and this gives the impression that the agencies will be responsible for taking the lead on this efforts. For most of the recommendations this is not the case, so this section should be reorganized.

In Table 11, the third recommendation relates to BMPs. The description should emphasize that BMPs should be implemented on a voluntary basis. It should also say that incentives should be provided to encourage BMPs.

Table 12 deals with “toxins”. Given the classifications that exist at the federal and state levels, it might be better to classify these as hazardous materials. In regards to sampling and monitoring recommended in this Table, the request that there be more sampling and monitoring is very general. Unless specific hazardous materials are not currently subject to monitoring and there is evidence that they should be, then this section should be eliminated.

In Table 12, the recommendations relating to the capping of abandoned wells should emphasize those that pose threats through discharges. Also, it is not clear what kinds of wells are being addressed (water, oil, or gas?).

In Table 12, the recommendation on removing toxins from the flood plain should use the phrase hazardous materials. It should recommend that research be done to indicate where there are problems and how this compares to existing regulations. The emphasis here should be education among small businesses, municipalities and landowners. Also, “area that drain directly to a waterway” is broader than intended.

In Table 12, the section addressing the application of brine seems to ignore existing research that has been completed by PA DEP over the last few years. DEP has based its standards on this research. If there is evidence that there is too little information available, this section should recommend additional research.

In Table 13, eliminate the recommendation for “advocate for a forest practices act.”

In Table 13, either justify the need for additional bond requirements for gravel mining or eliminate this recommendation.

In Table 13, a recommendation calls for stricter erosion and sediment control plans. Clearly, what is desired is “Better follow through with erosion and sediment control plans.” There should be increased monitoring and “follow through with plans.”

Table 14 mentions “customized baitfish regulations.” Given the way baitfish are collected, this issue is more likely to be addressed through an educational program aimed at anglers who collect “riffle runners.”

In Table 16 eliminate those recommendations relating to permitting withdrawals or increased regulations.

In Table 18, reword the first recommendation to state, “Encourage Streambank fencing.” Also eliminate the line, “Livestock should not have free access to the streams.”

In Table 19, eliminate recommendations relating to permits and bonds.

In Table 20, it is assumed that there are no mandatory setbacks for drilling rigs. Setbacks are required now.

In Table 22, in the first recommendation, note and suggest implementation of PA DCNR’s new program on ATVs. Regulations for stream crossings already exist.

In Table 22, the second recommendation should state, “Encourage a cooperative approach to trail development.”

In Table 22, when talking about riparian development guidelines, instead of stating, “this may require mandatory setbacks and zoning”, state “local governments should be encouraged to adopt conservation programs that protect streams and lakes.”

In Table 23, Instead of mandatory setbacks, state “promote riparian protection by local governments.” Also, “promote a variety of local tools to protect riparian areas.”

In Table 23, change “Designate Growth Areas” to “Encourage municipalities and state agencies to focus infrastructure dollars.” The recommendations in this section lend themselves to a white paper on options for local government officials.

The Appendix B is dated.”

Erie County Conservation District: “Figure 9, Public Lands Map. This has a county park listed as the Field House Park. That is Headwaters Conservation Park. The symbol for the park is also in the wrong place. The symbol should almost be where Sixmile Creek Park is and Sixmile should be moved over too.

Figure 13, State Water Plan Watersheds. Currently the watersheds are color-coded. Would it be possible to number them also? There are way too many similar colors.

I could not find and mention of the Portage Trail. According to one of our Board Directors, it went from Erie to Port Venango. The trail was on land from Lake Erie to Waterford following Old French Road, then by water from Waterford to Franklin, to the Allegheny River.”

