STREAMLINE
ENGINEERING
INC.

110 ALLAN STREET
LOWER BURRELL
PENNSYLVANIA 15068
TELE: 724-594-0326
FAX: 724-594-0328
WWW.STREAMLINEENGINEERING.NET

June 25, 2025

Project No. 21-109

Anne Fox, Senior Resource Conservationist
Allegheny County Conservation District
317 East Carson Street, Suite 119
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: DEP FILE E0205225-004
Incompleteness Review
Quaker Valley School District
New High School Campus
Leet Township, Leetsdale & Edgeworth Boroughs, Allegheny County

Dear Ms. Fox:

Streamline Engineering, Inc. has reviewed the administrative incompleteness review letter dated March 3, 2025, for the Quaker Valley School District's proposed new high school campus. Streamline, with the assistance of Phillips and Associates, the prime consultant, has addressed the comments and revised the project and application accordingly. The proposed project also has been revised to incorporate the changes requested by the concurrent administrative/technical reviews from the USACE and the PADEP as part of the Joint Permit process for the anticipated impacts of the water resources on the site. Streamline recently received the PADEP technical review for the Joint Permit on June 16, 2025, and has yet to respond which is due mid August.

The notable changes in the design for this submission is the reevaluation of the water resources on the site and the shifting of the stormwater pond locations to reduce the impacts to the unnamed tributaries in response to all of the agencies' reviews. These changes do not alter the school campus layout.

Below are the responses to ACCD's comments:

1. 102.6(a)(1) Address the following items in the Individual NPDES Application form:

    a. Page 1, General Information - #3: Provide the applicant type, structure, etc. in the space provided.

    RESPONSE: *The applicant type and structure has been added to the NPDES form.*

b. Page 2, Project Site Information - #11: Provide either the address number for the site on Camp Meeting Road, or provide the two closest cross streets.

RESPONSE: *The project address is 210 Camp Meeting Road.*

c. Page 2, Project Site Information: For the clarification purposes, if the intent is that the permit boundary is the same as the LOD for this project, please revise the total project site acreage to the 69.6 acres rather than the entire property boundary of 158 acres.

RESPONSE: *The total project site acreage is revised to be 69.77 acres which is the disturbed area of 69.6 acres plus 0.17 acre of impervious road area on Camp Meeting Road north of the site. This 0.17 acre area will be milled and paved to transition the new drive to the existing alignment of Camp Meeting Road.*

d. Page 4, Stormwater Discharge Information: For the DP IDs that discharge to storm sewer, please state "via storm sewer" with the name of the receiving waters.

RESPONSE: *The project does not result in DPs that discharge to a storm sewer based on correspondence with the Allegheny County Department of Public Works (DPW) and with Mr. Matt Gordon of the ACCD. Refer to Answer 1.e. below and Enclosure 1 of this letter.*

e. Page 4, Stormwater Discharge Information; For the DP ID that discharge to storm sewer owned by Allegheny County, Check the box 'yes' for MS4 sewer (see comment #33).

RESPONSE: *The box has not been checked based on the correspondence between Mr. Matt Gordon of ACCD and Allegheny County (see Enclosure 1). New storm sewers will be installed along the revised entrance at Camp Meeting Road as part of this project. The new catch basins will discharge back to the site into Channel 3 which conveys runoff to the SWMF-1. A MS4 form was submitted to Allegheny County for review and signature, but Allegheny County decided that the MS4 was not needed since the new storm sewers would not discharge into the existing Allegheny County storm sewer system. Refer to Enclosure 1.*

2. 102.6(a)(1) Please discuss and address the following items related to the GIF. Make any necessary changes.

a. Coordination Information Items #3.0-3.3, page 6: eMap PA shows several locations of existing oil and gas wells on the site.

RESPONSE: *Streamline reviewed the eMap PA information and conducted a site visit on March 12, 2025, for the purpose of locating the gas wells based on the location information on eMap. No oil and gas wells were located on the project site. Photos were taken at the locations as evidence that the wells were not at the site. The photos are included in the Wetland Delineation and Water Resources Evaluation Report.*

b. Coordination Information Item #15, page 8: eMap PA & PAGEODE identify a drinking water well located on the project site (Pa WellID: 642871).

