

# **SCRO DEP & Blair County Conservation District**

CHAPTER 102 INDIVIDUAL NPDES PERMIT FACT SHEET

Application No. PA	D070014 A-1
--------------------	-------------

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

administrative	and toomin	an considerations, stall may supplement the information		aniona racio	no presente	od under reg	julutions.
		Applicant and Project	ct information				
Applicant Name: M&G Realty, II		M&G Realty, Inc.	Project Name:	Rutters #	82 - Waste	e Haul Roa	ad
			-	Intersecti	tersection of Pleasant Valley lvd & Sabbath Rest Road		
Applicant A	aaress:	2295 Susquehanna Trail, Suite C	Project Address:	BIVO & Sa	ibbath Re	St Road	
Municipality		York, PA 17404	County	Plair			
Municipality Receiving V		Antis Township UNT to Sandy Run	County: Ch. 93 Class:	Blair (HQ-CWF			
Date Applica	. ,			2.76			
Application		Amendment	Laitii Distarbance.	2.10	acres		
Project Des		A new temporary haul road to transport ma	torial from the const	uction eite			
l Project Des	cription.	A new temporary nati road to transport ma	terial from the const	uction site			
		Application Completenes	s Review Checklis	t			
cc	MPLETEN	ESS ITEM			TRUE	FALSE	N/A
		One original and one copy of the complete applica	tion form (3800-PM-B	CW0408b)		IALGE	
1. we		ed and were completed as instructed in the Ap			$\boxtimes$		
2. 10	2. 102.6(a)(1) – One original and one copy of the complete GIF (0210-PM-PIO0001).						
		Two copies of County and Municipal Notification F			$\boxtimes$		
<ol> <li>38.00-FM-BCW0271c, respectively) with county and municipal signatures or proof that the county and municipality received the forms were submitted.</li> </ol>							
4. 102.6(a)(2) – Two copies of the PNDI receipt (draft receipts not acceptable), which will not expire prior to anticipated authorization of permit coverage, were submitted.			$\boxtimes$				
5. 102.6(a)(1) – One original and two copies of the complete E&S Module 1 (3800-PM-BCW0406a) were submitted and were completed as instructed in the Application Instructions.		$\boxtimes$					
a. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) - Details were provided for all E&S BMPs (Question 5 of E&S Plan Information) (can be provided on the E&S Plan Drawings).							
b	102.4(	b)(5)(viii) – Standard E&S Worksheets from the E	•	quivalent)	$\boxtimes$		
	were attached.						
Approve	Deny	Signature				Date	
		CCD Application Manager Name					
		CCD Professional Engineer (if CCD is PC	SM Delegated)				
		CCD Manager Name					
	_ <del>_</del>	DEP Application Manager Name					
DEP Permits Chief / Program Manager Name							

#### 102.4(b)(5)(viii) - Supporting E&S calculations were provided (for any calculation not $\mathsf{X}$ C. handled by a Standard E&S Worksheet or an equivalent). X d. 102.4(c) - An Off-site Discharge Analysis was provided, if applicable. 102.4(b)(5)(v) – If hydric soils are present, a wetland determination was submitted. $\times$ П e. 6. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) - Three sets or copies of E&S Plan Drawing(s) were submitted. $\times$ 102.4(b)(5)(i) - The Drawing(s) include existing and proposed topography (including any $\times$ a. temporary contours) with appropriate contour labels. 102.4(b)(5)(iii) - The Drawing(s) include the project site boundary. $\mathsf{X}$ b. 102.4(b)(5)(iii) - The Drawing(s) include the limit of earth disturbance within the project $\times$ C. site. 102.4(b)(5)(v) - The Drawing(s) show receiving surface water(s) and watershed $\mathsf{X}$ d. boundaries, if applicable, within the project site and floodway or floodplain. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) - The Drawing(s) identify all discharge points. $\times$ П e. 102.4(b)(5)(vi) - The Drawing(s) show the location of all BMPs and drainage areas to the $\times$ f. BMPs as applicable. 102.4(b)(5)(iii) - The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed utilities and site $\times$ g. improvements. 102.4(b)(5)(xv) - The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed riparian buffer(s), if h. $\times$ applicable. П П $\times$ i. 102.4(b)(5)(iii) - The Drawing(s) show proposed off-site support activities, if applicable. 102.4(c) - The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed PNDI j. X receipt, if applicable. 1 102.4(b)(5)(vii) - The Drawing(s) provide for protection of infiltration PCSM BMPs until $\times$ k. drainage areas are completely stabilized, if applicable. 102.4(b)(5)(vii) & 102.4(b)(5)(xii) - The Drawing(s) show the sequence of construction, an operation and maintenance (O&M) program, and procedures for recycling or disposing X I. of materials (not necessary if a separate narrative is attached). 102.6(a)(1) - One original and two copies of the complete PCSM Module 2 (3800-PM-7. $\mathsf{X}$ BCW0406b) were submitted and were completed as instructed in the Application Instructions. 102.8(n) - The project qualifies as a Site Restoration Project. 2 $\times$ a. 102.8(g)(1) - A pre-development site characterization was provided (i.e., soils and b. $\times$ geotechnical testing results and narrative of methods and results). 102.8(g)(1) - Soil/geologic test results were attached. $\times$ C. 102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(2) & 102.8(g)(4) - Printout of DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet - Volume $\times$ П d. Worksheet was attached. 3 102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(2) & 102.8(g)(4) - Stormwater Analysis - Runoff Volume Questions $\times$ e. 5 - 9 were answered and supporting calculations were provided. 3 102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(3) & 102.8(g)(4) - Printout of DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet - Rate f. X Worksheet was attached. 4 102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(3) & 102.8(g)(4) - Stormwater Analysis - Peak Rate Questions 5 - $\times$ g. 9 were answered and supporting calculations were provided. 4