Comments Received from Spring 2000 Public Stakeholder Meetings

Date	Meeting Group	Major category	Specific issue
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Development	Encourage redevelopment of existing areas (neighborhoods, brown fields)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Development	Look at total costs of development before decisions are made (economic and ecological costs)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Development	Define what the limits to growth are (i.e., water?)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Development	Make growth compatible with the environment (i.e., growth is not always progress; progress can be protecting the environment)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Development	Define the cost of natural resource loss during development
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Development	Utilize the emerging science of ecosystem valuation in evaluating cost of development
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Assist in development of EACs to help focus development planning on potential eco-impacts
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Work with chambers of commerce and tourism promotion agencies

5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Future partnership with an economic development agency
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Promote ordinances that relate to eco-impact of development
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Economic development is not necessarily "building" but can be the economic benefits of resource conservation (i.e., eco-tourism)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Foster building reuse instead of green space development (brown fields)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Target the out-of-town developers for education
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Growth zones can be linked to county conservation plans
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Reach out to "Big Box" retailers to have them do earth-friendly activities to counter development losses
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Development	Reevaluate the desire to promote exceptional value status of stream reaches; and the economic impact of that
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Education	Highlight great biodiversity and ecological importance of stream
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Education	Create an educational experience
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Timbering association outreach
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Landowner self-assessment (Conservation Districts have "home-assist" and "farm-assist" programs)
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Do more outside of Meadville

13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Push economic benefits of conservation
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Add interpretive aspect to greenway development
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Increase outreach to smaller & private schools
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Provide opportunities for public commitments
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Increase outreach to other groups (headwater associations; sports clubs; religious groups)
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Promote county conservation camps
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Network with people from other watershed groups
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Target pilot areas for specific problems (i.e., Cussewago Creek for poor agricultural practices)
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Education	Do a flyover for educational purposes
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Need for educated and informed municipal officials
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Promote independent student studies
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Initiate "adopt-a-stream"
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Promote students working with and in communities for sustainable change (i.e., rather than "monitoring")
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Need for municipal government official education
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Excuse students from class for projects (i.e., experiential education)

27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Promote competition and cooperation among college groups
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Promote interdisciplinary college approach to watershed protection (i.e., across college program lines)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	We are not reaching our college students
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Promote colleges to look at their own sustainability
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Don't give up on general public education
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Focus on education and outreach at the sub-watershed level
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	"home-assist" self appraisal approach from Cornell University
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Encourage farmers to sign up for environmental security areas
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Encourage permanent farmland preservation
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Use a web site-media blitz promotion technique
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Develop and implement training for township supervisors
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Promote development of municipal residential conservation plans (i.e., smaller lots, more green space)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Utilize city and borough meetings as a communication tool

27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Education	Irregular enforcement of erosion and sedimentation plans across municipal boundaries
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Riparian landowner education
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Set up exhibits at REA annual meetings
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Target tree associations (International Society of Arboriculture)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Develop database of all watershed farmers
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Focus on whole watershed, not just on riparian landowners
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Target planning groups, agencies, etc.
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Target zoning boards (i.e., when zoning ordinances are being changed)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Educate people who develop land development ordinances (where zoning is absent)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Target people who develop and update county conservation plans
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Develop key stakeholder group interest pages on web site; link to those groups from web site
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Target sport fishery groups for education
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Target hunters groups (sporting clubs; Ducks Unlimited; Turkey Federation)

5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Reach out to recreational boaters (educate on exotic spp.; waste disposal by boaters, etc.)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Educate organizers of ATV events (i.e., Poker Run)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Exhibit displays prolifically (municipal buildings; libraries; banks; grocery stores; post offices; Pymatuning Waterfowl Festival; highway welcome centers)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Venango County lacks Environmental Education Center
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	What schools are being missed in outreach?
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Educate groups regarding what grant sources are available
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Increase traditional advertising
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	Do non-traditional advertising (i.e., George Washington float; "French Creek Folk Festival")
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Education	"Broadcast" the ecological uniqueness of French Creek
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Environmental impact of water trails	Keep access areas away from environmentally-sensitive areas
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Environmental impact of water trails	All work needs to conform to environmental impact analysis
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Environmental impact of water trails	Walking on mussel beds during low water will be a problem