RESPONSE: *Streamline reviewed the eMap PA & PAGEODE information. The drinking water well is located on the opposite bank of the UNT Little Sewickley Creek on an adjacent property not owned by the Quaker Valley School District.*

3. 102.6(a)(1) Were responses received to the Municipal Notification Forms? Per the instructions, the signed certified mail receipts may be acceptable, after 30 days from when the notifications were sent. The application was submitted prior to that 30 day point, thus responses should be provided if the receiving parties responded in that timeframe.

   RESPONSE: *The forms were sent to Allegheny County and to the municipalities, and the certification cards were returned in January 2025. Allegheny County responded on January 23, 2025, and Leet Township responded on January 28, 2025. The signed certified mail receipts and the signed Notifications Form from Allegheny County and Leet Township are provided in the revised permit submittal. Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs did not return the municipal forms.*

4. 102.6(a)(2) The question regarding amount of woods/trees to be removed in the PNDI appears to have been answered incorrectly based on the pre-development conditions that identify acreage of woods on the site in the PCSM calculations. Revise the PNDI to be reflective of site conditions or provide supporting evidence that the PNDI acreage is correct (including a map exhibit). Identify in the response to this comment the anticipated area of woods (in acres) proposed to be disturbed during the life of the project.

   RESPONSE: *The answer to the PNDI question was answered correctly. The total on-site Pre-development wooded area is 44.42 acres, and the total on-site Post-development wooded area is 13.17 acres, resulting in 31.25 acres of wood clearing. The wooded areas and the acreages are presented on the Pre-Development and Post-Development Plans in the PCSM, Appendices B and C, respectively.*

   a. It is also recommended to re-run the PNDI based on the initial run date being in 2023 and PNDIs are valid only for 2 years.

      RESPONSE: *The PNDI has been updated, and the PNDI receipt is provided in the revised permit submittal.*

5. 102.4(b)(5)(ii) and §102.6(a)(1) The 2nd Phase 1 ESA from 2019 identifies 55 gallon drums present on the site with leaf staining/dead vegetation, as well as building materials with possible asbestos containing materials, and recommends additional testing in those specific areas for potential soil or groundwater contamination. This consequent testing has not been provided, as the Phase 2 investigation provided is for a different portion of the site and relates to other dumped materials on the site.

   a. Furthermore, per current guidance, ESAs and testing should have been conducted within 3 years of application submittal and soil samples should have been collected within the last 5 years (with a preference for within the last year).

   b. Provide updated report(s) that shows environmental due diligence has been conducted and provide testing results for soils/groundwater, as applicable and appropriate to the RECs on the site.

c. Revise other portions of the application, such as the modules, where needed. Revise the E&S and PCSM drawings to identify locations of these potentially contaminated (or contaminated) hotspots.

d. Provide a specific soil management plan with guidance on how to identify and handle soils in these areas during earthmoving operations.

RESPONSE: *QVSD hired AGX, Inc. to follow-up on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA, Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs)). AGX, Inc. performed soil testing in the area of the identified 55-gallon drums and leaf staining/dead vegetation to evaluate the extent of fuel oil impact, if any. AGX, Inc. also performed soil testing at the building materials dump to evaluate whether hazardous substances associated with the former building materials affected soil at this location. AGX, inc. verified that the 55-gallon drums were removed from the site, and soil testing results verified that all the affected soil was removed from the site by the property owner's contractor. AGX, Inc. soil testing results verified that all of the demolition debris was removed from the site and the remaining soils are not affected. See the attached AGX, Inc. report dated 9/13/2019 regarding Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA, Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs)).*

6. 102.6(a)(1) Provide a cut/fill balance sheet with soil volumes identified for the project. Check the box in E&S Module 1.

RESPONSE: *The proposed grading quantities for the QVSD new high school project were calculated to be 444,339 cubic yards cut and 626,405 cubic yards fill. Using a swell factor of 1.4%, agreed upon by the project geotechnical engineers and the school project consult, the cut quality will increase to 622,075 cubic yards. These quantities were calculated from existing grade to proposed subgrade for the site. The proposed grading for the project will be a balance of cut and fill and no material will leave the site nor any material brought to the site.*

7. 102.4(b)(5)(iii) and 102.8(f)(3) The LOD identified in the wetland report contains additional area (appears to be for a utility connection) going towards B Street from the site. This is not on the current E&S or PCSM plan versions – has that been removed from the project?