Application Completeness Review Checklist (Continued)

#### Application Completeness Review Checklist (Continued) 102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(2) & 102.8(g)(4) - Printout of DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet - Quality $\times$ Worksheet was attached. 102.11(b) - If Managed Release Concept (MRC) BMPs were proposed, MRC Design Summary Sheets were provided for each BMP and were sealed by a professional П П $\times$ i. engineer. 8. 102.8(f)(9) - Three sets or copies of PCSM Plan Drawing(s) were submitted. $\times$ П 102.8(f)(1) - The Drawing(s) include existing and proposed topography with appropriate $\times$ П a. contour labels. 102.8(f)(3) - The Drawing(s) include the project site boundary. $\times$ b $\times$ 102.8(f)(3) - The Drawing(s) include the limit of earth disturbance within the project site. C. 102.8(f)(5) – The Drawing(s) show receiving surface water(s) and watershed boundaries, $\times$ П d. if applicable, within the project site and floodway or floodplain. e. 102.8(f)(9) - The Drawing(s) identify all discharge points. $\times$ 102.8(f)(6) - The Drawing(s) show the location of all BMPs with identifiers cross- $\times$ f. referenced to PCSM Module 2. 102.8(f)(9) - Details were provided for all PCSM BMPs (required for any PCSM BMP $\times$ g. identified in Question 1 of PCSM Plan Information). 102.8(f)(3) - The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed utilities and site improvements. $\times$ П h. 102.8(f)(14) - The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed riparian buffer(s), if i. X applicable. į. 102.8(f)(3) - The Drawing(s) show proposed off-site support activities, if applicable. П $\times$ 102.8(f)(15) - The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed П П X k. PNDI receipt, if applicable. 102.8(f)(7) & 102.8(f)(10) - The Drawing(s) show the sequence of PCSM BMP implementation, a long-term operation and maintenance (O&M) schedule, procedures $\times$ I. П П for recycling or disposing of materials, and critical stages of BMP implementation (not necessary if a separate narrative is attached). 102.8(f)(2) - The Drawing(s) show sensitive features including sinkholes, surface П m. П $\times$ depressions, soil contamination hot spots, and wetlands, if applicable. 102.8(q)(1) - The Drawing(s) show the location of test pits used for infiltration testing as $\times$ П cross-referenced to PCSM Module 2, Infiltration Information. 102.6(a)(1) - Three copies of the complete Antidegradation Analysis Module 3 (3800-PM-BCW0406c) were submitted and were completed as instructed in the Application Instructions if 9 1) there are proposed discharges to special protection waters, and/or 2) there are proposed П $\mathsf{X}$ discharges directly to waters impaired for siltation, sediment, turbidity, water/flow variability, flow alterations/modifications, or nutrients. 102.6(a)(1) - Three copies of the complete Riparian Buffer Module 4 (3800-PM-BCW0406d) were submitted and were completed as instructed in the Application Instructions if the earth 10. П $\times$ disturbance or project site is within 150 feet of a perennial or intermittent river, stream, or creek, lake, pond or reservoir designated for special protection. X 11. 102.6(a)(1) - PHMC clearance letter (for projects > 10 acres of disturbance).