5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Environmental impact of water trails	Discourage or encourage selective stream use related to sensitivity of areas (both spatially and temporally)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Existing information resources	Science is lacking
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Existing information resources	Intensify college research on the streams
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Existing information resources	Bring colleges in to study data gaps in lakes
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	GIS information-Erie National Wildlife Refuge
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Lake water quality data-Fish & Boat Commission
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Fish surveys-Fish & Boat Commission
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Develop central information repository
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Data is fragmented, non consistently formatted
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Dirt & gravel road inventory-Conservation Districts
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Water quality assessments-PADEP Water Quality
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Land use and demographics-County Conservation Plans
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	GIS information-PADEP
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Stream environmental assessments-PADOT, esp. at stream crossings
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Individual NPDES discharge data-PADEP and EPA STORET
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	U.S. census data (demographics)
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Cost of sprawl-10,000 friends

13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Permitted facilities information-PADEP
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Future growth projections-Municipal chapter 94 reports
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Agricultural data-County Conservation Services
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Soils information-County Conservation Services
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Flood maps, etc. - U.S. ACE
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Stream level data-USGS
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Lake assessments-USEPA
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Satellite imagery
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Tourism bureaus
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Research & GIS information - Edinboro University
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Research-Allegheny College
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Geneva Marsh information-U. of Pittsburgh Ecology lab
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	County plat maps (riparian landowners)
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Existing information sources	Pennsylvania bird atlas-Audubon Society
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Water withdrawal for agricultural uses leaves less for municipal use
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Promote Environmental Advisory Councils in municipalities
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Lobbying to promote comprehensive water planning legislation

13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Assure quantity of water
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Work to maintain riparian buffers in municipal planning
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Work to manage storm water as sprawl occurs
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Infrastructure often doesn't mirror watershed hydrology
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Sprawl is an issue in Erie County portion of watershed
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Many 537 plans meet only letter of the law
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Help municipalities develop 537 plans
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Municipal funding of projects through Small Flows Institute (WV)
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Exporting of water from watersheds via bottling operations
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	DEP funding of municipal environmental management systems
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Impact of brine and road dust controls used by municipalities
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Local governments	Educate county commissioners re: purpose of conservation easements (they result in reduction of taxes)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Local governments	Talk with Borough or Township associations
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Local governments	Reach out one-on-one to municipal officials
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Local governments	Have peer-to-peer outreach among municipal officials
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Local governments	Target groups like municipal officials for float

trips

5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Maps & Guides (water trails)	Waterproof maps vs. paper maps
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Maps & Guides (water trails)	Brochure kiosk needs
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Maps & Guides (water trails)	Where can brochures be made available (libraries, shops, trailheads)
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Maps & Guides (water trails)	Web site posting of information
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Maps & Guides (water trails)	Need both general and detailed maps for varying needs
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Riparian Landowners	Information exchange with landowners-letting them know what is upcoming
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Riparian Landowners	Need landowner education and outreach
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Riparian Landowners	Farmers are interested in conservation easement purchase program (Crawford Co. hasn't adopted yet, so can't be implemented)
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Riparian Landowners	Develop capacity with local land trusts & conservancies for smaller parcels not covered by State program
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Riparian Landowners	Need county tax structure changes to help change land use and pressures
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Riparian Landowners	Impacts of ORVs
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Riparian Landowners	Include landowners in outreach
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Riparian Landowners	Incentives to create stream buffer zones are not high enough

27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Riparian Landowners	Look at ways to link private and government funding to increase incentives to landowners for riparian buffer zones
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Safety/Liability	Need education on boating safety
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Safety/Liability	Partner with local groups, non-profits and PA Fish & Boat Commission
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Safety/Liability	Non-powered boats not traditionally regulated or an educational focus
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Safety/Liability	Hypothermia is an issue
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Signage (water trails)	Brochures and signage can be educational
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Signage (water trails)	Need for pre-paddling videos (safety, ecology, history)
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Signage (water trails)	Need to overcome inertia to get people from car door to stream
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Signage (water trails)	Zebra mussel warning signs
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Signage (water trails)	Need consistency of signs
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Signage (water trails)	Worry about sign vandalism
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Signage (water trails)	Road side signs leading people to water trailhead
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Adequate/excess access intervals
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Very little access in upper reaches
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Access to dangerous areas
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Carry in/carry out (as in Susquehanna River water trail)

