Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection

CHAPTER 102
NPDES INDIVIDUAL PERMIT
FACT SHEET

Revised 1/12/2026

The checklists contained in this fact sheet are intended to provide guidance to staff reviewing the NOI or application but are not intended to be inclusive of all administrative and technical considerations; staff may supplement the information in these checklists with additional factors prescribed under regulations.

Applicant and Project Information

Applicant Name:	AAMPA Holdings, LLC	Application No.:	PAD210118
Applicant Address:	1514 Commerce Avenue, Suite 203	Project Name:	AAMPA Holdings - Ritner Hwy
City, State, ZIP:	Carlisle, PA 17015	Project Address:	3485 Ritner Highway
County:	Cumberland	City, State, ZIP:	Newville, PA 17241
Municipality:	West Pennsboro Township	Receiving Water(s):	Big Spring Creek
Application Type:	New	Chapter 93 Class.:	HQ-CWF, MF
Project Site Area:	112.8 acres	Disturbance Area:	112.8 acres

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 constructd to manage runoff volume, peak rate, and quality.

☐ The entire project qualifies as a site restoration project.

☐ The project involves floodplain restoration or gravity wells

☐ SPEED QP Name: QP Company:

Reviews:
- ☑ Completeness — Completed By: Cumberland County Conservation District
- ☑ E&S Technical — Completed By: Cumberland County Conservation District
  - ☑ E&S Standard Checklist ☐ E&S Expanded Checklist
- ☑ PCSM Technical — Completed By: Cumberland County Conservation District

Recommendations and Signatures

Recommended Action	Name / Signature	Title	Date
Issue Final Permit	Michael W. Lubinsky, P.E.	District Engineer	4/17/2026
Issue Final Permit	Vincent McCollum	District Manager	4/17/2026
Issue Final Permit	Nathan Phillips	DEP Permits Chief	4/21/2026

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection

Revised 1/12/2026

Application Tracking Sheet

Date Application Received:	12/22/2023

Correct Administrative Filing Fee Submitted?	Yes
Correct Disturbed Acreage Fee Submitted?	Yes
Correct District-Specific Fee(s) Submitted?	Yes
Upfront Processing Completion Due Date:	12/29/2023
Upfront Processing Completion Date:	12/27/2023

Completeness Review Start Date:	12/28/2023
Completeness Review Due Date:	1/18/2024
Were Completeness Deficiencies Identified?	Yes
Were Only Minor Deficiencies Identified?	No
Date Applicant and/or Consultant Notified:	
Date Minor Deficiencies Corrected:	
Date Incompleteness Letter Sent:	4/11/2024
Incompleteness Letter Response Due Date:	6/10/2024
Was an Extension Requested?	No
Was an Extension Granted?	
Extension Length (Calendar Days):	
Incompleteness Letter Response Received?	Yes
Date Incompleteness Letter Response Received:	5/21/2024
Did the Response Resolve the Deficiencies?	Yes
Date Application Deemed Complete:	6/13/2024

First Technical Review Start Date:	6/14/2024
First Technical Review Due Date:	8/20/2024
Were Technical Deficiencies Identified?	Yes
Were Only Minor Deficiencies Identified?	No
Date Applicant and/or Consultant Notified:	
Date Minor Deficiencies Corrected:	
Date Technical Deficiency Letter Sent:	11/4/2024
No. Calendar Days Provided for a Response:	30

Technical Deficiency Letter Response Due Date:	12/4/2024
Was an Extension Requested?	Yes
Was an Extension Granted?	Yes
Extension Length (Calendar Days):	
Technical Deficiency Letter Response Received?	Yes
Date Deficiency Letter Response Received:	12/26/2024

Second Technical Review Start Date:	12/27/2024
Second Technical Review Due Date:	1/27/2025
Did Response Resolve Deficiencies?	No
Second Technical Review Completion Date:	1/16/2025

Draft Individual Permit Issuance Date:	4/24/2025
Draft Individual Permit PA Bulletin Posting Date:	5/10/2025
Public Comment Period End Date:	6/9/2025

Individual Permit Pre-Denial Letter Date:	

Application Enters Elevated Review?	Yes
Date of Elevated Review Memo:	2/20/2025
Date of Elevated Review Meeting:	3/5/2025
Due Date for Corrections:	3/7/2025
Did Response Resolve Deficiencies?	No
Date Corrections Received:	3/7/2025

Public Comments Were Received? [1]	Yes
Are Responses to Public Comments Attached?	Yes
Was a Public Hearing Held?	Yes
Date of Public Hearing:	8/14/2025
Comment-Response Document Was Prepared:	Yes

Site-Specific Conditions Added to Permit? [1]	No
Explanation of Site-Specific Conditions:	

Reviewer Comments:

Additional deficiencies were remaining after receipt of the response to the Elevated Review Memo. Those deficiencies were emailed to the DEP on 3/10/2025 and to the Applicant on 3/21/2025. The response to that email was received on 3/28/2025 and all remaining deficiencies were adequately addressed.

Public comment period was extended through the date of the public hearing.

1 These sections are required if public comments were received and/or site-specific conditions were added to an individual permit.