### Footnotes:

- If the PNDI receipt indicates "Avoidance Measures," the applicant must have signed the PNDI receipt and included the avoidance measures on the E&S and PCSM Plans; otherwise clearance letters must be included in the Application.
- 2 If the entire project meets 25 Pa. Code § 102.8(n), then responses to Questions 7.b 7.h may be omitted.
- 3 The response to either Question 7.d or 7.e must be TRUE for the project to be deemed complete.
- 4 The response to either Question 7.f or 7.g must be TRUE for the project to be deemed complete.

# **Application Manager's Completeness Review Comments:**

	E&S Technical Review Checklist 1,2				
	TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A	
1.	The Standard E&S Control Plan Technical Review Checklist is attached.			$\boxtimes$	
2.	The Expanded E&S Control Plan Technical Review Checklist is attached.	$\boxtimes$			
3.	102.11(a)(1) – E&S BMPs have been designed in accordance with the E&S Manual.	$\boxtimes$			
4.	102.11(b) – Where E&S BMPs have been designed with a deviation from the E&S Manual, such deviations were found to be consistent with 25 Pa. Code § 102.11(b).			×	
5.	102.11(b) – Alternative E&S BMPs are consistent with the Approved Alternative E&S BMP List.			×	
6.	102.2(b) – There will be discharges directly to waters impaired for siltation, sediment, turbidity, water/flow variability, flow alterations/modifications, or nutrients.			$\boxtimes$	
	a. 102.2(b) – The applicant has proposed E&S BMPs to treat such discharges consistent with a non-discharge alternative or ABACT.			×	

### Footnotes:

- In addition to deficiencies identified through the use of the Standard or Expanded E&S Control Plan Technical Review Checklists, the Application Manager should consider an answer of FALSE a technical deficiency when both Questions 3 and 4 are FALSE, and when Questions 5 or 6.a are FALSE.
- 2 A technical review of the E&S Plan is not required for renewal Applications or for amendment Applications where there is no new earth disturbance.

Application Manager's E&S Technical Review Comments:

# PCSM Technical Review Checklist 1,2

	TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
1.	The CCD is not PCSM delegated.	$\boxtimes$		
2.	102.11(a)(2) - PCSM BMPs have been designed in accordance with the BMP Manual.	$\boxtimes$		
3.	102.11(b) – Where PCSM BMPs have been designed with a deviation from the BMP Manual, they were found to be consistent with 25 Pa. Code § 102.11(b).	$\boxtimes$		
4.	102.11(b) - Alternative PCSM BMPs are consistent with the Approved Alternative PCSM BMP List.			×
5.	102.2(b) – There will be discharges directly to waters impaired for siltation, sediment, turbidity, water/flow variability, flow alterations/modifications, or nutrients.	$\boxtimes$		
	a. 102.2(b) – The applicant has proposed PCSM BMPs to treat such discharges consistent with a non-discharge alternative or ABACT.	×		
6.	102.8(f)(1) - Existing topography of project site and immediate surrounding area were adequately explained (E&S Module 1, Question 1).	$\boxtimes$		
7.	102.8(f)(2) – The types, depth, slope, locations and limitations of the soils and geologic formations were accurately characterized (E&S Module 1, Question 2).	$\boxtimes$		
8.	102.8(f)(3) – Characteristics of the project site were adequately explained in terms of past (i.e., at least 50 years ago), present and proposed land uses (E&S Module 1, Question 3).	$\boxtimes$		
9.	102.8(f)(4) – An adequate description (may be qualitative) of the volume and rate of runoff from the project site and any area upgradient of the project site that flows onto the project site has been provided (PCSM Module 2).	$\boxtimes$		
10.	102.8(f)(5) – The locations of surface waters and their classifications under Chapter 93 have been identified on PCSM Plan Drawing(s) and in the Application.	$\boxtimes$		
11.	102.8(f)(6) - All PCSM BMPs have been identified in PCSM Module 2 (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 1) and located on PCSM Plan Drawing(s).	×		
12.	102.8(f)(6) - PCSM BMP design details were provided on PCSM Drawing(s) and specifications for permanent stabilization were included on PCSM or E&S Plan Drawing(s) (E&S Module 1, Question 15, for stabilization only).	$\boxtimes$		
13.	102.8(f)(7) – A sequence of PCSM BMP implementation in relation to earth disturbance activities and a schedule of inspections for critical stages of BMP implementation were provided (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 2).	$\boxtimes$		
14.	102.8(f)(8) – Supporting calculations for the design of PCSM BMPs were provided and are technically sound.	$\boxtimes$		
15.	102.8(f)(10) — A long-term O&M schedule for PCSM BMPs including BMP repair and maintenance activities was provided (PCSM Module 2, Long-Term O&M) and is consistent with the Stormwater BMP Manual or is otherwise technically sound.	$\boxtimes$		
16.	102.8(f)(11) – Procedures ensuring proper measures for recycling or disposal of materials associated with or from PCSM BMPs were provided (PCSM Plan Drawings or PCSM Module 2, Long-Term O&M).			
17.	102.8(f)(12) – The applicant identified naturally occurring geologic formations or soil conditions that may have the potential to cause pollution and prepared a plan to avoid or minimize potential pollution (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 6).	×		
18.	102.8(f)(13) – The applicant has identified potential thermal impacts from post-construction stormwater and has proposed BMPs that will avoid, minimize or mitigate potential impacts (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 7).	$\boxtimes$		