5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Portable toilets at formal access points
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Level of needs depend on level of use
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Trash containers attract more trash
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Over-use may lead to spp. damage in access areas
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Access points provide opportunity for increased & effective education
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Evacuation/emergency access
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Start thinking about stream recreational carrying capacity now
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Need a present use study
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Need a cultural resource assessment
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Permits may be needed for access points (U.S. ACE)
5-Apr	French Creek Water Trail Initiative	Stream access points (water trails)	Access site facilities needed-parking, restrooms, information, trash collection
13-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Middle Section	Threats	Fuel storage tanks without secondary containment
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Union City Dam (and other dams)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Dams lead to stream bed widening and shallowing
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Dams stop upstream migration
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Dams secondarily change biological community structure
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Constant flow from dams promote erosion downstream

27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Persistent contaminants (PCBs; mercury) in sediments and biota
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Wetlands loss and removal
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Recreational boating impact on endangered spp. (especially mussels)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Poor farming practices (esp. cows in stream, nutrient inputs, pesticide-herbicide inputs)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Exotic spp. introduction
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Atmospheric deposition (lack of air quality monitoring stations; lack of experts; lack of data)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Urbanization (sprawl; inner city flight; loss of farmland)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Infrastructure expansion into rural areas exacerbates sprawl
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	No storm water regulations in many areas
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Loss of forest land
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Poor forestry practices (i.e., clear-cutting)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	Poor highway maintenance practices (i.e., brine application; road salt; oils for dust control)
27-Apr	French Creek Stakeholders-Upper Section	Threats	New highway construction
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Pollution
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Erosion

5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Urban sprawl
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Invasive species (aquatic and terrestrial)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Any new dams
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Existing dams
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Dredging
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Four-wheelers (ATVs/ORVs)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Sedimentation and siltation
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Point source pollution (Meadville STP; septic systems; cooling water discharges; industrial wastewater; hazardous sites; gravel mining)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Chemical spraying (pesticides and herbicides)
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Lawn care chemicals
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Road runoff
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Road brining
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Road oiling
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Asphalt plant
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Gas and oil wells
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Water withdrawal for agricultural uses
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Mowing or tilling to the stream edge
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Lack of an informed public

5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Lack of environmental enforcement
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Trash dumping
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Floods carrying materials into stream from floodplain
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Improper development in the floodplain
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Wetlands loss
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Salt storage runoff
5-May	French Creek Stakeholders-Southern Section	Threats	Lack of proper community land use planning

