pennsylvania
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

COMMENT/RESPONSE DOCUMENT

April 22, 2026

The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) received an application for an Individual NPDES Permit from the applicant named below to authorize discharges of stormwater associated with construction activities from the project site named below to surface waters of the Commonwealth.

Applicant: AAMPA Holdings, LLC

Applicant Address: 1514 Commerce Ave STE 203, Carlisle, PA 17015

Application Number: PAD210118

Project Site Name: AAMPA Holdings-Ritner Hwy

Project Site Address: 3485 Ritner Highway, Newville, PA 17241

Municipality / County: West Pennsboro Township, Cumberland County

Total Earth Disturbance Area: 112.8 acres

Surface Waters Receiving Stormwater Discharges: Big Spring Creek (HQ-CWF, MF)

Project Description: A land development plan with the proposed construction of 3 commercial warehouses and the necessary parking and access driveways. Bioretention ponds and subsurface infiltration basins will be constructed to manage stormwater runoff volume, peak rate and quality.

Effluent limitations and rate or frequency of the discharges: Upon issuance of the permit, compliance is required with the narrative based effluent limitations as identified in the approved Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Post-Construction Stormwater Management Plan and in accordance with 25 Pa. Code, Chapter 102 and the permit. Rate of discharges are identified in the application and incorporated into the permit in accordance with 25 Pa. Code Chapter 102.

The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) made a tentative determination to issue an Individual NPDES Permit to the applicant named above on May 10, 2025. DEP held a public hearing on the NPDES permit application on August 14, 2025 in Newville, Cumberland County, PA. Written comments for this application and draft permit were accepted through April 21, 2026.

Notice of receipt of AAMPA's complete application and Notice of DEP's tentative determination to issue NPDES permit PAD210118 and draft permit were published in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* on May 10, 2025. 55 Pa. B. 3246.

Notice of the public hearing and extension of the comment period were published in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* on July 12, 2025, 55 Pa. B. 4703, and in the *Carlisle Sentinel* on July 10, 2025. DEP also posted the permit application, public notices, draft permit and Fact Sheet on the DEP Southcentral Regional Office's website in advance of the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* notice of public hearing publication.

On April 22, 2026, DEP issued NPDES permit no. PAD210118 to AAMPA Holdings, LLC (AAMPA).

Additional information about the project is available on DEP's webpage for the project.

This comment response document contains the public comments submitted to DEP by 78 commentators during both the public participation process and during the public hearing.

This comment response document is divided into two parts. The first part contains a table listing the commentators that commented during the public comment period. The second part of the document contains the submitted comments and DEP's responses. Public comments are listed with the identifying commentator ID number at the end of the comment, example: (20) would denote commentator no. 20 provided the comment. Where multiple commentators expressed common concerns, the shared concerns are set forth in a general comment and all pertinent commentator ID numbers are listed after the comment, example: (1, 2, 5, 20).

Table of Contents:

LIST OF COMMENTERS

*Denotes Commentator provided testimony at the public hearing

1. Mark Albano, Citizen
2. Jon Allen, Citizen
3. Thomas Baltz*, Citizen/Angling Adventures
4. Brad Basehore, Citizen
5. Matt Bentz*, Citizen
6. Laszlo Bockh and Mary Blakeslee, Citizens
7. Andrew Bogley, Citizen
8. Patrick Bolden, Citizen
9. Brad, Citizen
10. Tom Brennan, Citizen
11. William Burkholder, Citizen
12. Joe Carpenter, Citizen
13. Keith Clinton, Citizen
14. Jeffrey Cohick*, Citizen
15. Johnathan Daniels, Citizen
16. Brian and Tina Eaton*, Citizens
17. Jack Ericksen*, Council Member, Borough of Newville
18. Ralph Fisher, Chairman, Board of Supervisors, North Newton Township
19. Bill Franz*, Big Spring Watershed Association
20. Rev. Dr. Vernon Gauthier, Citizen
21. Clayton Good, Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission
22. Pamela Greenwood, Citizen
23. Jeremy Haag, Citizen
24. Kristine Hammar, Citizen
25. Peter Heil, Citizen
26. William Hill, P.E., Keller Engineers, Inc.
27. Mohammad Husain, Citizen
28. Anita Johnson, Citizen
29. Susan Johnson, Citizen
30. Donovan Jones, Citizen
31. Dennis Kane, Citizen
32. Jeffrey Kunkleman, Citizen
33. Joan-Marie Lartin, PhD, RN, Citizen
34. Lance Lascari, Citizen
35. Gary Leone, Citizen
36. Lenny Lichvar, President, Pennsylvania Council Trout Unlimited
37. Philip Light, Citizen
38. Charles and Sharon Lightner, Citizens
39. George Love*, Citizen
40. Michael Males, Hopewell Fish and Game Association
41. Valerie Mansberger*, Citizen
42. Marcus McKnight*, Irwin & McKnight, P.C. on behalf of the Borough of Newville
43. Vincent Mellott*, Chairman, Newville Economic Development Authority
44. Zoe Metro, Citizen