# PCSM Technical Review Checklist (Continued)

	TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
19.	102.8(f)(14) – The applicant has proposed a riparian forest buffer, a riparian forest buffer management plan is attached, and is generally consistent with § 102.14.			$\boxtimes$
20.	102.8(g) – A stormwater analysis was completed on a discharge point basis or on a watershed basis (i.e., all discharges to specific receiving waters analyzed collectively).			
21.	102.8(g)(1) – A pre-development site characterization and assessment of soil and geology was conducted and is within the recommendations of Appendix C of the Stormwater BMP Manual or are otherwise technically sound.			
22.	102.8(g)(2) — 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.			
23.	102.8(g)(2) — A volume reduction standard contained in an approved and current Act 167 Plan was used, and the Application Manager 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.			×
24.	102.8(g)(2)(iv) — 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.			⊠
25.	$102.8(g)(2)- The \ PCSM \ Spreadsheet, \ Quality \ Worksheet \ was \ submitted, \ illustrating \ the \ net \ change in \ water \ quality \ (pollutant \ loading) \ up \ to \ the \ 2-year/24-hour \ storm \ event.$	$\boxtimes$		
26.	102.8(g)(2)(i) – All existing non-forested pervious areas have been considered meadow in good condition or better (if exceptions at § $102.8(g)(2)(i)$ apply select "N/A") (PCSM Spreadsheet, Volume Worksheet or supporting calculations).			
27.	$102.8(g)(2)(ii)-20\% \ of \ existing \ impervious \ surfaces \ to \ be \ disturbed \ has \ been \ considered \ meadow in good \ condition \ or \ better \ (if \ exceptions \ at \S\S \ 102.8(g)(2)(ii) \ or \ (iii) \ apply \ select \ "N/A") \ (PCSM \ Spreadsheet, \ Volume \ Worksheet \ or \ supporting \ calculations).$			
28.	$102.8(g)(4)- The\ precipitation\ depth\ for\ the\ 2-year/24-hour\ storm\ event\ is\ based\ on\ NOAA\ Atlas\ 14\ or\ other\ reputable\ sources.$			
29.	$102.8(g)(4)-Land\ covers\ and\ curve\ numbers\ have\ been\ appropriately\ determined\ to\ calculate\ pre-\ and\ post-construction\ runoff\ volumes\ and\ pollutant\ loadings.$			
30.	102.8(g)(2) – Structural and non-structural BMPs were proposed that will eliminate or manage the net change in volume and pollutant loading up to the 2-year/24-hour storm event, and the calculations demonstrating this are technically sound or the PCSM Spreadsheet was used.	×		
31.	102.8(g)(3) – 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.			
32.	102.8(g)(3) – Rate requirements contained in an approved and current Act 167 Plan were used, and the Application Manager 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.			×
33.	102.8(g)(3)(iii) – 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.			⊠
34.	102.8(g)(3) – Structural and non-structural BMPs were proposed that will eliminate or manage the net change in peak rates, and the calculations demonstrating this are technically sound or the PCSM Spreadsheet was used.			
35.	102.11(b) – Managed Release Concept (MRC) BMP(s) were proposed, MRC Design Summary Sheets were adequately completed, and MRC design standards have been met or alternative MRC design standards are considered technically sound.			⊠
36.	102.8(b)(8) – There are wetlands on the project site and adequate efforts have been made to ensure no significant changes to pre-construction hydrology that would affect the wetlands.			
37.	102.14(d)(1), 102.14(f)(2) & 102.14(f)(3) – If Riparian Buffer Module 4 is completed, the project qualifies for an exception or is an allowed or allowable activity.			×