Appendix C

Potential Hazardous Sites in the French Creek Watershed

Site Name	Municipality	County
LITTLE COOLEY LANDFILL	ATHENS TWP	CRAWFORD
LORD CORP. - CAMBRIDGE SPRINGS	CAMBRIDGE SPRINGS	CRAWFORD
MORCO CORP SITE	COCHRANTON	CRAWFORD
NICKEL PLATE RD	COCHRANTON	CRAWFORD
KEYSTONE ORDINANCE PUMPING STATION WORKS	FAIRFIELD TWP	CRAWFORD
USA KEYSTONE ORDINANCE	GENEVA	CRAWFORD
RUSCO INDUSTRIES	GREENWOOD TWP	CRAWFORD
ERIE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE	GUY'S MILLS	CRAWFORD
WATSON SITE	HAYFIELD TWP	CRAWFORD
LOCKE ROAD GAS WELL ROAD	HAYFIELD TWP	CRAWFORD
RESERVOIR ROAD SITE	HAYFIELD TWP	CRAWFORD
SUPERIOR REFUSE DISPOSAL	HAYFIELD TWP	CRAWFORD
FRENCH CREEK CANAL	HAYFIELD TWP	CRAWFORD
GREENLEAF CORPORATION	HAYFIELD TWP	CRAWFORD
CONRAIL PROGRAM CAR SHOP	MEADVILLE	CRAWFORD
SPAULDINGS, INC	MEADVILLE	CRAWFORD
OLD MEADVILLE LANDFILL	MEADVILLE	CRAWFORD
MEADVILLE MALLEABLE IRON CO	MEADVILLE	CRAWFORD
NEW RICHMOND TANNERY SITE	NEW RICHMOND	CRAWFORD
MERCER SPRING & WIRE	RICHMOND	CRAWFORD
GAME FARM RD LOGGING ROAD	RICHMOND TWP	CRAWFORD
EAGER BEAVER LUMBER CO	RICHMOND TWP	CRAWFORD
SCHILLER SITE	RICHMOND TWP	CRAWFORD
GAME FARM RD LOGGING ROAD	RICHMOND TWP	CRAWFORD
HUGHSON CHEMICAL CO	SAEGERTOWN	CRAWFORD
GATX	SAEGERTOWN	CRAWFORD
SAEGERTOWN INDUSTRIAL AREA	SAEGERTOWN	CRAWFORD
KNUTH KUSTOM COMPLEX	SAEGERTOWN	CRAWFORD
SHALLOWMANDER PROPERTY	SPRING TWP	CRAWFORD
REIXO ROAD SITE	SPRING TWP	CRAWFORD
CONNEAUT LAKE PARK DUMP	SUMMIT TWP	CRAWFORD
SKELTONTOWN RD DRIVEWAY SITE	VENANGO TWP	CRAWFORD
TOBIN SITE	VENANGO TWP	CRAWFORD
ACKERMAN PROPERTY	VERNON TWP	CRAWFORD
AVTEX FIBERS INC	VERNON TWP	CRAWFORD
AVTEX MERCURY SPILL SITE	VERNON TWP	CRAWFORD
MEADVILLE PLATING CO.	WEST MEAD TWP	CRAWFORD
LEETECH SITE	WEST MEAD TWP	CRAWFORD
TALON INC	WEST MEAD TWP	CRAWFORD
LEECH TOOL & DIE RTE 77 SITE	WEST MEAD TWP	CRAWFORD
ABEX PLT - MEADVILLE PLT	WOODCOCK	CRAWFORD

O'POLKA SITE	WOODCOCK TWP	CRAWFORD
AMITY LANDFILL	AMITY TWP	ERIE
WASHINGTON ST LANDFILL	CORRY	ERIE
EDINBORO WELL SITE	EDINBORO	ERIE
MOLDED FIBERGLASS BOAT CO	LEBOUF TWP	ERIE
NICHOLSON'S LANDFILL II	LOWVILLE (VENNANGO TWP)	ERIE
PENN DOT RTE19 LAGOON	SUMMIT TWP	ERIE
AGWAY INC	UNION CITY	ERIE
UNION MACHINE CO INC	UNION CITY	ERIE
UNION CITY LANDFILL	UNION CITY	ERIE
DAVIS DUMP	UNION CITY	ERIE
MFG - PALMER SITE	UNION CITY	ERIE
WASHINGTON TWP DUMP	WASHINGTON TWP	ERIE
PRESQUE ISLE CHEMICAL	WASHINGTON TWP	ERIE
ELGIN ELECTRONICS	WATERFORD	ERIE
WATERFORD MUNICIPAL SITE	WATERFORD	ERIE
HUNT SITE	WATERFORD TWP	ERIE
OLIVER LANDFILL	WATERFORD TWP	ERIE
MONROE LANDFILL	WATERFORD TWP	ERIE
PENN DISPOSAL SITE	WAYNE TWP	ERIE
MORCO DEER CREEK RD SITE	FRENCH CREEK TWP	MERCER
MERCER COUNTY DRUM DUMP SITE	MILLEDGEVILLE	MERCER
CHICAGO PNEUMATIC TOOL CO	FRANKLIN	VENANGO
JOY MANUFACTURING-TRI CITY SPEEDWAY SITE	OAKLAND TWP	VENANGO
AARDVARK TRANSFER & DISP SITE	SUGARCREEK BOROUGH	VENANGO
AMALIE REFINERY	SUGARCREEK BOROUGH	VENANGO
Source: PA DEP		