45. Scott Miller*, Citizen
46. Dennis and Cheryl Mooney, Citizens
47. Bob Over*, Citizen
48. Sharpe Over*, Citizen
49. Scott Penner, President, Borough of Newville
50. John Patterson VI, Commander, USN (Ret.), Citizen
51. Blyden Potts, Citizen
52. David Raphael, K&L Gates, on behalf of the Big Spring Preservation Association LLC (BSPA)
53. George Reilly, Citizen
54. Robert Robinson*, Citizen
55. Rausa Roscinski, Citizen
56. William Russell, Citizen
57. Wayne Samson, Citizen
58. Robert Schott, Citizen
59. William Seaton, Ph.D., P.G,* ARM Group, on behalf of the Borough of Newville
60. Nicholas Slear, Citizen
61. Joseph Smak, Citizen
62. Michael Spencer, Citizen
63. Mark Spicka*, Big Spring Watershed Association
64. TaWanda Stallworth, Citizen
65. Garret Stahlman, Cumberland Valley Rails-to-Trails Council, Inc. (CVRTC)
66. Steven Switzer, Citizen
67. Daniel Terlizzi, Citizen
68. Wayne Wadell*, Citizen
69. Randall Wallett, Citizen
70. Ray Walter, Citizen
71. Avery Walters, Citizen
72. Avis, David, and Ian Ward, Citizens
73. John Wardel*, Citizen
74. John W Wardel*, Citizen
75. Doris Weaver, Citizen
76. Sally Winder, Citizen
77. John Zazworsky, Cumberland Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited (CVTU)
78. Bruce Kessler, Citizen

Requesting a Public Hearing

1. Summarized Comment: DEP should hold a hearing for the public regarding this project. Requests for a public hearing for the project were received. (6, 19, 22, 42, 46, 51, 63, 77)

   Response: In response to requests that the DEP received, the DEP held a public hearing on this project on August 14, 2025 in Newville, Cumberland County, PA.

Related to Karst Geology and Implementation of Best Management Practices or Stormwater Control Measures

2. Summarized Comment: The site of the proposed development is particularly sensitive to potential contamination from stormwater as it sits on limestone karst and has several sinkholes and surface depressions. Since limestone is porous, contaminants from stormwater can easily enter into the groundwater if not properly filtered through soils. Once in the groundwater, contaminants can travel long distances over a relatively short time through subsurface fractures and find their way into Big Spring Creek, residential wells, and Newville's primary water source at Cool Spring. (1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 44, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77)

   Response: DEP addresses potential hazardous geologic formations or soil conditions that have the potential to cause pollution to waters of the Commonwealth during earth disturbance activities by ensuring compliance the erosion and sediment control plan (E&S Plan) and post-construction stormwater management plan (PCSM Plan) requirements that are part of the process to obtain an Individual National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Individual NPDES Permit).

   In accordance with 25 Pa. Code § 102.4(b)(5)(xii) (relating to erosion and sediment control requirements), erosion and sediment control plans (E&S Plans) must contain drawings and narrative which describe . . . "[i]dentification of the naturally occurring geologic formations or soil conditions that may have the potential to cause pollution during earth disturbance activities and include BMPs to avoid or minimize potential pollution and its impacts from the formations." Also in accordance with 25 Pa. Code § 102.8(f)(12), post construction stormwater management plans (PCSM Plans) must contain . . . "[a]n identification of naturally occurring geologic formations or soil conditions that may have the potential to cause pollution after earth disturbance activities are completed and PCSM BMPs are operational and development of a management plan to avoid or minimize potential pollution and its impacts."

   Accordingly, applicants proposing to conduct earth disturbance activities under Chapter 102 must perform environmental due diligence including, but not limited to, evaluation and identification of potentially hazardous naturally occurring geologic formations or soil conditions that could potentially cause or contribute to pollution during and/or after earth disturbance activities and include BMPs to avoid or minimize potential pollution.

For this project, DEP evaluated the information provided in AAMPA's permit application with a focus on the potential risks associated with development in karst watersheds. Based on this review, DEP identified that additional information was needed to demonstrate compliance with the applicable law and issued two rounds of technical deficiency letters following the initial application submission, requesting additional information

As a result, AAMPA completed additional geophysical, geotechnical, and hydrogeologic studies of the site as a part of the required pre-development site characterization. In particular, AAMPA provided a Hydrogeologic Evaluation, signed and sealed by a Pennsylvania licensed geologist, that included a fracture trace analysis and appended the fracture trace analysis report completed for the Borough of Newville. While the limestone underlying the site is subject to karst weathering, the site-specific Hydrogeologic Evaluation concluded that the proposed development would have little effect on the underlying hydrogeologic conditions primarily because there are no significant karst features or fracture zones that extend from the ground surface to the water table that would facilitate the rapid movement of surface water to groundwater. In addition, all infiltrating stormwater, capable of reaching the water table, will be treated by filtering through manufactured devices in the stormwater inlets first, and then suitable soil within the stormwater control measures (SCMs) prior to reaching the native material under the SCMs. The stormwater would then percolate through the native material into the water table several feet below the site. Based on the DEP's review of the information provided in the permit application review process, the DEP determined that AAMPA's proposed management of the stormwater at this site is consistent with the applicable law, including current guidance and regulatory requirements to protect and maintain Big Spring.

Summarized public hearing testimony: A commentator raised concerns that the permittee's analysis of the underground conditions from their geophysical study were misinterpreted and indicated potential underground pathways. The commentator classifies the permittees' interpretation as "*oh, no big deal, no big problem here. Nothing extraordinary as far as a karst hazard here*". However, they view the results as a "*poster child for karst geology*", where water is potentially infiltrating deep into the surface. The commentator noted that fracture trace analysis backed up the presence of these potential pathways and that they would theoretically take the water right to Big Spring Creek. Overall, the commentator felt the permittee should have done a much more comprehensive study of the area because this is a very problematic scenario that requires additional study and monitoring before, during, and after construction so you have a baseline, particularly during construction. (59)

Response: DEP addresses potential hazardous geologic formations or soil conditions that have the potential to cause pollution to waters of the Commonwealth during earth disturbance activities by ensuring compliance the erosion and sediment control plan (E&S Plan) and post-construction stormwater management plan (PCSM Plan) requirements that are part of the process to obtain an Individual National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Individual NPDES Permit).