RESPONSE: *The additional area going towards B street from the site as presented in the wetland report is no longer part of the project. The LOD has been revised to exclude this area.*

8. 102.6(a)(1) In the soil table attached to E&S Module 1, no soils are identified as hydric, even though the following page shows that some are hydric or have hydric inclusions, and wetlands are present on the site. Revise the table to identify the hydric soil types. (PDF Page 7.)

RESPONSE: *The soil table in Module 1 has been revised to identify soils that are hydric or have hydric inclusions.*

9. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) Per the E&S Manual, the smallest scaling that should be used for drawings is 1"=60'. The drawings provided in this submission use a scale of 1"=80', which makes it difficult to decipher slopes/grading and site features. Please revise.

RESPONSE: *Drawings have been revised to present the work at 1"=60' scale mapping.*

10. 102.4(b)(5)(v) Identify and label the floodway and floodplain for all watercourses on the site. Use the 50' assumed floodway or provide calculations for the calculated 100 year floodway for those without FEMA mapping.

    RESPONSE: *The floodways and floodplains are shown on the drawings. The floodways and floodplains are confined to the channels based on Bankfull Capacity calculations that are provided in E&S Standard Worksheets section of the permit resubmittal and in Appendix B of the PCSM Report, and based on observations of the lack of floodplains on site.*

11. 102.4(b)(5)(v) Provide a copy of the JPA plans and the accompanying ARIT.

    RESPONSE: *PADEP sent a Technical Deficiency letter dated June 16, 2025 for the Joint Permit Application for this project. Once these comments are addressed, a copy of the JPA plans and the accompanying ARIT will be forwarded to ACCD.*

12. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) Identify and label all discharge points on the E&S drawings, cross referenced with the discharge points identified in the Individual Application Form.

    RESPONSE: *The discharge points shown on the E&S drawings have been cross-referenced with the points identified on the Individual Application Form.*

13. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) Label the sediment basins as such in the E&S drawing set.

    RESPONSE: *The sediment basins have been labeled on the E&S drawings.*

14. 102.4(b)(5)(viii) Provide a stage storage graph with elevations 2 & 3 labeled with the stage storage tables provided in the E&S calculations for the sediment basins.

    RESPONSE: *Stage-Storage graphs for the Sediment Basins with elevations "2" and "3" indicated have been added to the E&S calculations (see E&S Standard Worksheets).*

15. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) Provide details and notes for the following BMPs in the E&S drawing set:

    a. Skimmer (Standard Detail #7-1)
       RESPONSE: *Standard detail #7-1 will not be used for this project.*

    b. Skimmer Attached to Permanent Riser (Standard Detail #7-2)
       RESPONSE: *Standard Detail #7-2 has been added to the E&S drawings.*

    c. Skimmer Landing Device (Standard Detail #7-3)
       RESPONSE: *Standard Drawing #7-3 has been added to the E&S drawings.*

    d. Permanent Riser Structure
       RESPONSE: *Details for the permanent new structure have been added to the PCSM drawings.*

e. Detail for the Grate on the top of the permanent riser structure and/or trash rack
RESPONSE: *A detail for the grate on the permanent riser is provided on the PCSM drawings.*

f. Clean out stake
RESPONSE: *A detail for the clean-out stake has been added to the E&S drawings.*

g. Emergency Spillway (Standard Detail #7-12 for riprap emergency spillway)
RESPONSE*: Details for the emergency spillway have been added to the E&S drawings.*

h. Basin Dewatering Device (Standard Detail #7-18)
RESPONSE: *Standard Detail #7-18 will not be used for this project since a skimmer device will be used to dewater the basins.*

i. Anti Seep Collars (Standard Detail #7-16)
RESPONSE: *Standard Detail #7-16 has been added to the E&S drawings.*

j. Riprap Apron at Pipe Outlet to an Existing Channel (Standard Detail #9-3)
RESPONSE: *Standard Detail #9-3 has been added to the PCSM drawings.*

16. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) Identify locations of haul roads to be utilized while performing cut/fill and grading operations. Provide applicable details for haul road construction (Standard Details in E&S Manual Chapter 3).

