Opposition to Proposed Reservoir by Catawba River Water Supply Project
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• Applicant’s Justification
• Comments submitted by Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation, Inc. and American Rivers
• Preferable Alternatives to ≈ $50 Million project
• Public Input Opportunities
CRWSP’s Justification & Alternatives

108 million gallon reservoir
(4.5 days at normal usage
and many more under
drought conditions)

+ 25 day supply of water
suggestion in current IBT
certificate (re-issuance
upcoming)

= Need for new $50 million,
900 million gallon
reservoir for rare drought
periods
CRWSP’s Alternatives Analysis

- Interconnections
  - 8.6 to 11.1 MGD available currently

- Existing Reservoirs
  - Fishing Creek Reservoir too dirty for current facility treatment
  - Lake Wylie too far

- Storage and Recovery
  - Piedmont region insufficient storage capacity

- Offsite Reservoirs
  - Too small, not studied

- Onsite Reservoirs
  - Too small
Comments Submitted to USACE

- Requested full assessment of alternatives in an Environmental Impact Statement
- Requested Public Hearing for input opportunities
Comments Submitted to USACE

- Least Damaging Practicable Alternative
  - Water Efficiency and Conservation
    - Effective management
    - Pricing for conservation
    - Efficient water use
    - Watershed protection
Comments Submitted to USACE

• Increase drought resilience through Emergency Municipal Interconnections

• Compensatory mitigation for proposed project remains inadequate
Recommendations

• Efficiency and Conservation
• Existing Supply for Drought Resilience – 18 MGD needed
  – 108 MGD Reservoir
• Additional Increases to Emergency Water Supply Connections
  – 8.6 to 11.1 MGD
  Interconnections currently
  • Rock Hill (~$6 million)
  • Fort Mill (24” water main with Rock Hill & moving towards run of River supply)
  • Anson County, NC
  • Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utilities
  – Emergency increases could yield balance of need
Recommend Alternatives “Re-analysis”

• CRWSP suggested project will cost $25 million in submitted documents

• CRWSP has recently mentioned $50 million as project costs

Analyze previous, proposed and other alternatives with true project costs
SC v. NC, No. 138, Orig. – Agreement

– 1st req. conservation during drought periods
– 3rd req. coordinate IBT Certifications
  • Notice of applications
  • Prepare Env. Impact Statement
  • Written findings of fact, especially assessing the effects of IBT during drought LIP Stages 0-4
  • Applicant has burden of proving justification
SC v. NC, No. 138, Orig. – Agreement

– 4th req. drought response plans for withdrawers in Project reservoirs applicable to water intakes
– 5th req. develop MOA to coordinate bi-state water providers, such as CRWSP
C-W BiState Adv. Commission

• Thank you for the continued leadership with interstate water conflict resolution

• CRWSP project presents a great opportunity to test SC v. NC settlement agreement
Thank You