In accordance with 25 Pa. Code § 102.4(b)(5)(xii) (relating to erosion and sediment control requirements), erosion and sediment control plans (E&S Plans) must contain drawings and narrative which describe . . . "[i]dentification of the naturally occurring geologic formations or soil conditions that may have the potential to cause pollution during earth disturbance activities and include BMPs to avoid or minimize potential pollution and its impacts from the formations." Also in accordance with 25 Pa. Code § 102.8(f)(12), post construction stormwater management plans (PCSM Plans) must contain . . . "[a]n identification of naturally occurring geologic formations or soil conditions that may have the potential to cause pollution after earth disturbance activities are completed and PCSM BMPs are operational and development of a management plan to avoid or minimize potential pollution and its impacts."

Accordingly, applicants proposing to conduct earth disturbance activities under Chapter 102 must perform environmental due diligence including, but not limited to, evaluation and identification of potentially hazardous naturally occurring geologic formations or soil conditions that could potentially cause or contribute to pollution during and/or after earth disturbance activities and include BMPs to avoid or minimize potential pollution.

For this project, DEP evaluated the information provided in AAMPA's permit application with a focus on the potential risks associated with development in karst watersheds. Based on this review, DEP identified that additional information was needed to demonstrate compliance with the applicable law and issued two rounds of technical deficiency letters following the initial application submission, requesting additional information

As a result, AAMPA completed additional geophysical, geotechnical, and hydrogeologic studies of the site as a part of the required pre-development site characterization. In particular, AAMPA provided a Hydrogeologic Evaluation, signed and sealed by a Pennsylvania licensed geologist, that included a fracture trace analysis and appended the fracture trace analysis report completed for the Borough of Newville. While the limestone underlying the site is subject to karst weathering, the site-specific Hydrogeologic Evaluation concluded that the proposed development would have little effect on the underlying hydrogeologic conditions primarily because there are no significant karst features or fracture zones that extend from the ground surface to the water table that would facilitate the rapid movement of surface water to groundwater. In addition, all infiltrating stormwater, capable of reaching the water table, will be treated by filtering through manufactured devices in the stormwater inlets first, and then suitable soil within the stormwater control measures (SCMs) prior to reaching the native material under the SCMs. The stormwater would then percolate through the native material into the water table several feet below the site. Based on the DEP's review of the information provided in the permit application review process, the DEP determined that AAMPA's proposed management of the stormwater at this site is consistent with the applicable law, including current guidance and regulatory requirements to protect and maintain Big Spring.

The DEP is aware of, and takes very seriously, the risks associated with development in karst watersheds. To that end the DEP issued two rounds of technical deficiency letters following the initial application submission, requesting additional investigation prior to any permit approval.

The geophysical assessments confirmed the presence of karst geology. Contrary to commentator's characterization that the studies suggested "*no big deal, no big problem here*" the revised Geotechnical Engineering Report for Stormwater Management highlighted karst related risk. Echoing the commentator's concerns, the reports indicated that the Elector Magnetic (EM) survey areas exhibiting higher conductivities may be areas where there is an increased risk for karst feature development and that several of the Electrical Resistivity (ER) profiles exhibited great variability indicative of karst features and low resistive zones may indicate the presence of soil or water filled fractured rock.

Following the ER and EM studies, AAMPA identified locations with increased karst risk for additional study via Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) testing. These probes extended into the subgrade to assess the relative density and consistency of the subsurface soils. While the DCP results did identify areas of karst activity, they did not identify extensive areas of soft or loose soils that would indicate widespread karst development. The geotechnical report includes site specific construction recommendations to mitigate karst related risks.

Recognizing that excavation and construction may pose a potential threat of pollution to waters of the Commonwealth, the Erosion and Sediment Control (E&S) and Post Construction Stormwater Management (PCSM) Plans were developed by utilizing the PADEP E&S Manual, PA Stormwater Best Management Practices Manual, and include ABACT BMPs. Based on the DEP's review of the information provided during permit review process, the Department determined that the project was designed in accordance with Chapter 102 rules and regulations.

3. Summarized Comment: A detailed hydrologic evaluation of the Big Spring and Cool Spring watersheds should be performed to better identify potential pathways from the AAMPA site to the springs. The evaluation should also identify potential threats to downgradient sources so that mitigative measures can be planned. (16, 42, 52, 59)

   Response: A Hydrogeologic Evaluation that included a fracture trace analysis, signed and sealed by a Pennsylvania licensed geologist, was completed for the site. The site-specific Hydrogeologic Evaluation concluded that the proposed development would have little effect on the underlying hydrogeologic conditions primarily because there are no significant karst features or fracture zones that extend from the ground surface to the water table that would facilitate rapid movement of surface water to groundwater. n addition, all infiltrating stormwater, capable of reaching the water table, will be treated by filtering through manufactured devices in the stormwater inlets first, and then suitable soil within the stormwater control measures (SCMs) prior to reaching the native material under the SCMs. The stormwater would then percolate through the native material into the water table several feet below the site. Based on the DEP's review of the information provided in the permit application review process, the DEP determined that AAMPA's proposed management of the

stormwater at this site is consistent with the applicable law, including current guidance and regulatory requirements to protect and maintain Big Spring.