RESPONSE: *The site has three existing access points and roads for the construction of the site. A fourth access point and haul road will be the new driveway between the sediment basins, SB-1 and SB-2. Details for this new access has been added to the detail drawings.*

17. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) Identify locations where erosion control blanketing will be installed on the E&S drawings.

RESPONSE*: Locations where erosion control blanketing will be installed is shown on the E&S Plan drawings.*

18. 102.14 Identify existing riparian buffer zones for the portion of the site in the Little Sewickley Creek watershed on the E&S drawings.

RESPONSE: *The existing riparian buffer zones for the portion of the site in the Little Sewickley Creek watershed is shown on the E&S plan drawings.*

19. 102.8(f)(6) and §102.8(f)(3) Label all proposed PCSM SCMs as they are identified in PCSM Module 2. Ensure the labeling can be easily seen (the bioretention areas in particular are difficult to distinguish the labeling in this original drawing set.) Also the proposed meadow area is labeled in the DA maps but not labeled on the full PCSM set. Make any necessary changes.

RESPONSE: *The labeling of proposed PCSM SCMs has been made consistent with the labeling in PCSM Module 2. All meadow areas have been identified.*

20. 102.8(f)(9) Identify and label all proposed discharge points, cross referenced to PCSM Module 2 and the IP Application Form on the PCSM Drawings.

    RESPONSE: *The proposed discharge points have been identified consistently on the drawings and PCSM Module 2.*

21. 102.6(a)(1) Provide separated volume and rate pages of PCSM Module 2 for each POA/DP.

    RESPONSE: *Separate volume and rate pages of PCSM Module 2 are provided.*

22. 102.8(f)(8) and §102.8(g)(3) Explain where overflow from storm events larger than the 2 year/24 hr storm event for the bioretention areas will go. If this is routed to another PCSM SCM, the module, spreadsheet and routing calculations should reflect as such.

    RESPONSE: *Bioretention area overflows resulting from storm events larger than the 2-year 24-hour storm are conveyed to either SWMF-1 or SWMF-2.*

    a. Explain why the bioretention areas are not represented in the hydrographs, drainage area maps, etc. Provide any supporting calculations related to the bioretention SCMs.

       RESPONSE: *The bioretention ponds are designed to provide volume control and water quality (initial flush) for storm events up to the 2-year 24-hour storm. Larger magnitude storms would pass through the bioretention areas with lesser benefits. Calculations for the bioretention areas is provided in Appendix E of the PCSM Plan. The ponds would provide little or no influence on events larger than the 2-year storm, and therefore are neglected in the designs for SWMF-1 and SWMF-2.*

23. 102.8(g)(2), §102.8(g)(3), §102.8(f)(8) Provide routing calculations for the MRC Basin for the 1.2"/24 hour storm.

    RESPONSE: *The 1-inch/2-hour storm is used to determine the allowable release rate through the MRC orifice. Routing of the 1.2"-2hr storm is not required for the MRC analyses. Per MRC guidance, "The stormwater release rate from the MRC SCM for the 1.2-inch/2-hour storm may not exceed 0.02 cubic feet per second (cfs) from the equivalent impervious area within the MRC SCM's drainage area (within the project site)". The calculations for determining the equivalent impervious area and for sizing the SWMF-1 MRC orifice to meet the MRC release rate are provided in Appendix G of the PCSM Plan. The elevation for the stormwater management dewatering orifice has been set no lower than the elevation corresponding to the MRC volume.*

    Routing analyses for the 1-year, 2-year, 10-year, 50-year, and100-year 24-hour storms under pre-development and post-development conditions are also provided in Appendix G of the PCSM Plan to complete the MRC evaluation..

24. 102.4(b)(5)(v), §102.8(f)(5), §102.14, §102.8(f)(14) The watercourse/wetland report provided does not appear to have considered the possibility of additional watercourses on the southern side of the site or the northwestern side of the site. Please revisit and confirm there are not any other surface waters in those areas of the site that would require buffer protection with easements or implementation. Make any necessary

changes to the application package. Module 4 may also be needed if there are smaller watercourses present on those areas of the property.