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection

CHAPTER 102
NPDES INDIVIDUAL PERMIT
FACT SHEET

Revised 1/12/2026

Reviewed By: M. Lubinsky, M. Stough Office: Cumberland County Conservation District

NPDES INDIVIDUAL COMPLETENESS REVIEW CHECKLIST

	COMPLETENESS ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A	Citation
1	All applicable sections of the application (3800-PM-BCW0408b) are complete.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(1)
a.	The Compliance History section appears to be accurate and there are no conditions per the SOP that would preclude issuance for compliance history.	✓			
b.	The person who signed the application is either: 1) a responsible corporate officer (president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, or manager authorized to make decisions); 2) a general partner or proprietor; or 3) a principal executive officer or ranking elected official.	✓			
c.	The Total Area of Earth Disturbance as reported in the Project Site and Earth Disturbance Information Section of the application appears to be accurate based on the LOD shown on E&S Plan Drawings.	✓			
d.	If any portion of the site is in an HQ/EV watershed or is contaminated (soil exceeding Act 2 standards) or if there are discharges to impaired waters (including Chesapeake Bay), the applicant is proposing to use non-discharge alternatives or ABACT BMPs.	✓			
2	The General Information Form (GIF) (4700-PM-CEE0001) has been submitted, is generally complete, and has been signed by someone identified in 1.b above.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(1)
3	The Administrative Filing Fee ($1,500) and CCD-specific fees were submitted (as applicable).	✓			§ 102.6(b)(1)
4	The correct Disturbed Acreage Fee was submitted ($100 x Total Acres Earth Disturbance reported in the Earth Disturbance Information Section of the application, rounded to the nearest whole acre).	✓			§ 102.6(b)(1)
5	The County Notification Form (3800-FM-BCW0271b) has been submitted.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(1)
a.	The county has signed the form.		✓		
6	The Municipal Notification Form (3800-FM-BCW0271c) has been submitted.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(1)
a.	The municipality has signed the form.	✓			
7	Proof of county and/or municipal receipt of notification forms was submitted.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(1)
8	A valid PNDI receipt was submitted.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(2)
a.	The receipt is not expected to expire prior to anticipated authorization of permit coverage.	✓			
b.	The receipt is a final (not draft) receipt.	✓			
9	PNDI clearance letter(s) from the appropriate agencies were submitted.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(2)
10	E&S Module 1 (3800-PM-BCW0406a) was submitted.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(1)
a.	All applicable questions in Module 1 have been completed.	✓			
11	Final E&S Plan Drawings were submitted (not identified as "preliminary").	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(ix)
a.	E&S BMPs shown on Drawings align with BMPs identified in Module 1.	✓			
b.	The Drawings include existing and proposed topography (including any temporary contours) with appropriate contour labels.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(i)
c.	The Drawings include the project site boundary.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(iii)
d.	The Drawings include the limit of earth disturbance within the project site.	✓			
e.	The Drawings show receiving surface water(s) and watershed boundaries, if applicable, within the project site and floodway or floodplain.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(v)
f.	The Drawings identify all discharge points.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(ix)
g.	The Drawings show the location of all BMPs and drainage areas to the BMPs as applicable.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(vi)
h.	The Drawings show existing and proposed utilities and site improvements.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(iii)

i.	The Drawings show existing and proposed riparian buffer(s), if applicable.			✓	§ 102.4(b)(5)(xv)
j.	The Drawings show proposed off-site support activities, if applicable.			✓	§ 102.4(b)(5)(iii)
k.	The Drawings provide for protection of infiltration PCSM SCMs until drainage areas are completely stabilized, if applicable.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(vii)
l.	The Drawings provide a sequence of BMP installation and removal in relation to the scheduling of earth disturbance activities, prior to, during and after earth disturbance activities.	✓			
m.	The Drawings (or separate narrative) identify a maintenance program which provides for the operation and maintenance of BMPs and the inspection of BMPs on a weekly basis and after each stormwater event.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(x)
n.	The Drawings (or separate narrative) identify procedures which ensure that proper measures for the recycling or disposal of materials associated with or from the project site will be undertaken.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(xi)
o.	The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed PNDI receipt, if applicable.	✓			§ 102.4(c)
p.	The Drawing(s) show E&S BMP construction or installation details.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(ix)
12	E&S Standard Worksheets (or equivalent) and supporting calculations were submitted.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(viii)
13	PCSM Module 2 (3800-PM-BCW0406b) was submitted.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(1)
a.	All applicable questions in Module 2 have been completed.	✓			
b.	A printout or file containing ***DEP's Pre-Development Site Characterization (PDSC) Spreadsheet*** was submitted.			✓	
14	Final PCSM Plan Drawings were submitted (not identified as "preliminary").	✓			§ 102.8(f)(9)
a.	PCSM SCMs shown on Drawings align with SCMs identified in Module 2 and ***DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet*** (as applicable).	✓			
b.	The Drawing(s) include existing and proposed topography with appropriate contour labels.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(1)
c.	The Drawing(s) include the project site boundary and limit of disturbance.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(3)
d.	The Drawing(s) show receiving surface water(s) and watershed boundaries, if applicable, within the project site and floodway or floodplain.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(5)
e.	The Drawing(s) identify all discharge points and points of analysis.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(9)
f.	The Drawing(s) show the location of all SCMs with identifiers cross-referenced to PCSM Module 2.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(6)
g.	Details were provided for all PCSM SCMs.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(9)
h.	The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed utilities and site improvements.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(3)
i.	The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed riparian buffer(s), if applicable.			✓	§ 102.8(f)(14)
j.	The Drawing(s) show proposed off-site support activities, if applicable.			✓	§ 102.8(f)(3)
k.	The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed PNDI receipt, if applicable.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(15)
l.	The Drawing(s) show the sequence of PCSM SCM implementation and identify a schedule of inspections for critical stages of SCM installation.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(7)
m.	The Drawing(s) provide a long-term operation and maintenance (O&M) schedule.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(10)
n.	The Drawing(s) provide procedures for recycling or disposing of materials.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(11)
o.	The Drawing(s) show sensitive features including sinkholes, surface depressions, soil contamination hot spots, and wetlands, if applicable.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(2)
p.	The Drawing(s) show the location of test pits or borings used for infiltration testing as cross-referenced to the ***PDSC Spreadsheet***.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(1)
q.	The Drawings show the location of all SCMs and drainage areas to the SCMs as applicable.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(9)
15	SCM design calculations were submitted (e.g., hydrographs and other model output or calculations).	✓			§ 102.8(f)(8)
16	Pre- and post-construction runoff volumes were calculated using ***DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet - Volume Worksheet*** or stormwater analysis calculations were submitted that quantify the pre- and post-construction runoff volumes and pollutant loads up to the 2-year/24-hour storm.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(2)