4. Summarized Comment: The plans do not adhere to the DEP's Best Management Practices (BMP) guidance for karst areas. Some commentators provided specific concerns including higher than recommended loading ratios, insufficient distance between the basin bottom and bedrock, and the subsurface facilities are too deep to be inspected and maintained. (1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 44, 45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77)

   Response: The DEP's E&S Manual, BMP Manual, and other guidance documents inform those engaged in earth disturbance activities how to comply with regulations found at 25 Pa. Code Chapter 102. The manuals list various BMPs and design standards which are acceptable in Pennsylvania. BMPs, when designed according to these standards, and properly implemented and maintained, are expected to achieve the regulatory standard of minimizing the potential for accelerated erosion and sedimentation, and at the same time protect, maintain, reclaim and restore water quality and existing and designated uses of surface waters. Alternate BMPs that are not listed in the manuals but that provide the same (or greater) level of protection may also be used to attain the regulatory standard. Proposed the use of alternate BMPs requires demonstrating their effectiveness. Significantly, due to the wide variation in geology and topography in the Commonwealth, the manuals provide flexibility in the design of the stormwater control measures (SCMs) to fit the specific site constraints so long as they meet the applicable requirements.

   Regarding loading ratios, loading ratios are one guideline meant to spread the footprint of the stormwater over a larger area to better ensure the performance of the facility is sustained over the life of the facility, to limit the potential for sinkhole formation in karst geology, and maintain water quality. Higher than recommended loading ratios can be mitigated through providing SCMs throughout the site, limiting the ponding depth to around 2 feet for the more frequent 2 year/24 hour storm event, providing pre-treatment water quality SCMs, and ensuring there is 2 feet of soil between the SCM bottom and the limiting zone. The plans for this project show 14 SCMs spread throughout the 112.8 acre project site with a total SCM footprint of 12.8 acres to infiltrate and manage the stormwater. In addition, the project plans and supporting calculations demonstrate the SCMs will have a ponding depth of less than 2.5 feet, pre-treatment water quality devices that include hydrocarbon (oil, diesel, gas, etcetera) removal capabilities are being provided, and the plans specify that when rock is encountered, the rock will be excavated an additional 2 feet below the SCM bottom and filled with suitable soil or media blend.

   Regarding the distance from basin bottom to bedrock, the BMP Manual recommends a minimum of 2 feet between a limiting zone and a basin bottom. A limiting zone includes bedrock. Where the limiting zone is encountered, it is acceptable and common practice to excavate 2 feet beyond the bottom of the basin and backfill with suitable soil material to achieve the recommended distance. Here, the project plans provide for excavation beyond the basin bottom and backfill with suitable material.

Regarding the depth of the subsurface facilities, the BMP Manual recommends that stormwater management facilities be placed on native material and not on non-native fill to limit the potential for settling. The depth of the facilities shown in AAMPA's project plans correspond to the bottom of the facility being placed on native material. AAMPA's project plans provide inspection manholes and inlets to conduct inspections.

The stormwater management criteria in Chapter 102 require management and treatment of stormwater discharges for rate, volume, and water quality in accordance with the regulations prior to discharge of the stormwater to surface waters. DEP considered the loading ratios along with other relevant guidelines, like ponding depth, within the BMP Manual and the permittee has demonstrated that their project will manage stormwater runoff from the project consistent with the regulations. The designated use of Big Spring will be protected and maintained through implementation of the SCMs and the approved plans.

Related to Special Protection Surface Waters

5. Summarized Comment: The site is about 3400 feet upslope of Big Spring Creek and in its surface watershed. Big Spring Creek is designated as a High Quality/Exceptional Value waterway. Furthermore, Big Spring Creek serves as Newville's secondary water source and the groundwater that creates Big Spring is also the source of water for residential wells in the area. Big Spring Creek is not an ordinary stream. It is a cold, limestone-influenced spring creek whose stability, groundwater inputs, and thermal regime support a self-sustaining wild trout population. These systems are exceptionally sensitive to land-use change. (16, 17, 25, 28, 52, 54)

   Summarized Comment: Big Spring is already suffering ecologically due to the incredibly high New Zealand Mud Snail density. Damaging the geology through which the groundwater flows, increasing stormwater runoff from the impervious surfaces, and further damaging the surrounding area will only cripple it further. The stream and its ecology are important. Anglers, ecologists, and those who drink well water in the surrounding land all use this iconic Newville landmark, and we don't want to see it further damaged. (30)

   Response: Big Spring Creek's aquatic life use is impaired for Organic Enrichment and Siltation. Big Spring Creek's recreational use is impaired for pathogens. The source of each impairment is unknown.

   The stormwater management criteria in Chapter 102 require management and treatment of stormwater discharges for rate, volume, and water quality in accordance with the regulations, including a thermal impacts analysis, prior to discharge of the stormwater to surface waters. Further, the discharges from the proposed project may not cause or contribute to any existing impairments of the receiving surface water, which is Big Spring.

   AMMPA has demonstrated that their project will manage stormwater runoff from the project consistent with the regulations and that the stormwater discharges from the site during and after construction will protect and maintain the designated use of Big Spring through implementation of the SCMs and the approved plans. This demonstration includes the antidegradation analysis found in Module 3 of the application along with the associated information in the approved plans.

Additionally, AAMPA has demonstrated, within the permit application materials, which include geotechnical, geophysical, and hydrogeologic evaluations, the proposed development will ensure that waters of the Commonwealth will be protected and maintained. The SCMs proposed in the approved plans were evaluated by AAMPA for applicability in karst terrain, alternative SCMs were evaluated, and the permittee has demonstrated to DEP's satisfaction that the SCMs are appropriate and adequate for use at the project site.

6. Comment: Should the Department issue a permit allowing the facility to be constructed DEP must require that the developer fund the reinstallation of the stream gage on the upper section of Big Spring Creek by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). The gage must not only monitor stream discharge but also include sensors for turbidity, specific conductance, temperature, dissolved oxygen, and pH. Gage installation must occur prior to any blasting or construction on the site of the proposed project. (58)

   Response: The Department considered whether stream monitoring at Big Spring Creek was needed and determined that in-stream monitoring was neither reasonable nor necessary given the existing regulatory framework and the proposed design of this project. Further, funding and installing USGS stream gages is outside DEP's authority.