RESPONSE: *Streamline accompanied personnel from the PADEP and the USACE March 21, 2025 to revisit these areas. No streams are located within the existing 150-floor buffer on the north side of the site draining to Little Sewickley Creek. All existing channels in the southwest area of the site were determined to be ravines with the exception of a 100-foot section of an ephemeral UNT-6. At the request of the USACE, the ephemeral channels have been added to the wetland report.*

25. 102.8(f)(9) Provide a planting plan for proposed SCMs where ET credits are being taken. Per the PCSM Spreadsheet instructions, a combination of woody and herbaceous plantings should be provided (plugs, not just a seed mixture).

    RESPONSE: *Planting plans for the bioretention ponds are provided on the Plant Schedule drawing by LBA Landscape Architecture in Appendix G of the PCSM Plan. The plantings will include woody and herbaceous plantings, including plugs.*

26. 102.6(a)(1), §102.4(b)(5)(ii), §102.8(g)(1) Provide thorough explanations and provide guidance in the plans and in the modules on how fractured bedrock and redbeds on the site are being handled and considered as it relates to stormwater management, slope construction and grading design, and sediment pollution prevention during and after site development.

    RESPONSE: *The test boring program indicates that intact redbed bedrock will not be encountered during stormwater management/sediment pond construction, as that layer daylights above the pond elevations. However, there are redbed-derived colluvial (landslide) deposits covering some of the planned pond area. Those colluvial deposits will be removed, mixed with other suitable on-site soils, and recompacted as engineered fill to construct the pond embankments. The mixture percentages will be controlled by comparing shear strength test results completed on compacted mixed samples (95% of max density as determined by modified proctor ASTM D 1557) and must meet the shear strength parameters needed for a global stability factor of safety (FS) of at least 1.5 as normal and customary in the geotechnical engineering profession. If fractured bedrock of other types are encountered, they will be mixed and compacted according to the same criteria. All temporary slopes must have a FS of at least 1.3 as customary and meeting the local geotechnical engineering standard of care.*

27. 102.6(a)(1), §102.4(b)(5)(ii), §102.8(g)(1) Carbonaceous materials and other potentially expansive minerals were encountered during site investigation or are anticipated to be encountered based on the geotechnical report. Provide an analysis addressing the likelihood that these materials may be encountered during cut/fill operations on the site.

    a. If carbonaceous materials will be exposed or excavated, handling of these materials should be discussed and appropriate guidance should be provided in the site soil management plan.

       RESPONSE: *Significantly thick seams of carbonaceous, pyritic, or other potentially expansive minerals (PEMS) were not encountered in the test borings. Thin seams were encountered in some areas that when mixed with the surrounding sandstone fragments and sand will account for less than 10% of the*

overall mixture. Therefore, the extent of carbonaceous material during earthwork should not affect the performance of engineered fill soils comprised of that mixture. However, if thicker seams are encountered, those materials would be segregated into separate stockpiles and blended into other on-site soils so that any mixture contains less than 10% PEMS. If used in slope or embankment construction, those soils would be subject to the same design criteria outlined above for question 26.

b. Provide a copy of the proposed final grading plan and recommendations, along with applicable details for slope shoring and construction materials.

RESPONSE: *The final grading is shown on the plans. Details for slope shoring and construction materials are part of the construction documents which will be the responsibility of the awarded project contractor. Details for slope shoring and construction materials will be submitted by the contractor and reviewed and approval by the QVSD project geotechnical engineer.*

28. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) and 102.4(b)(5)(vii) Due to the significant amount of engineered fill and overcut that is required to provide for stable slope construction, an additional E&S phase plan is requested for providing sufficient materials handling, stockpiling areas, haul roads, etc. during construction.

RESPONSE: *Intermediate phase grading plans have been prepared showing the proposed extent of the large slope undercuts and benching and the proposed 10' rock undercut of the building pad area.*

The final grading is shown on the plans. Details for slope shoring and construction materials for the bulk grading of the site will be the responsibility of the awarded project contractor. The details for slope shoring and construction materials will be submitted by the project contractor to the QVSD Project Geotechnical Engineer for be review and approval. These details for the bulk grading of the site are construction means and methods which the project contractor is to provide and is not directly related to the proposed Erosion and Sedimentation Controls Methods proposed for this project.