Appendix D

PA DEP Permitted Mining Sites

DEP Permit #	Site Name	Operator
20970303	2C 5 Mine	Frank Tucci
25870309	Afton 2 Gravel Mine	Afton Trucking Inc.
25930302	Afton 3 Gravel Mine	Afton Trucking Inc.
25900802	Backus Mine	John W. Waldemarson
4876SM12	Bagdad Gravel Mine	Waterford Sand & Gravel
25900303	Batchelor 12 Mine	Hoover Sand & Gravel Co. Inc.
25890301	Bear 1 Mine	Wroblewski Sand & Gravel Inc.
25970308	Bear 3 Mine	Wroblewski Sand & Gravel Inc.
25940301	Beute & Bliley 2 Mine	Beute & Bliley Inc.
25980301	Briggs Showman Mine	Ray Showman Jr. Excavating Inc.
25950301	Brumagin 2 Mine	Hoover Sand & Gravel Co. Inc.
25992805	Burawa Mine	Raymond D. Showman & Sons Inc.
SM-535	Burdick Mine	Vance E. Burdick
3773SM1	Burkhardt Mine	IA Construction Corp.
20870303	Carpenter Mine	Ralph L. Hunter
20842303	Carpenter Mine	Ralph L. Hunter
25960801	Coe Mine	William R. Coe Jr.
3076SM4	Conneaut Lake Sand & Gravel Mine	Conneaut Lake Sand & Gravel Inc.
20950804	Cooley 1 Mine	William Cooley
20800303	Cutshall Mine	W. L. Dunn Construction Co.
20830308	Dale G. Snow Mine	Dale G. Snow
20890801	Daniel E. Berlin Mine	Daniel E. Berlin
25860303	David Klie 1 Mine	David & Elaine Klie
20990805	Dean 1 Mine	Bruce E. Dean
20970305	Deckards Road Mine	Meadville Redi Mix Concrete Inc.
SM459-1	Denny Crns mine	Mrs. Robert L. Smock
43820603	Dietrich Mine	Larry G. Temple
20940803	Donald L. Merritt Mine	Donald L. Merritt
4876SM10	Edinboro Gravel Mine	Edinboro Gravel Co.
3173SM11	Erie Aggregates Mine	Erie Aggregates Inc.
25870301	Fenton Gravel Mine 1	C. B. Fenton
20910303	Ferris 1 Mine	Donald Ferris
25870807	Fiesler Mine	Sally Fiesler
4876SM17	Fountain House Mine	Meadville Redi Mix Concrete Inc.
4878NC7	Foust 2 Mine	Jack R. & Robert L. Foust
3076SM8	Foust Mine	Jack R. & Robert L. Foust
20810302	Foust Road Mine	Conneaut Lake Sand & Gravel Inc.
20800301	Fowler Mine	Conneaut Lake Sand & Gravel Inc.

3772SM8	Franklin Opr Mine	Vincent Excavating & Gravel
43910304	French Creek 1 Mine	Meadville Redi Mix Concrete Inc.
20940304	Fritz Mine	IA Construction Corp.
25870804	Gilbert Kress Mine	Gilbert Kress
25870302	Glover 1 Mine	James H. Glover
20800302	Glover Mine	Leroy R. Glover
20992802	Gravel Run Mine	R. Hunter Inc.
25880305	Hanas 1 Mine	Hanas Gravel Co.
20870802	Herb Landers 1 Mine	David M. Russell
25900304	Hoover 10 Mine	Hoover Sand & Gravel Co. Inc.
25900301	Hoover 9 Mine	Hoover Sand & Gravel Co. Inc.
20940301	Huber Mine	Meadville Redi Mix Concrete Inc.
25842305	Hunt Mine	Carl Hunt Jr.
20890304	Hunter 2 Mine	Ralph L. Hunter
20910306	Hunter 3 Mine	Ralph L. Hunter
25992804	Jack Pfadt 2 Mine	John F. Pfadt
4876SM4	Kantz Mine	W. L. Dunn Construction Co.
61990301*	Karns Mine	Cooperstown Sand & Gravel
25860307	Kent 1 Mine	Waterford Sand & Gravel
25800305	Kingens Gravel Mine	Raymond D. Showman & Sons Inc.
3778SM10	Laing Mine	Franklin Gravel Co.
20850305	Locke Mine	Gary Theuret
20970304	Mac Son 2 Mine	Mac Son Corp.
25820311	Martin Arneman Mine	Martin W. Arneman
20970802	Marzka 1 Mine	Vera I. Marzka
4876SM6	Maybro Lowville Mine	Wroblewski Sand & Gravel Inc.
25880303	McKean 3 Mine	McKean Sand & Gravel Inc.
25860306	McLaughlin 1 Mine	McLaughlin Peat Sales
20930801	McMahon Mine	David L. & Sandra McMahon
3776SM20	McWhirter Mine	IA Construction Corp.
20830306	Meadville Redimix Mine	Meadville Redi Mix Concrete Inc.
25992807	Munsee Mine	Munsee Sand & Gravel
25870304	Niemeyer 2 Gravel Mine	Rodger E. Niemeyer Sr.
25950303	Niemeyer 3 Gravel Mine	Rodger E. Niemeyer Sr.
25002803	Niemeyer Gravel 4 Mine	Rodger E. Niemeyer Sr.
25992808	Niemeyer Gravel 5 Mine	Rodger E. Niemeyer Sr.
20820305	Northwest Gravel 2 Mine	Northwest Gravel Co.
4878NC3	Orr 1 Mine	Frank Tucci
20900302	Orr 2 Mine	Frank Tucci
25992801	Osborn Mine	Ray Showman Jr. Excavating Inc.
3773SM6	Patchel Run Mine	Cooperstown Sand & Gravel
25002804	Pavkov Mine	Bill Danylko & Son Excavating Inc.
25820302	Pfadt 1 Mine	John F. Pfadt
20992804	Pikula 1 Mine	Joseph G. & M. Shirley Pikula

20830307	Pinney Gravel Mine	Donald R. Wallis
20960303	Powell Mine	W. L. Dunn Construction Co.
4877SM13	Rockdale 1 Mine	Frank Tucci
25002805	Rohrer Blum Mine	Blum Rohrer
25870806	Roy L. Colvin Mine	Roy L. Colvin
20950807	Schlosser Mine	Donald R. Wallis
20890306	Shale 1 Mine	Ralph L. Hunter
25970306	Showman 1 Mine	Raymond D. Showman & Sons Inc.
25992806	Skelton Mine	Raymond D. Showman & Sons Inc.
25960802	Spotts Gravel Mine	Phillip L. Spotts
20960301	Stutzman Mine	R. Hunter Inc.
20880802	Tatalovic 1 Mine	Ralph R. Tatalovic
25980302	Tech Mine	Afton Trucking Inc.
25950802	Thompson Mine	Tom Francis
3773SM4	Tionesta 3 Mine	Cooperstown Sand & Gravel
25950304	Troyer 1 Mine	Troyer Sand & Gravel LTD
4876SM5	Troyer 2 Mine	Mervin Troyer
4878SM1	Union City 3 Mine	Dean Glover Trucking
25910302	Waterford 5 Mine	Waterford Sand & Gravel Co.
3076SM2	West Greene Mine	Afton Trucking Inc.
20890803	William H. Wilson Mine	William H. Wilson
43910308	Wood Dean Mine	Halls Excavating Inc.
25930305	Wroblewski 2 Mine	Wroblewski Sand & Gravel Inc.
61930301	Wyant Mine	Cooperstown Sand & Gravel
4876SM16	Wygant Farm Plt.	Meadville Redi Mix Concrete Inc.
4876SM15	Wygant Farm Wash Plt.	Meadville Redi Mix Concrete Inc.
25940803	Wynn Woods Mine	Wynn Woods
Source: PA DEP		