

**Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities**  
**through the ePermit System**  
**SOP No. BCW-PMT-042-E**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**  
**Version 1.0**

This SOP describes the procedures by which the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Waterways and Wetlands Program, DEP Regional Permit Coordination Office (RPCO), and delegated county conservation districts (CCDs) will process electronic Notices of Intent (NOIs) for PAG-02 General NPDES Permit coverage for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activities via the web-based ePermit system. The eFACTS authorization type covered by this SOP is “NSC2” and the application types covered by this SOP include “NEW”, “AMAJ” (Major Amendment), “AMIN” (Minor Amendment) and “REN” (renewal).

This SOP is intended to comply with the DEP’s [Policy for Implementing the Department of Environmental Protection \(Department\) Permit Review Process and Permit Decision Guarantee](#) (DEP Document No. 021-2100-001) (PRP/PDG Policy). Only certain types of applications are subject to the Permit Decision Guarantee (PDG) described in the PRP/PDG Policy. PAG-02 NOIs **ARE NOT** part of the PDG.

It is anticipated that CCDs will be the permitting authority for most PAG-02 authorizations. However, DEP will also receive and review PAG-02 NOIs, particularly for projects in counties without a delegated CCD. The term, “DEP/CCD” is used in this SOP to represent the applicable permitting authority.

DEP and CCDs will refer to DEP’s [Policy for Permit Coordination](#) (DEP Document No. 021-2000-301) and other existing guidance when evaluating the need to coordinate issuance of PAG-02 General Permit coverage with other permits.

## **I. Pre-Application Meeting (DEP/CCD Staff)**

Applicants are encouraged to request a Pre-Application Meeting with DEP/CCD. A Pre-Application Meeting is important not only for the applicant to explain the project to DEP/CCD, but also for DEP/CCD to verify eligibility, minimizing the likelihood of a DEP/CCD finding of ineligibility.

- A. If an applicant would like to request a Pre-Application Meeting, they should contact DEP/CCD to schedule a Pre-Application Meeting (either an in-person meeting or a conference call, as determined by DEP/CCD). The request should be accompanied by a completed [Chapter 102 Pre-Application Meeting Request Form](#) (DEP Document No. 3800-FM-BCW271e). If a CCD is the permitting authority and believes that there will be unique or challenging circumstances for the NOI review, the CCD will invite appropriate DEP staff.

---

<sup>1</sup> **DISCLAIMER:** The process and procedures outlined in this SOP are intended to supplement existing requirements. Nothing in the SOP shall affect regulatory requirements. The process, procedures and interpretations herein are not an adjudication or a regulation. There is no intent on the part of DEP to give the rules in this SOP that weight or deference. This document establishes the framework within which DEP will exercise its administrative discretion in the future. DEP reserves the discretion to deviate from this policy statement if circumstances warrant.

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**

- B. During the Pre-Application Meeting, DEP/CCD staff will identify any additional DEP permits potentially required for the project<sup>2</sup> and provide an explanation of the Permit Review Process (PRP) and review timelines. DEP's *Policy for Permit Coordination* should be followed during the Pre-Application Meeting.
- C. During the Pre-Application Meeting, DEP/CCD staff will take general notes of the discussion and record the notes on the Chapter 102 Pre-Application Meeting Record Form (see **Attachment A**) or equivalent. At the conclusion of the Pre-Application Meeting, DEP/CCD staff will provide (in person or by email) a copy of this form to the applicant and consultant to ensure understanding by all parties.
- D. If known at the time, the Application Manager for DEP/CCD (i.e., the lead reviewer of the NOI when it is submitted) for the NOI should be identified to the applicant.

**II. Preliminary Processing, Prioritization and Assignment (DEP/CCD Staff/Management)**

Upon receipt of a PAG-02 NOI through the ePermit system, the system will automatically assign an NPDES Permit Application Number in accordance with Section 6 of the E&S and NPDES Administrative Manual (Permit Numbering). DEP/CCD administrative staff and management will implement the following steps as soon as possible but no longer than five (5) calendar days following the receipt of the NOI:

A. Process Fees.

- 1. If the CCD will be performing the Completeness Review, the appropriate Base Administrative Filing Fee (\$500) for PAG-02 coverage will be submitted directly (i.e., on paper) to the CCD Office (and will not be paid through the ePermit system). CCD administrative staff will process and deposit the fee (including any CCD-specific fees where a CCD is the permitting authority) in accordance with guidance provided under the DEP Management Directive OAM-1000-001 (Deposit of Fees, Fines, Penalties and Other Revenue). If the appropriate Base Administrative Filing Fee for PAG-02 coverage was not submitted, DEP/CCD administrative staff will follow the procedures for over- or under-payment of fees identified in the DEP Management Directive OAM-1000-001 and Program Clarification Memo PCM\_WET\_NCEC\_13\_003 and follow Step II.B.4.

**NOTE 1** – Fees should not be held until after the Completeness Review has been performed.

**NOTE 2** – The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), PennDOT, the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, DEP, the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR), and the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission are exempt from Chapter 102 NPDES fees. If any other entity claims an exemption, request assistance from the DEP regional office or DEP Bureau of Clean Water.