29. 102.8(g)(1) Provide a copy of the infiltration testing results and test pit descriptions for the project.

RESPONSE: *Prior to developing a site plan for the proposed high school project, due diligence evaluation (DDE) was conducted on the site. As part of the DDE, a preliminary geotechnical exploration and evaluations was performed that consisted of drilling of 136 test borings across the entire project site. These test borings revealed the project site ridgetop is capped by a layer of competent sandstone with a thin layer of residual sandy soil that has weathered from its parent sandstone. The sandstone layer is approximately 11 feet thick. This sandstone layer is underlain by an unnamed redbed unit, the Ames limestone, and the Pittsburgh redbed unit. The redbed unit is approximately 80 feet thick. The bedrock below the redbed unit consisted of cyclic sequences of sandstone, siltstone, claystone, and shale to the lowest termination elevations across the site. Pockets of colluvium were encountered in many of the test borings, generally located at or below the elevation of the redbed unit. Since the geology of the site consisted of a sandstone rock layer just below the ridge surface and a redbed unit layer below the rock layer, we did not perform pre-development infiltration testing on the site.*

30. 102.8(g)(1) Provide a drawing showing areas that were investigated for pre-development infiltration capabilities.

RESPONSE: *As mentioned in response to comment #29, we did not perform pre-development infiltration testing on the site. However, 136 test borings were drilled across the entire project site. These test borings revealed the soil (sandstone rock, redbed unit, colluvium, etc.) are not conducive to infiltration. Therefore, the site was designed to include bio-retention areas around the proposed school building and parking lots that will be constructed on placed fill material consisting of a mixture of the excavated site soils with sand from the processing (on-site crusher and screens) of the sandstone rock on the site. We are proposing infiltration testing after the proposed bio-retention areas have been constructed. The site Pre-Characterization Map is provided in Module 2. The Map indicates that only the ridge and the area along UNT-2 are potential areas for infiltration. The ridge provides the only size area possible for the school campus.*

31. 102.4(c) Provide an erosion potential analysis for each proposed discharge point expected to result in concentrated flow during and after construction. The IP should evaluate the stability of the flowpath from a discharge point to a surface water or storm sewer that directly discharges to a surface water.

RESPONSE: *All concentrated discharge points from the site will discharge directly to a stream. Therefore, erosion potential analyses are not required.*

DP-001 (SWMF-1) discharges directly to UNT-2 via its riprap apron. DP-002 (SWMF-2) discharges directly to UNT-6, immediately upstream of UNT-2 via its riprap apron. DP-003 (Culvert 4) also discharges directly to UNT-6 at the same location as DP-002. DP-004 (catch basins on the new driveway near the intersection of the new driveway with Camp Meeting Road) discharges directly to UNT-2 at the Culvert 5 riprap apron.

DP-005 identifies project site runoff to the UNT to Little Sewickley Creek. All runoff flows to the UNT to Little Sewickley Creek are currently, and will continue to be, sheet flow. No development, SCM discharges, or concentrated flows occur or will occur to the UNT. DP-004 is identified only to denote that the UNT is a receiving stream for project flows, as is required per the Module 2 instructions.

DP-006 is a temporary discharge point for the diversion of off-site roadway drainage flows to allow the proposed work on UNT-1 and Channel 3. These flows will subsequently be permanently directed to Channel 3 and SWMF-1, and discharge via DP-001.

32. 102.8(g)(1) Identify and label locations of soil testing, infiltration testing, and test pits on the PCSM drawing set. These should be cross referenced to Module 2 test pit and infiltration testing information.

RESPONSE: *The locations of the 136 test borings have been shown on the existing conditions plan.*

33. 102.6(a)(1) Provide the MS4 notification form filled out and sent to Allegheny County for any discharges proposed to connect to their storm sewer as well as proof of delivery.

RESPONSE: *A MS4 Notification Form was completed and submitted to Allegheny County Department of Public Works for review and signature. Jean L. Statler, P.E., Manager of Roads for Allegheny County Department of Public Works contacted Matt Gordon, ACCD. Matt Gordon told Jean Statler that ACCD reviewed the latest plan that was submitted to them for the project, Allegheny County is not required to sign this document. It is only for direct connections into the Allegheny County MS4 storm sewer system. All of the proposed storm sewers discharge directly to the stream. A copy of the emails pertinent to these discussions is attached as Enclosure 1.*

34. 102.4(b)(5)(v) The LOD in the area of where Camp Meeting Road is being redone, towards the northern corner of the site does not contain sufficient surrounding area to determine proximity to the stream on the HQ side of the site. Did the wetland investigation include this area?