PCSM Technical Review Checklist (Continued)				
	TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
38.	Act 162 – If Riparian Buffer Module 4 is completed, the project does not propose the use of a waiver, which is allowed only for E&S Permits.			$\boxtimes$
39.	102.14(b) - If Riparian Buffer Module 4 is completed, and a riparian forest buffer will be implemented, the riparian forest buffer meets the criteria in 25 Pa. Code § 102.14(b).			$\boxtimes$
40.	Act 162 – If Riparian Buffer Module 4 is completed, and an equivalency demonstration has been done, the equivalency demonstration is consistent with DEP guidance, and worksheets 12 and 13 from the BMP Manual and worksheets 14 and 15 from the Equivalency Demonstration (310-2135-002) guidance have been completed and are technically sound.			M
41.	Act 162 – If Riparian Buffer Module 4 is completed, and offsetting is proposed, the offset riparian forest buffer is in the same drainage list as the project site riparian forest buffer, authorization for use of the offset site has been attached, and the offset buffer meets the criteria in 25 Pa. Code § 102.14(b).			×

### Footnotes:

- 1 An answer of FALSE to any the questions that are applicable may be considered a technical deficiency except #1. If #5.a is FALSE and #5 is TRUE, it is a deficiency. If all answers in the following groups are FALSE, it is a deficiency: #22/23/24 and #31/32/33.
- 2 A technical review of the PCSM Plan is not required for renewal Applications or for amendment Applications where there is no new earth disturbance.

## **Application Manager's Technical Review Comments:**

The temporary haul road did not need stormwater management. The haul road only had E&S Plans which the district reviewed. The PCSM portion of the FACT Sheet answers was based on the original PCSM Plans for the Rutters Store.

# PNDI Review:

- 2 102.6(a)(2) PNDI search receipt contained no potential impacts and/or avoidance measures were signed by the applicant. 1
- 102.6(a)(2) PNDI clearance letter(s) from the appropriate agencies if 1) the PNDI receipt indicates "Potential Impact" or 2) the PNDI receipt indicates "Avoidance Measures" and the applicant has not signed the PNDI receipt indicating that the applicant will fulfill those Avoidance Measures were submitted. 1

### Footnote:

1 Clearance applies to threatened and endangered species only (i.e., not species of special concern).

ic Comments:		
Notice of the receipt of the application and a tentative d	ecision to <u>issue a permit</u> was publis	shed in <i>Pennsylvania Bulletin</i> on:
August 26, 2023	30-day public comment end date:	September 26, 2023
Notice of the receipt of the application and a tentative on:	decision to <u>deny the application</u> wa	s published in <i>Pennsylvania Bulletin</i>
	30-day public comment end date:	
Comments were received from the applicant during the application denial letter.	e comment period and are address	sed in the final permit cover letter or
Public comments were received during the comment pe	eriod and were considered in makin	g a final decision on the application.
A public hearing was held due to significant interest.	Date of hearing:	
A comment-response document has been developed to	address comments/testimony rece	eived from the public.
No public comments were received during the review of	f the application	
	Notice of the receipt of the application and a tentative of August 26, 2023  Notice of the receipt of the application and a tentative of on:  Comments were received from the applicant during the application denial letter.  Public comments were received during the comment per A public hearing was held due to significant interest.  A comment-response document has been developed to	Notice of the receipt of the application and a tentative decision to issue a permit was public August 26, 2023  30-day public comment end date:  Notice of the receipt of the application and a tentative decision to deny the application was on:  30-day public comment end date:  Comments were received from the applicant during the comment period and are address application denial letter.  Public comments were received during the comment period and were considered in making

Site-Specific Special Conditions and Rationale: