

---

# **Morrison Cove Water Resources Availability Study**

*Publication No. 277*

*December 31, 2011*

---

*Robert D. Pody, P.G.  
Senior Commission Scientist*

*Zhenxing Zhang, Ph.D., P.E.  
Water Resources Engineer*

*Wade J. Cope, E.I.T.  
Hydrologist*

*Luanne Y. Steffy  
Aquatic Ecologist*

*Erin C. Lynam  
Aquatic Ecologist*

# SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION



Paul O. Swartz, Executive Director

James M. Tierney, N.Y. Commissioner  
Kenneth P. Lynch, N.Y. Alternate  
Peter Freehafer, N.Y. Alternate

Michael L. Krancer, Pa. Commissioner  
John T. Hines, Pa. Alternate  
Kelly J. Heffner, Pa. Alternate  
Ned E. Wehler, Pa. Advisor

Dr. Robert M. Summers, Md. Commissioner  
Herbert M. Sachs, Md. Alternate/Advisor

Colonel Christopher Larsen, U.S. Commissioner  
Colonel David E. Anderson, U.S. Alternate  
David J. Leach, U.S. Alternate  
Amy M. Guise, U.S. Advisor

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created as an independent agency by a federal-interstate compact\* among the states of Maryland and New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the federal government. In creating the Commission, the Congress and state legislatures formally recognized the water resources of the Susquehanna River Basin as a regional asset vested with local, state, and national interests for which all the parties share responsibility. As the single federal-interstate water resources agency with basinwide authority, the Commission's goal is to coordinate the planning, conservation, management, utilization, development, and control of basin water resources among the public and private sectors.

*\*Statutory Citations: Federal – Pub. L. 91-575, 84 Stat. 1509 (December 1970); Maryland – Natural Resources Sec. 8-301 (Michie 1974); New York – ECL Sec. 21-1301 (McKinney 1973); and Pennsylvania – 32 P.S. 820.1 (Supp. 1976).*

This report is available on our web site ([www.srbc.net](http://www.srbc.net)) by selecting Public Information/Technical Reports. For a CD or hard copy, contact the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, 1721 N. Front Street, Harrisburg, Pa. 17102-2391, Phone: (717) 238-0423, Fax: (717) 238-2436, E-mail: [srbc@srbc.net](mailto:srbc@srbc.net).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	4
1.1 Purpose and Objectives.....	4
1.2 Study Methodology.....	6
2.0 Geographic Setting.....	7
2.1 Surface Water Drainage.....	9
3.0 Hydrogeologic Setting .....	10
3.1 Bedrock Geology .....	10
3.2 Structural Geology .....	12
3.3 Hydrogeology .....	13
3.4 Hydrogeologic Terrains .....	14
3.4.1 Mountainside/Toeslope Carbonates Terrain.....	16
3.4.2 Interior Carbonates Terrain.....	16
3.4.3 Gatesburg Terrain .....	17
4.0 Hydrogeologic Analysis.....	18
4.1 Water Table Mapping .....	18
4.2 Seepage Run.....	18
4.3 Mountainside/Toeslope Carbonates Terrain .....	21
4.4 Northern Gatesburg Terrain and Base Flow Basins .....	23
4.5 Southern Gatesburg Terrain.....	25
4.6 Roaring Spring.....	26
4.7 Underdrained Interior Carbonates Terrain; Yellow Creek and Plum Creek Watersheds.....	28
5.0 Hydrologic Analysis .....	29
5.1 Streamflow Statistics .....	32
5.2 Recurrence Interval Analysis.....	36
6.0 Water Availability.....	39
6.1 Flow Statistics.....	39
6.2 Water Use.....	40
6.3 Water Availability.....	43
6.4 Screening for Identification of Critical Water Planning Areas (CWPAs).....	48
6.5 Conclusions.....	49
7.0 Water Quality and Aquatic Habitat.....	50
7.1 Water Quality.....	50
7.2 Riparian Areas and Aquatic Habitat .....	51
7.3 Methods for Water Quality Evaluation.....	52
7.4 Watershed Evaluations.....	56
7.4.1 Clover Creek .....	56
7.4.2 Piney Creek.....	59
7.4.3 Halter Creek .....	62
7.4.4 Yellow Creek .....	71
7.4.5 Potter Creek .....	74
7.4.6 Three Springs Run .....	76
7.4.7 Beaver Creek.....	78

7.5	Conclusions.....	81
8.0	Conclusions and Recommendations .....	84
8.1	Water Availability Conclusions and Recommendations .....	84
8.2	Recommendations for the Management of the Gatesburg Terrain CARAs .....	85
8.3	Recommendations for the Management of the Roaring Spring.....	85
8.4	Recommendations for Mitigation of Nitrate Contamination .....	86
8.5	Recommendations for the Protection and Restoration of Stream Quality and Aquatic Habitat.....	87
8.6	Recommendations for Development of Municipal Grade, Potable Water Supplies from Groundwater in the Carbonate Aquifers of Morrison Cove.....	88
8.7	Recommendations for Development of Municipal Grade, Potable Water Supplies from Groundwater in the Gatesburg Formation.....	88
8.8	Optimum Well Locations.....	89
	REFERENCES .....	90

## FIGURES

Figure 1-1.	SRBC Potentially Stressed Areas .....	5
Figure 2-1.	Location of Morrison Cove in the Juniata Subbasin of the Susquehanna River Basin .....	7
Figure 2-2.	Land Use in Morrison Cove.....	8
Figure 3-1.	Geologic Formations in Morrison Cove .....	11
Figure 3-2.	Roadcut in Loysburg Water Gap, Yellow Creek, Showing Sandstone Beds in the Bald Eagle Formation Dipping at Approximately 50 Degrees to the Southeast ..	12
Figure 3-3.	Topography Resulting from Differential Erosion of Folded Rocks with Differing Resistance to Erosion.....	13
Figure 3-4.	Hydrogeologic Terrains and Secondary Watersheds in Morrison Cove .....	15
Figure 4-1.	Water Table Contours, Hydrogeologic Terrains, and Seepage Run Sites .....	20
Figure 4-2.	Hydrograph for Yellow Creek Where it Leaves Morrison Cove.....	21
Figure 4-3.	Relationship of Streamflow to Drainage Area Using Seepage Run Data.....	22
Figure 4-4.	Base Flow Basins: Contributing Areas to Surface Water Flow during Periods of Low Base Flow .....	24
Figure 4-5.	Hydrograph of Flow from the Roaring Spring for the Period of Record (Eight Years).....	27
Figure 5-1.	Major Watersheds in Morrison Cove.....	30
Figure 5-2.	Secondary Watersheds in Morrison Cove.....	31
Figure 5-3.	Locations of Morrison Cove Temporary Gages .....	34
Figure 5-4.	The Daily Average Flow in the Temporary Gages .....	35
Figure 5-5.	Comparison of Daily Average Flow in csm at the Temporary Gages .....	36
Figure 5-6.	Estimate of Selected Streamflow Statistics for Clover Creek .....	38
Figure 6-1.	Remaining Water in Piney Creek .....	43
Figure 6-2.	Remaining Water in Clover Creek.....	44
Figure 6-3.	Remaining Water in Gatesburg North .....	45
Figure 6-4.	Remaining Water in Yellow Creek.....	45
Figure 6-5.	Remaining Water in Plum Creek .....	46

Figure 6-6.	Remaining Water in Halter Creek.....	47
Figure 6-7.	Remaining Water in the Roaring Spring.....	47
Figure 7-1.	Impaired Streams in Morrison Cove.....	55
Figure 7-2.	Clover Creek Watershed.....	57
Figure 7-3.	Example of Lack of Riparian Buffer and Agriculture along Clover Creek.....	58
Figure 7-4.	Piney Creek Watershed.....	61
Figure 7-5.	Halter Creek Watershed.....	64
Figure 7-6.	Roaring Spring Outflow.....	65
Figure 7-7.	Cabbage Creek Flowing under the Driveways of Homes in Roaring Spring.....	66
Figure 7-8.	Spring Complex along Cabbage Creek.....	66
Figure 7-9.	Within the High Quality–Cold Water Fishery Section of Plum Creek.....	67
Figure 7-10.	Outflow from Spring Complex near the Mouth of Plum Creek.....	68
Figure 7-11.	Yellow Creek Watershed.....	72
Figure 7-12.	Hickory Bottom Creek.....	73
Figure 7-13.	Lack of Riparian Vegetation and Channel Cover along Potter Creek.....	75
Figure 7-14.	Siltation Fencing and Constructed Banks along a Reach of Three Springs Run..	77
Figure 7-15.	Erosion and Sedimentation along a Meander on Beaver Creek near the Mouth..	80

## TABLES

Table 5-1.	Major Watersheds in Morrison Cove.....	29
Table 5-2.	The Secondary Watersheds in the Halter Creek and Yellow Creek Watersheds and Their Drainage Areas.....	29
Table 5-3.	Information for the Temporary Gage Records.....	32
Table 5-4.	Streamflow Statistics Computed From Temporary Gage Data (cfs).....	33
Table 5-5.	Reference Gages Used in the Study.....	37
Table 5-6.	Estimate of Selected Streamflow Statistics for the Temporary Gages.....	38
Table 6-1.	Ten-year Base Flows for Morrison Cove.....	40
Table 6-2.	Water Use by Sector and Base Flow Basin.....	42
Table 6-3.	Screening for Critical Water Planning Areas (CWPA's).....	48
Table 7-1.	Water Quality Criteria and Reference Values with Source.....	54

## APPENDICES

Appendix A.	Geologic Formations in the Morrison Cove Study Area.....	94
Appendix B.	Graphs of Discharge vs. Watershed Area in the Major Watersheds of Morrison Cove.....	98
Appendix C.	Hydrographs of the Roaring Spring and the Williamsburg Spring.....	102
Appendix D.	Major Watershed Flow Statistics.....	106

---

# MORRISON COVE WATER RESOURCES AVAILABILITY STUDY

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The objectives of the Morrison Cove Water Resources Availability Study were to assess existing water resources, establish an estimated sustainable yield from the constituent watersheds, inventory current water uses, and evaluate water quantity and quality issues in the study area. Morrison Cove includes an area identified by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC) as a “Potentially Stressed Area” and has a long history of agriculture-related water quality issues. A lack of flow data from USGS gaging stations within Morrison Cove has precluded quantitative water resource assessment.

The Morrison Cove study area encompasses about 185 square miles in portions of Blair and Bedford counties, Pennsylvania. The predominant land uses, by area, are agricultural (55 percent) and forested (40 percent). Developed land use (including industrial, commercial, municipal, and residential) covers approximately 1 percent. Major population centers include the boroughs of Roaring Spring, Martinsburg, and Williamsburg.

Morrison Cove, located within the Ridge and Valley physiographic province, is an intermontane valley about 30 miles long and five to eight miles wide. The underlying bedrock is predominantly siliciclastics (primarily sandstone) in the ridges, and carbonates in the enclosed valley. The carbonates have solutionally enlarged fractures and conduits which substantially increase aquifer permeability. As a result, relatively high well yields are widely available within the valley portion of the study area for wells sited along major fractures and fracture traces.

A substantial amount of field work and analysis by SRBC and Meiser & Earl, Inc., as well as literature review and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping of previous study results, was conducted as part of the study. From spring through winter 2009, field work included: (1) establishing temporary gaging stations near the mouth of each major watershed and developing rating curves; (2) continuously monitoring streamflows, including a wide range of seasonal flows; (3) measuring over 200 groundwater levels for a water table contour map; (4) performing seepage runs to obtain a snapshot of contributing flows within each major watershed; and 5) obtaining select water chemistry data and evaluating aquatic habitat at each seepage run station.

A detailed water availability analysis allowed SRBC to establish the amount of groundwater and surface water base flow currently available on a sustainable basis for use in each major watershed. For the purposes of this study, the sustainable limit of consumptive use is approximated by the 10-year base flow. The use of water utilization data representing the maximum approved or permitted daily use ensures a worse-case evaluation, and a conservative estimate of water availability.

The water resources in the Yellow Creek, Piney Creek, and Clover Creek Watersheds, and in the northern Gatesburg groundwater basin, are largely undeveloped. However, the amount of water currently withdrawn from the Roaring Spring exceeds the amount of water available on a sustainable basis. The amount of water currently consumptively withdrawn from the Halter Creek Watershed represents 87 percent of the 10-year base flow. Approximately 11 percent of the 10-year base flow is currently being utilized in the Plum Creek Watershed.