    RESPONSE: *Yes.*

35. 102.4(b)(5)(v) and §102.8(f)(5) Identify the split in the watersheds for the site on the plans (UNT to Ohio River vs. Little Sewickley Creek).

    RESPONSE: *The watershed divide between the UNTs to Ohio River and Little Sewickley Creek is shown on the drawings.*

36. 102.6(a)(1) Provide an update on the PHMC Coordination.

    RESPONSE: *This project requires a PA DEP Chapter 105 and Section 404 Joint Permit process with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Under Section 106: the USACE has drafted a Determination of Eligibility letter to send to the SHPO. This is currently pending signature by USACE supervisor. We are waiting on a response from SHPO.*

If you have any questions on this submittal, please contact Streamline Engineering, Inc.

Respectfully yours,
STREAMLINE ENGINEERING, INC.

FOR

Martha L. Frech, P.E.
President

ENCLOSURE 1
MS4 Correspondence

mfrech@streamlineengineering.net

From: Statler, Jean L. <Jean.Statler@AlleghenyCounty.US>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 10:12 AM
To: Geoffrey Phillips
Cc: Michael Andrewsh (mandrewsh@dewooster.com); Martha L. Frech (mfrech@streamlineengineering.net)
Subject: RE: QVSD New High School Project ACCD review comments

Geoffrey

I checked with ACCD regarding if the County needs to sign this document. Matt Gordon told me that they reviewed the latest plan that was submitted to them for the project, Allegheny County is not required to sign this document. It is only for direct connections into our MS4 storm sewer system. All of your storm sewers discharge directly to the stream.

Thanks,
Jean

Jean L. Statler, P.E.
Manager of Roads
Department of Public Works
542 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Office #412-350-5927 | Cell #412-477-4942

From: Geoffrey Phillips <gcp@paiservices.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2025 2:01 PM
To: Statler, Jean L. <Jean.Statler@AlleghenyCounty.US>
Cc: Michael Andrewsh (mandrewsh@dewooster.com) <mandrewsh@dewooster.com>; Martha L. Frech (mfrech@streamlineengineering.net) <mfrech@streamlineengineering.net>
Subject: RE: QVSD New High School Project ACCD review comments
Importance: High

Jean,

Attached is the MS4 Notification Form for the Quaker Valley School District (QVSD) New High School Project with pertinent Pre and Post Development Maps and storm system calculations. We are submitting this notification for the existing county storm system along Camp Meeting Road in the area where the project will be relocating the road. The proposed realignment of Camp Meeting Road will not increase the volume nor rate of stormwater runoff to the existing county inlets (see attached calculations).

Previous plans submitted by Wooster and Associates with the HOP application showed the existing and the proposed new storm drainage system (realigned Camp Meeting Road) to be connected to an existing inlet E6 and the replacement of the existing 18" cross pipe with a larger 30" RCP pipe. We met with PA DEP and the US Army Corp of Engineers at the site the end of May. Both agencies do not want us to collect the entire drainage area from Quaker Heights into our proposed stormwater management facility. Therefore, we are not going to connect the existing and proposed storm system to inlet E6. Instead, we are going to install a pipe and inlet across Camp

Meeting Road and pipe into the School property to discharge into a proposed rip-rap channel located below the toe of slope. The proposed rip-rap channel will convey the stormwater runoff to the proposed SWMF number 1. The HOP plans will be revised by Wooster and Associates to reflect the change of the proposed storm system.

We are making a resubmittal to ACCD next Tuesday (6/24/25) and would like to include the signed MS4 notification form. Will you be able to review the MS4 Notification Form information, have Mr. Shanley sign the form and send the signed form back to me by next Tuesday?

If you have any questions, please call my cell or email me.