   Additionally, there are no express or implicit requirements to conduct stream monitoring as requested by the commentator for this type of project. For this project, DEP determined that stream monitoring was not necessary because the applicant's proposed control measures are adequately designed to ensure that the water quality will be protected.

   For this project, stream monitoring would not be informative regarding the adequacy of the site-specific BMPs proposed in the permit application because streams are dynamic systems that are constantly changing -- impacted and modified not only by human activity (ie. the agricultural and industrial land uses in the area surrounding this project), but by weather and other natural phenomena.

   Significantly, as part of the permit application process, AAMPA compiled substantial information regarding the site's preconstruction conditions which are the basis for the natural stormwater management systems that exist onsite. AAMPA submitted to the DEP detailed descriptions and technical plan drawings of each site-specific BMP, including calculations and narratives prepared by a licensed professional that articulate how those selected BMPs will work to keep the stormwater on the site to mimic the preconstruction natural management of the stormwater.

   Importantly, at the request of project commentators, AAMPA has voluntarily agreed to conduct in-stream monitoring for pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and specific conductance in Big Spring Creek. Monitoring covers pre-construction, during construction, and post-construction time periods. See the permittee's Surface Water Monitoring Plan dated February 5, 2026 for details.

7. Summarized Comment: Sample the water down gradient of the site so the people will know what is coming off the site. It should be sampled for a number of years. (39, 59)

Response: The Department considered whether stream monitoring at Big Spring Creek was needed and determined that in-stream monitoring was neither reasonable nor necessary given the existing regulatory framework and the proposed design of this project.

Additionally, there are no express or implicit requirements to conduct stream monitoring as requested by the commentator for this type of project. For this project, DEP determined that stream monitoring was not necessary because the applicant's proposed control measures are adequately designed to ensure that the water quality will be protected.

For this project, stream monitoring would not be informative regarding the adequacy of the site-specific BMPs proposed in the permit application because streams are dynamic systems that are constantly changing -- impacted and modified not only by human activity (ie. the agricultural and industrial land uses in the area surrounding this project), but by weather and other natural phenomena.

The DEP has determined that AAMPA has satisfied the applicable Commonwealth statutory and regulatory requirements for obtaining the Chapter 102 permit associated with this project.

However, Part A, Section III.G. of the permit specifies that DEP/CCD may require additional monitoring where an increased risk of potential water pollution is present, or water pollution is suspected to be occurring from a construction activity subject to this permit, or for any reason in accordance with 25 Pa. Code §92a.61 (relating to monitoring). The permittee or co-permittee must commence such monitoring upon notification from DEP/CCD. (25 Pa. Code §92a.61(b.))

Importantly, at the request of project commentators, AAMPA has voluntarily agreed to conduct in-stream monitoring for pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and specific conductance in Big Spring Creek. Monitoring covers pre-construction, during construction, and post-construction time periods. See the permittee's Surface Water Monitoring Plan dated February 5, 2026 for details.

8. Comment: The DEP's announcement (Draft Issuance Public Notice) states that Big Spring Creek is designated as High-Quality, Cold Water Fish (HQ-CWF) . It fails to mention that the upper section of the stream is Exceptional Value (EV). This will make permitting much more difficult since the EV designation does not allow for any degradation or change in water quality. (58)

   Response: DEP has reviewed the information provided during the permit review process and determined that AAMPA has demonstrated that the project meets the applicable requirements for special protection watersheds and that stormwater runoff will be managed in accordance with the applicable law.

   While it is accurate that the upper reach of the Big Spring Creek has a designated use of EV, the project site only has the potential to discharge surface stormwater into a downstream section of the creek designated as HQ-CWF.

9. Summarized Comment: The Big Spring is a warm spring and open all year round. In cold weather, the spring provides a food and roosting source for many birds. The blasting will disturb the birds and their migratory patterns. (5)

   Response: Blasting will be in accordance with the required DEP Blasting Activity regulatory and industry standards. Blasting activity permit and permit-by-rule blasting projects protect wildlife by enforcing standards that minimize ground vibration and noise.

Related to Public and Private Water Supplies

10. Summarized Comments: The site is approximately 3400 feet upgradient of the Big Spring Creek which serves as a secondary public water source for Newville and the surrounding areas. Blasting will create new subsurface pathways allowing stormwater and the pollutants (oils, greases, other hydrocarbons) in the stormwater to flow into the Big Spring Creek, a secondary public water supply source. (Same as Comment 4, additionally 14, 43, 52, 59, 62, 7

11. Summarized Comment: Given the geology and sinkholes in the area, the concern is for private well water contamination due to the stormwater from the project. (Same as Comment 4, Additionally 16, 22, 52, 55, 76)

    Response: The stormwater management criteria in Chapter 102 require management and treatment of stormwater discharges for rate, volume, and water quality in accordance with the regulations prior to discharge of the stormwater to surface waters. The applicant has demonstrated that the project will manage stormwater runoff from the project consistent with the regulations.

    Additionally, the permit terms and conditions ensure protection of waters of the Commonwealth. In particular, Part C.XII.C. of permit PAD210118 prohibits the discharge of non-stormwater discharges, except as specifically identified in Part C.I.B of the permit Additionally, 25 Pa Code § 102.5(l) and Permit Condition, Part A, Section II.B.4. requires the permittee to design, install, implement, and maintain effective pollution prevention measures to minimize the discharge of pollutants and includes the requirement to prepare and implement a Preparedness, Prevention, and Contingency (PPC) plan for certain types of activities at the site, such as the storage, use, or transportation of materials including: fuels, chemicals, solvents, and other similar materials. Part C., Section VIII also requires the development of PPC plans if toxic, hazardous, or other polluting materials will be on site. Further, Part C, Section XI. requires the permittee to ensure that various personnel understand the requirements of the permit, including the PPC plan.