17	A printout or file containing ***DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet - Volume Worksheet*** was submitted and completed in full.	✓			
	a. Calculations were provided that demonstrate how the net change in volume up to the 2-year/24-hour storm will be managed or how an Act 167 or alternative design standard will be met through SCMs.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(2)
18	A printout or file containing ***DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet – Rate Worksheet*** was submitted and completed in full (*the complete worksheet rather than the Summary of Peak Rates table was completed*).		✓		
	a. Calculations were provided to quantify pre- and post-construction peak rates for the 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year/24-hour storms.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(3)
	b. Calculations were provided that demonstrate how the net change in rate for the 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year/24-hour storms will be managed or how an Act 167 or alternative design standard will be met through SCMs.	✓			
19	A printout or file containing ***DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet – Quality Worksheet*** was submitted.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(2)
20	A wetland determination report was submitted if E&S Module 1 identified hydric soils.			✓	
	a. Wetlands were identified on-site.			✓	§ 102.4(b)(5)(v)
	b. A wetland delineation report was submitted with a map identifying the wetland boundaries on the project site.			✓	
21	An Act 537 sewage planning approval letter was submitted.		✓		§ 102.6(a)(1)
22	An Act 2 release of liability letter was submitted (applicable if the Project Site and Earth Disturbance Information section of the application indicates the site is enrolled or was previously enrolled in the Act 2 program).			✓	§ 102.6(a)(1)
23	Test pit / boring logs for the pre-development site characterization were submitted.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(1)
24	Phase I or II Environmental Site Assessment(s) (ESA(s)) were submitted.			✓	§ 102.4(b)(5)(ii)
25	A Pollutant Characterization and Minimization (PCM) Plan has been submitted for known contaminated soils or groundwater on-site.			✓	
	a. ABACT E&S BMPs are specified during construction, at a minimum.			✓	
	b. A Professional Geologist (PG), certified Soils Scientist, or other licensed professional with experience and training in the fate and transport of pollutants in soils has evaluated the site to determine if additional E&S BMPs should be implemented during construction activities to minimize the discharge of pollutants.			✓	
	c. A PG, certified Soils Scientist, or other licensed professional with experience and training in the fate and transport of pollutants in soils has evaluated the site to determine the feasibility of infiltration-based PCSM SCMs.			✓	§ 102.4(b)(5)(ii)
	d. For sites with contaminated groundwater, a PG or other licensed professional with training and experience in hydrogeology has evaluated the site to determine whether infiltration-based PCSM SCMs will promote off-site migration of a contaminant plume through the use of modeling software.			✓	
	e. A map showing the extent of groundwater contamination on-site has been submitted with pollutant concentrations and sampling locations, if applicable.			✓	
26	If contamination is present on-site, a map showing the extent of soil contamination has been submitted.			✓	§ 102.4(b)(5)(ii)
27	A map showing the area investigated for pre-development infiltration capabilities, which corresponds to the area identified in the ***PDSC Spreadsheet*** , has been submitted.			✓	§ 102.8(g)(1)
28	If the site is in an active karst area, a geotechnical report has been submitted to document subsurface conditions on-site.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(1)
29	One or more MRC SCMs is proposed.	✓			
	a. For MRC SCMs meeting the Simplified MRC Design Standards, an MRC Simplified Design Spreadsheet has been completed and submitted.				§ 102.8(f)(8)
	b. For MRC SCMs not meeting the Simplified MRC Design Standards, the MRC Spreadsheet has been completed and submitted.			✓	
30	If the applicant is a private business, legal documentation identifying members, owners, partners, etc. has been submitted.			✓	§ 102.6(a)(1)

31	Erosion Potential (EP) Analysis Form(s) (3800-FM-BCW0271h) were submitted for each discharge point (DP) expected to receive concentrated flows during and following construction.			✓	
	a. Color photos of proposed flow paths have been attached to the form(s).			✓	
	b. Critical section(s) of flow paths where EP Analysis has been completed are shown on E&S and/or PCSM Drawings.			✓	§ 102.4(c)
	c. Calculations documenting peak discharge rate from SCMs at the 10-year/24-hour storm have been submitted.			✓	
	d. Calculations documenting the maximum velocity or shear stress expected at critical sections have been submitted.			✓	
32	If there will be an increase in volume, rate, or pollutant loads to an MS4 or CSS, the MS4/CSS Notification Form (3800-FM-BCW0271f) has been submitted and signed by the MS4/CSS permittee acknowledging the increase.			✓	§ 102.6(a)(1)
33	Antidegradation Analysis Module 3 (3800 PM BCW0406c) was submitted due to proposed discharges to HQ/EV waters or impaired waters.	✓			§§ 102.4(b)(6) and 102.8(h)
	a. All applicable questions in Module 3 have been completed.	✓			
34	Riparian Buffer Module 4 (3800-PM-BCW0406d) was submitted if the project site boundary will extend to within 150 feet of a perennial or intermittent river, stream, creek, lake, pond or reservoir with a designated use of HQ or EV.			✓	§ 102.14
	a. All applicable questions in Module 4 have been completed.			✓	
	b. Worksheets 12 and 13 from DEP's BMP Manual and Worksheets 14 and 15 from DEP's Riparian Buffer or Riparian Forest Buffer Equivalency Demonstration (Document ID No. 310-2135-002) have been submitted.			✓	
	c. The Checklist for Functional Equivalency of Riparian Buffers and Riparian Forest Buffers as contained in DEP's Riparian Buffer or Riparian Forest Buffer Equivalency Demonstration (310-2135-002) was submitted.			✓	35 P.S. § 691.402(c)
	d. Authorization from an off-site property owner has been provided for implementation of a riparian forest buffer offset.			✓	
35	Proof of coordination with PHMC (i.e., PHMC review letter) was submitted.	✓			§ 102.6(a)(1)
36	One or more level spreaders are proposed where the level spreader will not result in a direct discharge to a surface water.			✓	
	a. Calculations have been submitted demonstrating sheet flow immediately below the level spreader (flow depth of less than 0.1 foot).			✓	§ 102.4(c)
	b. An EP Analysis has been submitted for the flow path below the level spreader(s).			✓	

Reviewer Comments:

All completeness deficiencies have been adequately addressed. Certain checklist items have been checked "N/A" because the documents were not required at the time of the review (i.e., PDSC spreadsheet, MRC spreadsheet, EP Analysis). However, the information that those documents contain was submitted by the permittee as a part of the application and was evaluated during the review. A pre-development site characterization was performed, the MRC Design sheets were utilized and an off-site discharge analysis was completed.

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection

CHAPTER 102
NPDES INDIVIDUAL PERMIT
FACT SHEET

Revised 1/12/2026

Reviewed By: M. Stough Office: Cumberland County Conservation District

Date of Original E&S Plan Drawings: 11/15/2023 Date of Final Approved E&S Plan Drawings: 3/28/2025

STANDARD E&S TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

REVIEW ITEM	COMPLIES	DEFICIENT	N/A	Citation
1 The E&S Plan was prepared by a person trained and experienced in E&S control methods and techniques applicable to the size and scope of the project being designed.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(3)
2 Existing topographic features of the project site and the immediate surrounding area are provided.				§ 102.4(b)(5)(i)
a. **E&S Module 1:**				
(i) Question 1 (describe existing topographic features) is complete.	✓			
b. **E&S Plan Drawings:**				
(i) Mapping is legible.	✓			
(ii) Existing contours are shown.	✓			
(iii) Land cover types are shown.	✓			
(iv) Existing improvements (e.g., roads, buildings, utilities) are shown.	✓			
(v) Sufficient surrounding areas (outside project site) are shown.	✓			
(vi) A mapping symbols legend and north arrow are shown.	✓			
(vii) A location map (e.g., USGS topo map) is provided.	✓			
3 The types, depth, slope, locations and limitations of the soils are addressed.				§ 102.4(b)(5)(ii)
a. **E&S Module 1:**				
(i) The soils map table (Question 2.a) is complete.	✓			
(ii) Site-specific soil limitations are described in Question 2.b and these limitations are identified on E&S Plan Drawings.	✓			
(iii) Hydric soils are indicated in Question 2.a.	✓			
(a) A wetland determination (report) is attached to the module.			✓	
(b) A wetland delineation report is attached to the module.			✓	
b. **E&S Plan Drawings:**				
(i) Soil boundaries clearly shown on plan maps	✓			
4 The characteristics of the earth disturbance activity, including the past, present, and proposed land uses and the proposed alteration to the project site are addressed.				§ 102.4(b)(5)(iii)
a. **E&S Module 1:**				
(i) Question 3 (past, present and proposed land uses) is adequately addressed (including identification of historical industrial uses, dumps, orchards, mining areas, etc. if applicable)	✓			
b. **E&S Plan Drawings:**				
(i) Project site boundary and limit of disturbance are shown.	✓			
(ii) Proposed countours/grades are shown.	✓			
(iii) Waterways and proposed stormwater control measures are shown.	✓			
(iv) Proposed improvements (i.e., roads, buildings, utilities) are shown.	✓			
5 The volume and rate of runoff from the project area and its upstream watershed area are described.				§ 102.4(b)(5)(iv)
a. **E&S Module 1:**				
(i) Question 4 (describe the volume and rate of runoff and the management of the runoff) is adequately addressed.	✓			
b. **E&S Plan Drawings:**				
(i) Flow paths for concentrated runoff flows are shown all the way to surface waters (including discharges to storm sewers).	✓			
(ii) Critical sections of flow paths where EP Analyses were completed are shown.			✓	
(iii) Off-site drainage drainage areas and diversions for off-site stormwater are shown.			✓	
c. **Erosion Potential (EP) Analysis:**				
(i) All EP Analyses demonstrate that calculated shear or velocity will be less than allowable shear or velocity at critical sections of concentrated flow paths during construction.			✓	

6	The location of all surface waters of this Commonwealth which may receive runoff within or from the project site and their classification under Chapter 93 is provided.				
	a. **NOI (Stormwater Discharge Information):**				
	(i) All surface waters that will receive discharges are identified.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(v)
	(ii) The Chapter 93 existing uses of all surface waters are identified.	✓			
	b. **E&S Plan Drawings:**				
	(i) All existing surface waters within or adjacent to the site are shown on drawings and are labeled.	✓			
	(ii) All existing wetlands and springs are shown on drawings.			✓	
	(iii) For projects adjacent to surface waters the known (FEMA) or assumed (50-foot) floodway is shown.			✓	
7	A narrative description of the location and type of perimeter and on-site BMPs used before, during and after the earth disturbance activity is provided.				
	a. **E&S Module 1:**				§ 102.4(b)(5)(vi)
	(i) Question 5 (BMP table) has been completed.	✓			
	(ii) The type and number of BMPs and deviations from the E&S Manual reported in E&S Module 1 match E&S Plan Drawings.	✓			
8	A sequence of BMP installation and removal in relation to the scheduling of earth disturbance activities, prior to, during and after earth disturbance activities that ensure the proper functioning of all BMPs is provided.				
	a. **E&S Plan Drawings:**				§ 102.4(b)(5)(vii)
	(i) A complete and site-specific sequence of BMP installation is provided.	✓			
	(ii) Activities are planned to limit exposed areas.	✓			
	(iii) Removal of all temporary BMPs is addressed.	✓			
9	Supporting calculations and measurements and Plan Drawings are provided.				
	a. **Stabilized Construction Entrance(s):**				§ 102.4(b)(5)(ix)
	(i) Locations are shown on Drawings.	✓			
	(ii) Complete details are shown on Drawings.	✓			
	b. **Sediment Barriers:**				
	(i) Locations are shown on Drawings.	✓			§ 102.4(b)(5)(ix)
	(ii) Slope lengths are shown on Drawings.				
	(iv) Complete details are shown on Drawings.	✓			
	c. **Channels:**				
	(i) Locations are shown on Drawings.	✓			
	(ii) Drainage areas are shown on Drawings.	✓			
	(iii) Contours and grades are shown on Drawings.	✓			§§ 102.4(b)(5)(viii) and (ix)
	(iv) Complete details are shown on Drawings.	✓			
	(v) Peak flow calculations are provided.	✓			
	(vi) Capacity and freeboard calculations are provided.	✓			
	(vii) Protective lining calculations are provided.	✓			
	d. **Sediment Basins:**				
	(i) Locations are shown on Drawings.	✓			
	(ii) Contours are shown on Drawings.	✓			
	(iii) Drainage areas are shown on Drawings.	✓			
	(iv) Complete berm and outlet details are shown on Drawings.	✓			§§ 102.4(b)(5)(viii) and (ix)
	(v) Cleanout information is provided.	✓			
	(vi) Discharge to surface waters or approved alternative.	✓			
	(vii) Capacity calculations are provided.	✓			
	(viii) Discharge calculations are provided.	✓			
	(ix) Dewatering calculations are provided.	✓			
	e. **Sediment Traps:**			✓	
	(i) Locations are shown on Drawings.			✓	
	(ii) Contours are shown on Drawings.			✓	
	(iii) Drainage areas are shown on Drawings.			✓	§§ 102.4(b)(5)(viii) and (ix)
	(iv) Complete berm and outlet details are shown on Drawings.			✓	
	(v) Cleanout information is provided.			✓	
	(vi) Discharge to surface waters or approved alternative.			✓	
	(vii) Capacity calculations are provided.			✓	
	(viii) Discharge calculations are provided.			✓	

f.	**Outlet Protection:**				§§ 102.4(b)(5)(viii) and (ix)
(i)	Locations are shown on Drawings.	✓			
(ii)	Complete details are shown on Drawings.	✓			
(iii)	Design calculations are provided.	✓			
g.	**Inlet Protection:**				§§ 102.4(b)(5)(viii) and (ix)
(i)	Locations are shown on Drawings.	✓			
(ii)	Complete details are shown on Drawings.	✓			
(iii)	Drainage areas are shown on Drawings.	✓			
h.	**Other BMPs:**			✓	§ 102.4(b)(5)(ix)
(i)	Locations are shown on Drawings.			✓	
(ii)	Complete details are shown on Drawings.			✓	
(iii)	Design calculations are provided.			✓	
i.	**Temporary Stabilization:**				§ 102.4(b)(5)(ix)
(i)	Seed type and seeding rate are specified.	✓			
(ii)	Liming rate is specified.	✓			
(iii)	Fertilizer type and application rate are specified.	✓			
(v)	Mulch type and application rate are specified.	✓			
(vi)	Other type and rate are specified.			✓	
j.	**Permanent Stabilization:**				§ 102.4(b)(5)(ix)
(i)	Seed type and seeding rate are specified.	✓			
(ii)	Liming rate is specified.	✓			
(iii)	Fertilizer type and application rate are specified.	✓			
(iv)	Mulch type and application rate are specified.	✓			
(v)	Other type and rate are specified.			✓	
(vi)	Topsoil replacement procedures are specified.	✓			
10	A maintenance program, which provides for the operation and maintenance of BMPs and the inspection of BMPs on a weekly basis and after each stormwater event, including the repair or replacement of BMPs to ensure effective and efficient operation must be addressed. The program must provide for completion of a written report documenting each inspection and all BMP repair, or replacement and				§ 102.4(b)(5)(x)
a.	**E&S Plan Drawings:**				
(i)	A BMP inspection schedule is provided.	✓			
(ii)	Maximum sediment storage elevations in BMPs are specified.	✓			
(iii)	Timeframes for completing specific maintenance and repairs for each type of proposed BMP are provided.	✓			
(iv)	The maximum sediment storage elevation/level in BMPs is specified.	✓			
(v)	Site stabilization repair specifications are provided.	✓			
(vi)	Disposal directions for sediment removed from BMPs are provided.	✓			
(vii)	Note(s) provided that require written documentation of inspection and repair or replacement of BMPs by contractor.	✓			
11	Procedures which ensure that the proper measures for the recycling or disposal of materials associated with or from the project site will be undertaken in accordance with this title must be identified.				§ 102.4(b)(5)(xi)
a.	**E&S Plan Drawings:**				
(i)	Project construction wastes are identified.	✓			
(ii)	Directions for recycling/disposal of construction wastes are provided (see Standard Note 10 in Appendix C of E&S Manual).	✓			
(iii)	E&S BMPs are provided for soil/rock disposal and borrow areas.	✓			
(iv)	An E&S Plan has been submitted for all identified off-site support areas (disposal and borrow areas).	✓			
12	Identification of natural 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 is provided.				§ 102.4(b)(5)(xii)
a.	**E&S Module 1:**				
(i)	Question 18 has been completed.	✓			
b.	**E&S Plan Drawings:**				
(i)	Instructions for proper handling and/or disposal of all materials that could cause pollution are provided.	✓			
(ii)	Typical details are provided for proper handling and/or disposal of all such materials.	✓			
(iii)	The locations of all such materials are clearly shown on Drawings.	✓			