Geoffrey C. Phillips, P.E.
Principal

Phillips & Associates, Inc.
1122 Mosside Boulevrd
Wall, PA 15148
412-825-4090
412-613-9898 Cell
Email: gcp@paiservices.net

From: Statler, Jean L. <Jean.Statler@AlleghenyCounty.US>
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2025 1:19 PM
To: Geoffrey Phillips <gcp@paiservices.net>
Subject: RE: QVSD New High School Project ACCD review comments

Geoffrey,

Please send it to me because I will be reviewing it for him.

Thanks,
Jean

Jean L. Statler, P.E.
Manager of Roads
Department of Public Works
542 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Office #412-350-5927 | Cell #412-477-4942

From: Geoffrey Phillips <gcp@paiservices.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2025 12:37 PM
To: Statler, Jean L. <Jean.Statler@AlleghenyCounty.US>
Subject: RE: QVSD New High School Project ACCD review comments
Importance: High

Jean,

The ACCD finally sent me the MS4 notification form. We have completed the form with pertinent Pre and Post Development Maps and storm system calculations. Can I email this information to Stephen Shanley for review and

signature? If so can you give me his email address. We are making a resubmittal to ACCD next week and would like to include the signed MS4 notification form.

Geoffrey C. Phillips, P.E.
Principal

Phillips & Associates, Inc.
1122 Mosside Boulevrd
Wall, PA 15148
412-825-4090
Email: gcp@paiservices.net

From: Statler, Jean L. <Jean.Statler@AlleghenyCounty.US>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 11:22 AM
To: Geoffrey Phillips <gcp@paiservices.net>; Michael Andrewsh <mandrewsh@dewooster.com>
Subject: RE: QVSD New High School Project ACCD review comments

Geoffrey

You will need to contact the ACCD for the form and the requirements regarding the notification procedure. Use the following contact and address for the contact information for the County:

Allegheny County Department of Public Works
542 Forbes Avenue
501 County Office Building
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

ATT: Stephen Shanley, Director of Public Works

Thanks,
Jean

Jean L. Statler, P.E.
Manager of Roads
Department of Public Works
542 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Office #412-350-5927 | Cell #412-477-4942

From: Geoffrey Phillips <gcp@paiservices.net>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 11:07 AM
To: Statler, Jean L. <Jean.Statler@AlleghenyCounty.US>; Michael Andrewsh <mandrewsh@dewooster.com>
Subject: RE: QVSD New High School Project ACCD review comments

Jean,

Can you send me this MS4 notification form we need to send, or a link get it. Do we send it back to you or who do we send it to?

Geoffrey C. Phillips, P.E.

Principal

Phillips & Associates, Inc.
1122 Mosside Boulevrd
Wall, PA 15148
412-825-4090
Email: gcp@paiservices.net

From: Statler, Jean L. <Jean.Statler@AlleghenyCounty.US>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 10:53 AM
To: Geoffrey Phillips <gcp@paiservices.net>; Michael Andrewsh <mandrewsh@dewooster.com>
Subject: RE: QVSD New High School Project ACCD review comments

Geoffrey

The County has to comply with the MS4 requirements for the storm sewers in County owned roads. MS4 includes any storm sewer direct connections as well as overland flow that enters our system from development sites. I am assuming that since you are realigning the road and moving our system and some of the flow from the development enters our storm sewers, that is why ACCD wants this form sent out notifying Allegheny County of your development site work under MS4.

Thanks,
Jean

Jean L. Statler, P.E.
Manager of Roads
Department of Public Works
542 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Office #412-350-5927 | Cell #412-477-4942

From: Geoffrey Phillips <gcp@paiservices.net>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 10:14 AM
To: Michael Andrewsh <mandrewsh@dewooster.com>; Statler, Jean L. <Jean.Statler@AlleghenyCounty.US>
Subject: RE: QVSD New High School Project ACCD review comments

Mike and Jean,

Attached is PDF of original portion of ACCD comment letter with #1e. and #33. They seem to be making reference to the storm system along Camp Meeting Road that will be realigned and at the lower driveway entrance. We are not connecting any site storm into either of these two systems. Does the County Road storm system even fall under the MS4?

Geoffrey C. Phillips, P.E.
Principal

Phillips & Associates, Inc.
1122 Mosside Boulevrd
Wall, PA 15148
412-825-4090
Email: gcp@paiservices.net