The Morrison Cove Watersheds were screened for potential designation as Pa. Act 220 Critical Water Planning Areas (CWPAs). The consumptive use in each watershed was compared to the appropriate Initial Screening Criterion (ISC). Consumptive use exceeded the ISC in the Halter Creek and Plum Creek Watersheds. However, the consumptive use in these watersheds is due to a few relatively stable, high volume withdrawals, and both watersheds support high quality aquatic habitat downstream of the withdrawal locations. Water use in Halter Creek and the Roaring Spring is largely driven by industrial use. Municipal and residential consumptive use is a small fraction of total use. Therefore, water use is not a function of population growth. Available data for industrial water use suggest overall stability, with no net increases in water demand in recent years. Designation of these watersheds as CWPAs does not appear to be warranted.

The greatest challenges for water supply in the Morrison Cove Study area are: (1) the concentration of major withdrawals in the Roaring Spring area, and (2) the widespread contamination of surface water and groundwater by agricultural activities. Under existing conditions, water demand exceeds available flow from the Roaring Spring during some summer and fall months in moderate drought years. In years with average hydrologic conditions, about 1-3 cubic feet per second (cfs) of flow leaves the spring pool. This flow of high quality water is critical to the aquatic habitat in downstream reaches of Halter Creek.

The study identified two unusually permeable hydrogeologic terrains as Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs). The central portions of the study area are underlain by highly permeable sandy carbonates and sandstones of the Gatesburg Formation (Gatesburg Terrain). These are overlain by a relatively thick mantle of weathering residuum composed largely of fine sand. The sandy residuum has a very high infiltration rate and correspondingly low runoff rate, and is a nearly ideal medium for maximizing and storing recharge. The Gatesburg Terrain provides groundwater to the largest springs in the study area. The Gatesburg Terrain also provides the only water in the valley that is relatively low in agrichemical constituents. The second unusually permeable terrain consists of a narrow belt of highly soluble limestones situated along the toeslope of the surrounding ridges. The ridges provide relatively acidic, but otherwise high quality, groundwater and surface water runoff to the soluble limestones where extensive strike-oriented karst conduits have developed. These conduits convey most of the local and mountainside recharge to springs and seeps located in the downstream reaches of the watersheds. They are largely responsible for the generally high quality aquatic habitat available in the downstream reaches of the ridge-parallel streams.

Nitrate levels in the base flow of streams were generally below state and federal drinking water standards, in contrast to the surrounding groundwater. This was taken to be the result of nitrogen uptake in riparian zones. Until the elevated nitrate levels in the groundwater of the

Interior Carbonate Terrain are addressed, the stream water may be a viable alternative water supply source for some uses. Surface water withdrawals from the downstream reaches of the Yellow Creek, Piney Creek, and Clover Creek Watersheds could supply water needs with minimal impacts to existing users and aquatic habitat. Stream water quality may be further improved by restoration of riparian zone vegetation. The resulting improvements would include water quality, aquatic habitat, and channel stabilization.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the study findings, SRBC has developed the following recommendations to help secure adequate yields, ensure the protection of current uses and aquatic and riparian needs, and help prevent adverse impacts to the water resources and aquatic habitat of Morrison Cove:

- Manage withdrawals from the Roaring Spring to ensure their sustainability, and to maintain and protect aquatic habitat in Halter Creek.
- Focus groundwater development for municipal grade wells on the aquifers having both high quality water and sufficient permeability to allow high production rates (i.e., the Gatesburg Terrains).
- Locate municipal-grade surface water withdrawals at downstream locations where the maximum amount of water is available and where impacts to existing users and the environment would be minimized.
- Locate large groundwater withdrawals in the downgradient portions of major recharge areas, where more water is available.
- Locate large groundwater withdrawals within watersheds in the downstream reaches to minimize the stream miles with reduced base flow and altered flow regime.
- Protect water quality in the two major Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs): the Gatesburg North and South Terrains through use of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs).
- Protect water quantity in the Gatesburg Terrain areas (north and south) through use of Stormwater and Development BMPs, to minimize impervious cover.
- Treat waters for nitrate levels which exceed federal Safe Drinking Water standard (10 mg/l), as is typical in the Interior Carbonates Terrain.
- Develop and implement methods to eliminate surplus manure.
- Encourage the restoration of riparian vegetation to increase the natural treatment of water and to improve aquatic habitat.
- Measure and record flow through the existing weirs on Plum and Halter Creeks, and on the Roaring Spring pool discharge on a daily basis.
- Continue and expand the collection of reported water use data.