13	The applicant has identified potential thermal impacts to surface waters of this Commonwealth from the earth disturbance activity including BMPs to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential pollution from thermal impacts.				§ 102.4(b)(5)(xiii)
	a. **E&S Module 1:**				
	(i) Question 19 is complete and analyzes how thermal impacts will be avoided.	✓			
	b. **E&S Plan Drawings:**				
	(i) BMPs are identified on Drawings to minimize thermal impacts.	✓			
14	The E&S plan has been planned, designed, and implemented to be consistent with the PCSM Plan under § 102.8 (relating to PCSM requirements).				§ 102.4(b)(5)(xiv)
	a. **E&S Plan Drawings:**				
	(i) Overall plan supports the managing of stormwater for E&S during earth disturbance activities.	✓			
	(ii) BMPs are compatible with, and can be integrated into, structural and non-structural PCSM SCMs.	✓			
15	Identification of existing and proposed riparian forest buffers.				§ 102.4(b)(5)(xv)
	a. **E&S Plan Drawings:**				
	(i) Existing and proposed riparian forest buffers are shown on the Drawings.			✓	
16	PNDI clearance letters have been submitted (required prior to approval if applicable).			✓	§ 102.6(a)(2)

Reviewer Comments:

All technical E&S deficiencies have been adequately addressed. Certain checklist items have been checked "N/A" because the documents were not required at the time of the review (i.e., EP Analysis). However, the information that those documents contain was submitted by the permittee as a part of the application and was evaluated during the review. An off-site discharge analysis was completed.

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection

CHAPTER 102
NPDES INDIVIDUAL PERMIT
FACT SHEET

Revised 1/12/2026

Reviewed By: M. Lubinsky Office: Cumberland County Conservation District

Date of Original PCSM Plan Drawings: 11/15/2023 Date of Final Approved PCSM Plan Drawings: 3/28/2025

PCSM TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

REVIEW ITEM	COMPLIES	DEFICIENT	N/A	Citation
1 Pre-Development Site Characterization (PDSC):				
a. A minimum of 4 test pits and/or soil borings were completed across the project site (or 2 were completed and meet exception criteria).	✓			
b. The pre-development site characterization considered the entire project site, not just area within the LOD.	✓			
c. The locations of test pits or soil borings and infiltration tests are identified on PCSM Plan Drawings.	✓			
d. Exclusions identified in the PDSC Spreadsheet were reflected on PCSM Plan Drawing(s).			✓	
e. The exclusions selected by the applicant are appropriate or reasonable.			✓	
f. The project site is within 0.5 mile of identified sinkholes and closed depressions on DCNR's published maps of sinkholes and karst features or within 0.5 mile of a "Karst Feature" on DEP's eMapPA.	✓			
g. The geotechnical report evaluated the potential for sinkholes and infiltration capabilities on-site.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(1)
h. Test pits or soil borings and infiltration testing were completed if the overburden on-site is at least 50 feet or the overburden is at least 33 feet and sinkhole risk is low.	✓			
i. The PDSC Spreadsheet indicates the infiltration test location frequency was at least 1 per 40,000 SF or the frequency was between 0.5 and 1 and the coefficient of variability (CV) was sufficiently low (<= 0.5) to allow a professional to determine whether additional tests were warranted.			✓	
j. The PDSC Spreadsheet indicates that additional infiltration tests are recommended.			✓	
k. A professional attached a justification to Module 2 for not completing additional tests and the justification is technically sound.			✓	
2 Stormwater Analysis:				
a. All pre- and post-construction stormwater runoff was accounted for in the stormwater analysis (i.e., the selected POAs account for all runoff from the LOD).	✓			§ 102.8(g)(2)
b. Post-construction drainage areas to SCMs and undetained areas are clearly shown on PCSM Plan Drawings.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(15)
c. Curve numbers and land covers are based on TR-55 or technically sound justification for other curve numbers has been provided.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(4)
d. The precipitation depth for the 2-year/24-hour storm event is based on NOAA Atlas 14 or other reputable sources.	✓			
e. All pervious non-forested pre-construction land cover is identified as meadow.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(2)(i)
f. If all pervious non-forested pre-construction land cover is not identified as meadow, one of the exceptions at § 102.8(g)(2)(i) applies.			✓	
g. At least 20% of existing impervious to be disturbed is treated as meadow in the pre-construction condition.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(2)(ii)
h. If at least 20% of existing impervious to be disturbed is not treated as meadow in the pre-construction condition, one of the exceptions at §§ 102.8(g)(2)(ii) or (iii) applies.			✓	
i. Calculations were provided to demonstrate the net change in volume up to the 2-year/24-hour storm event and the calculations are technically sound, or the PCSM Spreadsheet, Volume Worksheet was submitted.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(2)
j. A volume reduction standard contained in an approved and current Act 167 Plan was used, and the reviewer has confirmed that 1) the Act 167 Plan was approved within the past five years, and 2) the standard from the Plan was applied appropriately.			✓	§ 102.8(g)(2)

k.	An alternative design standard has been proposed for managing the net change in volume and an adequate demonstration has been made that the alternative standard is at least as stringent as management of the net change up to the 2-year/24-hour storm.			✓	§ 102.8(g)(2)(iv)
l.	The PCSM Spreadsheet, Quality Worksheet was submitted, demonstrating management of the net change in water quality (pollutant loading) up to the 2-year/24-hour storm event.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(2)
m.	Calculations were provided to demonstrate the net change in peak rates for the 2, 10, 50, and 100-year/24-hour storm events and the calculations are technically sound, or the PCSM Spreadsheet, Rate Worksheet was submitted.	✓			§ 102.8(g)(3)
n.	Rate requirements contained in an approved and current Act 167 Plan was used, and the reviewer has confirmed that 1) the Act 167 Plan was approved within the past five years, and 2) the standard from the Plan was applied appropriately.			✓	§ 102.8(g)(3)
o.	An alternative design standard has been proposed for managing the net change in peak rates and an adequate demonstration has been made that the alternative standard is at least as stringent as management of the net change for the 2, 10, 50, and 100-year/24-hour storm events.			✓	§ 102.8(g)(3)(iii)
p.	The Rational Method (including Modified Rational Method and Universal Rational Method) was used to determine pre- or post-construction volumes or peak rates.		✓		§ 102.8(g)(4)
q.	The applicant demonstrated that use of the Rational Method results in a peak rate control SCM footprint and storage capacity that is greater than or equal to SCS/NRCS hydrograph methods.			✓	
3	**PCSM SCMs:**				§ 102.11(a)(2)
a.	All proposed PCSM SCMs have been designed in accordance with the Stormwater BMP Manual.		✓		
b.	Minor deviations from the Stormwater BMP Manual were proposed that were justified by the designer and in the reviewer's judgment can be approved without considering the SCM an Alternative SCM.	✓			§ 102.11(b)
c.	One or more SCMs were proposed that are not identified in the Stormwater BMP Manual but are on DEP's list of Approved Alternative PCSM SCMs.	✓			
d.	One or more SCMs were proposed that are not identified in either the Stormwater BMP Manual or DEP's list of Approved Alternative PCSM SCMs.		✓		
e.	There will be discharges to waters with existing or designated uses of HQ or EV or waters impaired for siltation; turbidity; TSS; algae; eutrophication; nutrients; flow regime modification; and/or habitat alterations (including the Chesapeake Bay).	✓			
f.	The SCMs will individually or collectively eliminate or manage the net change in volume and pollutant loads up to the 2-year/24-hour storm for the entire area of disturbance.	✓			§ 102.8(h)
g.	SCM design calculations appear reasonable and support the volume, WQ, and rate control credit claimed in the PCSM Spreadsheet or alternative analysis.	✓			§ 102.11(a)(2)
h.	SCM design calculations consider all flows routed to the SCM from the LOD, project site, and off-site, as applicable.	✓			
i.	Non-structural volume management credits were claimed in the PCSM Spreadsheet, Volume Worksheet.		✓		
j.	Separate calculations for non-structural volume management credits are provided and are based on the Stormwater BMP Manual or otherwise have a sound technical basis.			✓	
k.	Non-structural water quality (WQ) management credits were claimed in the PCSM Spreadsheet, Quality Worksheet.		✓		
l.	Separate calculations for non-structural WQ management credits are provided and are based on the Stormwater BMP Manual or otherwise have a sound technical basis.			✓	
m.	A manufactured treatment device (MTD) or other water quality treatment system is proposed.	✓			
n.	WQ management credits for an MTD were calculated on the basis of median outflow concentrations (MOCs) for pollutants that are expected for the project's design flow rate.	✓			
o.	The inspection and O&M frequencies and requirements for each SCM as provided in PCSM Plan Drawings or a separate narrative are reasonable.	✓			
p.	One or more infiltration-based SCMs are proposed.	✓			