    The permittee has selected SCMs that treat for non-stormwater constituents such as in the case of hydrocarbon spills. An example is the proposed use of FlexStorm filter bags that are fitted with oil-capture membranes. See approved PCSM plan and the permittee's Supplemental Information and Response to Public Comments Received, dated February 6, 2026 for details.

Further, the permittee is required by the local municipal land development approval to ensure adequate protection of neighboring water-supply wells and other properties. Please see the permittee's Supplemental Information and Response to Public Comments Received, dated February 5, 2026 and Exhibit A of West Pennsboro Township's Conditional Use approval for more details.

Finally, except for limited water use registration requirements identified in PA Act 220, the DEP does not regulate private well water withdrawals, treatment, or well water protection measures. Any testing, treatment, or protection of private well water is at the discretion and expense of the landowner with limited exceptions for when a source cause/responsible party for a well contamination can be identified.

Blasting will be in accordance with the required DEP Blasting Activity regulatory and industry standards, which have proven to keep underlying geologic conditions intact. UIn accordance with the applicable law, blasting cannot exceed 2 inches per second (ips) peak particle velocity. Peak particle velocity is the maximum speed at which a particle of the ground moves as a wave of vibrational energy from a blast passes. The guideline of 2 ips was established by the U.S. Bureau of Mines after a multi-year comprehensive study which determined 2 ips will not damage a nearby structure. Note that it takes significantly more energy to damage subsurface structures than it does to damage an above ground structure as surface structures can amplify ground motion. Additionally, as noted by AAMPA, the physics of blasting itself will further ensure that impacts to the project site's underlying geology is minimized, as the energy that is released during a blast is directed upwards to fracture rock, not downward. The upward dispersion of energy follows the path of least resistance, which enables site development to be carried out in a way that does not cause undue impacts to underlying geologic features.

Related to Land Use

12. Summarized Comment: There are numerous places to build a warehouse outside of the Big Spring watershed. The need for increased commerce must be balanced with environmental stewardship. (20)

    Summarized Comment: The area does not need another warehouse that provides minimal skilled employment and truck traffic that increases the potential for increased trash and dirty stormwater runoff. (28)

    Summarized Comment: We are completely opposed to the plan, and want your agency to comply with it's own standards and protocols to protect our natural resources, and to keep PA citizens healthy. Warehouses are a blight on the landscape, hog resources and offer low paying jobs with few career options. (4, 33)

    Summarized Comment: With the warehouses, there will be increased litter, trash, and other pollutants going into the spring. No warehouses along the Big Spring. (47)

Comment: This project must be stopped! We already have lost too much prime land to warehouses, many of which are not even leased. Big Spring is a treasure and must be saved as it's one of the best and last remaining areas to fish in this area. (32)

Summarized Comment: The Big Spring Watershed is not a good spot for warehouses. I have no faith that the contractors and eventual operators of the building will not eventually have an accident and cause pollution to the Big Spring. (3)

Response: The DEP has considered these comments. The DEP has determined that the applicant has satisfied the applicable Commonwealth statutory and regulatory requirements for obtaining the Chapter 102 permit associated with this project. To the extent that these comments seek to address zoning issues and land use concerns, please note that the municipality was provided a Municipal Notification of Planned Land Development for Chapter 102 permits in accordance with Acts 14, 67, 68 and 127 on December 6, 2023, in which the municipality had 30 days to provide comments; The municipality signed the form indicating there is no zoning conflict and did not provide any additional comments to the DEP for the application.

Related to Public Notification

13. Summarized Comment: Both during construction and during the operation of the finished facility, there is the potential for diesel and other hydrocarbon spills at the site. Clarify how the public will be informed of the potential contamination. (22)

    Response: The permit terms and conditions ensure protection of waters of the Commonwealth. In particular, Part C.XII.C. of permit PAD210118 prohibits the discharge of non-stormwater discharges, except as specifically identified in Part C.I.B of the permit Additionally, 25 Pa Code § 102.5(l) and Permit Condition, Part A, Section II.B.4. requires the permittee to design, install, implement, and maintain effective pollution prevention measures to minimize the discharge of pollutants and includes the requirement to prepare and implement a Preparedness, Prevention, and Contingency (PPC) plan for certain types of activities at the site, such as the storage, use, or transportation of materials including: fuels, chemicals, solvents, and other similar materials. Part C., Section VIII also requires the development of PPC plans if toxic, hazardous, or other polluting materials will be on site. Further, Part C, Section XI. requires the permittee to ensure that various personnel understand the requirements of the permit, including the PPC plan.

    In the event of a spill at the site, the permit requires the immediate reporting any incident causing or threatening pollution in accordance with the requirements of 25 Pa. Code §§ 91.33 and 92a.41(b). This requirement includes immediate notification to downstream users of the waters of the Commonwealth to which the substance was discharged if notice is reasonably possible. Notice must include the location and nature of the discharge. The permittee must also immediately take or cause to be taken steps necessary to prevent injury to property and downstream users of the waters from pollution.

General Comments to the Project

14. Summarized Comment: We deserve clean air and water. Preserve the resources we have. (48)

    Response: DEP ensures protection of public natural resources by evaluating the potential environmental impacts of this project and by administering the applicable environmental laws through its comprehensive regulatory framework, permitting programs and other policies.

    The application submitted for this project was evaluated in accordance the applicable law, including The Clean Streams Law, 35 P.S. 691.1-691.1001, and 25 Pa. Code Chapters 92a (relating to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permitting, Monitoring and Compliance), 93 (relating to Water Quality Standards) and 102 (relating to Erosion and Sediment Control) consistent Article I, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, PA. CONST. art I, § 27. Specifically, DEP has evaluated the criteria established to minimize the potential for accelerated erosion and sedimentation and to manage post-construction stormwater associated with construction activities to ensure protection of waters of the Commonwealth. A "National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Individual Permit For Discharge of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activities" is required for this project and provides NPDES coverage for stormwater discharges associated with construction activities in satisfaction of state (25 Pa. Code 92a.1(b) and 102.5(a)) and federal (40 CFR 122.26(b)(14)(x) and 122.26(b)(15)) regulations, subject to the terms and conditions of the permit. In issuing this permit, DEP determined that the application and supporting plans and documents including the Erosion and Sediment Control (E&S) Plan and Post-Construction Stormwater Management (PCSM) Plan met the applicable regulations and requirements.

    Additionally, DEP evaluated this project in accordance with the applicable law, considered all the comments submitted, and concluded that the project will not cause unreasonable degradation, depletion, diminution of public natural resources. In order to make this conclusion and satisfy the necessary obligations, DEP coordinated with other state and local trustees of the Commonwealth's natural resources, including the municipality and state resource agencies. The municipality was provided a Municipal Notification of Planned Land Development for Chapter 102 permits in accordance with Acts 14, 67, 68 and 127 on December 6, 2023, in which the municipality had 30 days to provide comments. The municipality signed the form indicating there is no zoning conflict and did not provide any additional comments to the DEP for the application.

    Additionally, DEP coordinated internally regarding other potential environmental impacts. Regarding issues related to air quality, this permit requires compliance with all applicable laws, including any local air quality ordinances DEP's air quality requirements. Specifically, idling trucks shall comply with Act 124 of 2008: Diesel-Powered Motor Vehicle Idling. Fugitive dust control measures shall demonstrate compliance with 25 Pa. Code Chapters 121 and 123. In particular, 25 Pa Code § 123.1(c) requires that a person responsible for sources such as unpaved roadways, stockpiles and blasting operations shall take all reasonable actions to prevent particulate matter from becoming airborne. These actions include, but not

be limited to, the following: (1) Use, where possible, of water or chemicals for control of dust in the demolition of buildings or structures, construction operations, the grading of roads or the clearing of land.; (2) Application of asphalt, oil, water or suitable chemicals on dirt roads, material stockpiles and other surfaces which may give rise to airborne dusts.; (3) Paving and maintenance of roadways.; (4) Prompt removal of earth or other material from paved streets onto which earth or other material has been transported by trucking or earth moving equipment, erosion by water, or other means. Also, any backup power generation on site must comply with applicable air quality permitting requirements in 25 Pa. Code Chapter 127, and any applicable federal regulations, such as 40 CFR 60, Subpart IIII—Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines; 40 CFR Part 60 Subpart JJJJ - Standards of Performance for Stationary Spark Ignition Internal Combustion Engines; and/or 40 CFR 63, Subpart ZZZZ—National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines. DEP enforces these regulations.

Chapter 102, as well as other regulations, permits and policies implemented by the Department under Pennsylvania's environmental laws, establishes a comprehensive regulatory scheme for earth disturbance activities to ensure protection of public health, safety and the environment.

15. Commenters provided background history regarding land use around the Big Spring and the recreational use of the spring. (25, 41, 68, 73, 74)

    Response: DEP reviewed and considered these comments.

    To the extent the commentators expressed concern regarding land use, please note that DEP's framework for preventing pollution from land development-based changes in stormwater runoff focuses on site planning and BMP utilization that mimics a site's natural management of precipitation before construction – the goal is to replicate that natural hydrologic conditions of watersheds to the maximum extent practicable.

    This project utilizes planning and BMPs that mimic the site's natural management of precipitation before construction. Additionally, DEP reviewed the designated and existing use classifications of the aquatic and recreational resources impacted by this project during its review of the permit application to ensure compliance with DEP's antidegradation requirements in 25 Pa. Code Chapter 93. DEP concluded that the project will not cause unreasonable degradation, depletion, diminution of public natural resources coordinating with the municipality. The municipality was provided a Municipal Notification of Planned Land Development for Chapter 102 permits in accordance with Acts 14, 67, 68 and 127 on December 6, 2023, in which the municipality had 30 days to provide comments; The municipality signed the form indicating there is no zoning conflict and did not provide any additional comments to the DEP for the application.

16. Summarized Comments: Multiple commentators provided anecdotes about the aesthetic value, history of Big Spring Creek and the life along the Big Spring Creek. Commentators provided nostalgic reflections of living in the area and along the creek in addition to wildlife viewing opportunities that the creek provides. Further, commentators relayed the local

economic value that the Big Spring Creek provides related to recreation angling, including guide services that are rendered. These collective comments expressed concerns that actions and measures should be taken to ensure Big Spring Creek is protected from development and this proposed warehouse project and to ensure the water quality is protected and maintained. (3, 5, 9, 14, 28, 41, 43, 45, 47, 48, 52, 54, 73)

Response: DEP acknowledges the multitude of aesthetic and intrinsic values and recreational opportunities that the Big Spring Creek provides. The stormwater management criteria in Chapter 102 require management and treatment of stormwater discharges for rate, volume, and water quality in accordance with the regulations prior to discharge of the stormwater to surface waters. The DEP has thoroughly reviewed and evaluated the permit application and the permittee has demonstrated that their project will manage stormwater runoff from the project consistent with the Chapter 102 regulations and those found in 25 Pa. Code §§93 and 92a. DEP has considered the full impact of the project in accordance with our statutory authority and Article 1, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution and determined the designated use of Big Spring will be protected and maintained through implementation of the SCMs and the approved plans.