q.	The PCSM Plan Drawings specify the need to protect the infiltrating surface from compaction during construction and permanently stabilize the SCM's drainage area prior to constructing the SCM.	✓			
r.	The PCSM Plan Drawings specify the need to conduct confirmation testing for infiltration capabilities prior to completing infiltration-based SCMs when the SCM is converted from an E&S BMP or when the infiltrating surface has been compacted or is not protected.	✓			
s.	PCSM Plan Drawings or a separate planting plan shows deep-rooted vegetation (generally plug plantings, shrubs, etc.) in lieu of or addition to seed mixes where the PCSM Spreadsheet provides evapotranspiration (ET) credit for a vegetated SCM.			✓	
t.	Critical stages of PCSM SCM construction or installation are identified on plan drawings and are appropriate for the type(s) of SCM(s) proposed.	✓			§ 102.8(f)(7)
4	**Managed Release Concept (MRC) SCMs:**				
a.	The PDSC Spreadsheet indicates options other than infiltration should be considered.			✓	
b.	There are constraints on the project site other than karst and limited infiltration rates that may justify the use of MRC SCMs.	✓			
c.	Alternatives to MRC (e.g., riparian forest buffers, capture and use SCMs) were evaluated and deemed to be infeasible.	✓			
d.	PCSM Plan Drawings substantiate that the maximum drainage area (1 acre), soil media depth (2 feet with 1-foot IWS), and other standards are met for SCMs reported on the MRC Simplified Design Spreadsheet.			✓	
e.	For SCMs reported on the MRC Simplified Design Spreadsheet, a diversion or bypass is shown on PCSM Plan Drawings to route storms exceeding the 2-year/24-hour storm around the MRC SCM to a rate control SCM.			✓	§ 102.11(a)(2)
f.	PCSM Plan Drawings substantiate that the design standards are met for SCMs reported on the MRC Spreadsheet.	✓			
g.	Calculations are provided to demonstrate that the 2-year/24-hour post-construction peak rate is managed back to the 1-year/24-hour pre-construction peak rate within the MRC SCM or a downstream rate control SCM for the MRC drainage area.	✓			
h.	Calculations are provided to demonstrate that the controlled release through the underdrain orifice will meet the 0.02 cfs/equivalent impervious acre standard.	✓			
i.	MRC credits from the appropriate MRC spreadsheets have been accurately entered into the PCSM Spreadsheet, Volume Worksheet.	✓			
5	**Riparian Buffers:**			✓	
a.	The applicant has proposed a riparian buffer or riparian forest buffer as a PCSM SCM.			✓	§ 102.14
b.	A riparian forest buffer management plan is attached and is generally consistent with § 102.14.			✓	
c.	The applicant has completed an equivalency demonstration in lieu of establishing or protecting a riparian buffer or riparian forest buffer.			✓	
d.	The equivalency demonstration is consistent with DEP guidance and worksheets 12, 13, 14 and 15 have been completed accurately.			✓	
e.	An offset riparian forest buffer is proposed due to proposed disturbance within 100 feet of a surface water designated for HQ or EV.			✓	
f.	The offset riparian forest buffer is proposed in the same drainage list as the project site and is shown on PCSM Plan Drawings.			✓	35 P.S. § 691.402(c)
g.	The offset riparian forest buffer will have an area at least as large as the riparian forest buffer on the project site to be disturbed and will be a minimum of 50 feet wide.			✓	
h.	The applicant has provided written authorization from the off-site property owner to establish an offset riparian forest buffer.			✓	
i.	PCSM Plan Drawings show a level spreader along the width of the riparian forest buffer if concentrated or shallow concentrated flow is expected to form upstream of the buffer.			✓	
6	**EP Analysis:**			✓	
a.	Critical sections of flow paths have been identified correctly.			✓	
b.	Calculations were provided for SCM outflow discharge rates at the 10-year/24-hour storm and appear to be accurate.			✓	
c.	Maximum allowable velocity and/or sheer reported for critical sections are reasonable and are based on reputable sources.			✓	§ 102.4(c)
d.	Calculations for maximum velocity and/or sheer appear to be accurate based on proper Manning's "n" value and other input parameters.			✓	

e.	Where calculated maximum velocity or shear exceeds maximum allowable velocity or sheet, improvements to flow paths are proposed.			✓	
7	**Post-Construction Stormwater Discharges to Wetlands:**			✓	§ 102.8(g)(6)
a.	Modeling and calculations supporting the values reported in PCSM Module 2 for pre- and post-construction volumes and ponding depths appear reasonable.			✓	
b.	The wetlands receiving stormwater discharges are EV wetlands.			✓	
c.	The post-construction change in ponding depth for the 2-year/24-hour storm event (or greater) is less than 50% of the pre-construction ponding depth.			✓	
d.	Discharges to wetlands will be via sheet flow only.			✓	
e.	Due to grading or other reasons, the potential exists in the reviewer's judgment for long-term detrimental impacts to wetland hydrology that should be evaluated by a wetland scientist.			✓	
8	**Temperature Impacts:**				§ 102.8(f)(13)
a.	A peak rate control SCM is proposed that will receive stormwater from a drainage area containing more than 25% impervious surface that exceeds 10% of the receiving surface water's watershed area.			✓	
b.	A Wet Basin or Engineered Stormwater Treatment Wetland is proposed that does not include shading and/or a reversed slope outlet pipe.			✓	
c.	An impervious undetained area exceeds 10% of the receiving water's watershed area.			✓	
d.	A quantitative thermal impact analysis has been submitted and demonstrates there will not be a thermal impact to surface waters from the project.			✓	

Reviewer Comments:

All PCSM technical deficiencies have been adequately addressed. Certain checklist items have been checked "N/A" because the documents were not required at the time of the review (i.e., PDSC spreadsheet, MRC spreadsheet, EP Analysis). However, the information that those documents contain was submitted by the permittee as a part of the application and was evaluated during the review. A pre-development site characterization was performed, the MRC Design sheets were utilized, an off-site discharge analysis was completed, and thermal impacts were evaluated.