17. Summarized Comments on land use, emergency services support, sewage concerns, etc.: The warehouses are going to go in because DEP has a job to do. Warehouses do not contribute to the community and quality of life, either voluntarily or when specifically asked. The warehouses are a detriment to the environment and wasteful in resources. 30% of the fire calls are because of the warehouses. DEP does not live here and will not be the ones who bear the brunt of fire response, increased traffic accidents and fatalities. The current municipal sewage treatment facility already has more EDUs permitted to it than it has capacity and the cost of the upgrades will be passed on to all the customers. The warehouses and highway rest area have taken all the sewage capacity and there is none left for Centerville or other economic development. (74)

    Response: Land use in Pennsylvania is governed by local municipalities and municipal planning and zoning. Concerned parties may confer with the municipality about these concerns. However, DEP's framework for preventing pollution from land development-based changes in stormwater runoff focuses on site planning and BMP utilization that mimics a site's natural management of precipitation before construction – the goal is to replicate the natural hydrologic conditions of watersheds to the maximum extent practicable.

    This project utilizes planning and BMPs that mimic the site's natural management of precipitation before construction. Additionally, DEP reviewed the designated and existing use classifications of the aquatic and recreational resources impacted by this project during its review of the permit application to ensure compliance with DEP's antidegradation requirements in 25 Pa. Code Chapter 93. DEP concluded that the project will not cause unreasonable degradation, depletion, diminution of public natural resources coordinating with the municipality. The municipality was provided a Municipal Notification of Planned Land Development for Chapter 102 permits in accordance with Acts 14, 67, 68 and 127 on December 6, 2023, in which the municipality had 30 days to provide comments; The municipality signed the form indicating there is no zoning conflict and did not provide any additional comments to the DEP for the application.

Further, DEP coordinated with the DEP Clean Water Program related to the comments about sewage disposal and capacity in the community. This project received sewage planning approval from DEP on July 25, 2025. A total of 6,790 gpd was approved to be discharged to the West Pennsboro Municipal Authority's collection and conveyance system and the Newville Borough Water Sewer Authority collection and conveyance system with treatment at the Newville Water Sewer Authority WWTP. During the review the DEP received a capacity certification from West Pennsboro Township and Newville Water and Sewer Authority stating they have capacity to receive the 6,790 gpd without causing an overload or projected overload over the next 2-5 years. In general, the DEP does not have any sewage concerns about the existing and proposed development in the tributaries to the Newville Borough's WWTP.

Additionally, West Pennsboro Township has an approved Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan. The Act 537 plan was approved on April 11, 2994 with an update revision being approved by DEP on September 27, 2001. The Act 537 plan governs how sewage disposal needs will be met within the Township. The commentator did not provide site specific information for DEP to identify whether the other alleged project mentioned in testimony have sewage planning approval. How wastewater flows or Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) are assigned and to whom they are assigned is the responsibility of the local government. DEP does not engage in how local governments assign available wastewater capacity or EDUs or to which development types. Concerned parties may confer with the municipality and/or local sewer authority about concerns related to the local sewerage capacity and assignment of wastewater flows or EDUs or how much sewage capacity is available for additional development.

During a sewage planning determination, the DEP verifies the submittal meets all the requirements in the regulations with the focus on verification that the sewage flows proposed can be handled by the collection and conveyance system and the WWTP with no potential for a hydraulic or organic overload.

Based on West Pennsboro Township's and Newville Borough's 2025 Chapter 94 report shows no issues with existing overloads and no projected overloads in the collection and conveyance system over the next two years. In general, the DEP does not have any sewage concerns about the existing and proposed development in the tributaries to the Newville Borough's WWTP.

18. Summarized Comments: I'm not really here to talk to DEP but to the hearing attendees. The DEP public hearing is only to make you (the public) feel better. The permit is going to be approved and I have seen it happen right here in Cumberland County. In addition, when your well water goes bad and you call DEP, DEP is going to say that the water in Big Spring was bad before the warehouse went in, its been impaired since before the warehouses went in and they are not going to fix your well. Question for the public is, what are you going to do about it? will you call your legislators? will you call Governor Shapiro and tell them you don't like this going on in my backyard? DEP is under pressure to get this permit approved. That's how it works in Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania has a program to get this done as fast as possible.(68)

Response: DEP values public participation as part of DEP's permit review processes and considers all comments as part of the permit application review that are received during formal public comment periods. Public hearings are not required in all instances for Individual NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit applications. However, DEP determined there was significant public interest in the permit application for the proposed warehouse and opted to hold a public hearing to provide the public with the opportunity to take testimony and provide additional comments about the permit application. Importantly, the DEP has also considered all comments that were received outside of the formal public comment periods prescribed by the regulations.

When DEP receives complaints about the private well contamination and conducts an investigation, any findings are based upon the evidence that can be gathered during the investigation. When sources of well contamination can be identified, DEP has the authority to act as necessary to hold a responsible party accountable. However, except for limited water use registration requirements identified in PA Act 220, the DEP does not regulate private well water withdrawals, treatment, or well water protection measures. Any testing, treatment, or protection of private well water is at the discretion and expense of the landowner with limited exceptions for when a source cause/responsible party for a well contamination can be identified.

Finally, DEP has permit review processes and programs that guide how permit applications are reviewed and guide or direct the timeframes within such applications must be reviewed within, such as the Pennsylvania PAyback program. However, such programs don't guide or direct that DEP disregard regulatory requirements during a review or that reviews are not to be conducted in a thoughtful and thorough manner, in accordance with regulatory and statutory requirements. DEP conducted a thorough review of this permit application, considered all public comments and determined that the applicant demonstrated compliance with all applicable regulatory standards related to the earth disturbance and stormwater management activities proposed.