- 2. The Additional Administrative Filing Fee (i.e., Disturbed Acreage Fee) will always be collected by the ePermit system (unless the Applicant is exempt from the fees as identified in Note 2).
- 3. CCD administrative staff will determine whether the appropriate CCD-specific fees have been submitted (these fees will not be paid through the ePermit system). Where DEP is the permitting authority, they will coordinate with the CCD to ensure fee submission, where applicable (e.g., multiple county projects).

---

<sup>2</sup> It is the responsibility of an applicant to ensure that all necessary permits are obtained from DEP. The applicant is encouraged to submit their project information through DEP's [Permit Application Consultation Tool](#).

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**

- a. If the appropriate CCD-specific fee was not submitted, DEP/CCD administrative staff will follow the procedures for over- or under-payment of fees identified in the DEP Management Directive OAM-1000-001 and Program Clarification Memo PCM\_WET\_NCEC\_13\_003 and follow Step II.B.4.
  - b. If the CCD has an expedited (or otherwise named) review fee, the CCD can require a Pre-Application Meeting as part of their expedited review process.
4. If fees need to be corrected (including non-payment of the District fee), the CCD administrative staff will enter a Correction Notice into the ePermit system, which will document the decision made by the Applicant on how to proceed. The box for “General” will need to be checked for the “Associated Module(s) to unlock” for this Correction Notice. The Citation will be *25 Pa. Code § 102.6(b)(1)* when associated with the Base Administrative Filing Fee and *25 Pa. Code § 102.6(b)(3)* when associated with the CCD’s Service Fee.

**NOTE 3** – Fees (including CCD-specific fees) must be resolved prior to considering an NOI for completeness (Section III).

**NOTE 4** – Fees paid through the ePermit system may be returned electronically for one reason or another. If this happens, DEP Bureau of Clean Water will notify the permitting authority of the need for the applicant to repay the fees through the ePermit system. The permitting authority will then send a correction notice concerning the repayment of fees.

**B. Preliminary Data Management.**

1. If non-electronic payments are received by a CCD, the payment information (i.e., check number, amount paid, etc.) will be entered into the Internal Review Comments of the Completeness Review Task Detail.

**NOTE 5** – If necessary, the permitting authority will need to coordinate with a/other CCDs to coordinate the payment information.

**C. The CCD manager (or assistant manager or supervisor as designated by the manager) (where a CCD is the permitting authority) or the DEP Permits Chief (where DEP is the permitting authority) will:**

1. Prioritize the NOI in accordance with the “Permit Review Hierarchy” contained in the PRP/PDG Policy.

**NOTE 6** – A CCD may create an expedited review process under their fee schedule. However, the expedited reviews under such a process would be to pay for overtime for the CCD staff to perform the review. A CCD expedited review would not supersede the PRP/PDG Policy’s Permit Review Hierarchy.

2. Where a CCD believes that the project should receive a higher priority review, the CCD staff will consult with the DEP Permits Chief or Program Manager, specifically when a project may be considered controversial, involves an applicant with an adverse compliance history, or is the subject of legislative interest.
3. Assign an Application Manager to the NOI through the ePermit system by selecting that individual as the Lead Reviewer.

### **III. Completeness Review (Application Manager)**

When the Application Manager receives the NOI from the CCD Manager or Permits Chief, the Application Manager will, within 15 business days from DEP/CCD's completion of Step II, review the NOI for eligibility, administrative completeness and overall technical adequacy, as follows.

#### **A. Completeness Review by NOI Type.**

1. **New NOIs** – The Application Manager will document the completeness review of new NOIs using the PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet template (see **Attachment B**), which serves as the record of decision on the NOI. A complete and technically adequate PAG-02 NOI for a new project is characterized by a response of "TRUE" or "N/A" for all items in the NOI Completeness Review Checklist of the PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet, not including fees addressed in Section II.C.

**NOTE 7** – Where a CCD is the permitting authority, the Application Manager will coordinate with the DEP Permits Chief or Program Manager to verify eligibility for PAG-02 coverage and/or to evaluate the necessity of a DEP technical review of the PCSM Plan, where the CCD is not delegated for PCSM, using the following criteria:

- The impervious area will increase by 50 acres or more from pre-construction condition to post-construction condition.
- The impervious area will increase by 25 acres or more from pre-construction condition to post-construction condition and the receiving surface water is impaired for water/flow variability or flow modifications/alterations.
- The post-construction runoff volume for the 2-year/24-hour storm event exceeds 250,000 cubic feet (cf).
- The difference (post-construction minus pre-construction) in runoff volume for the 2-year/24-hour storm event exceeds 500% of the pre-construction runoff volume.
- Alternative design criteria are proposed for Managed Release Concept (MRC) BMPs or other thresholds for DEP review of MRC designs will be exceeded:
  - The total drainage area to any individual MRC BMP exceeds 3 acres or the total impervious area to any individual MRC BMP exceeds 1.5 acres.
  - The applicant proposes an overall increase in impervious area (including gravel, stone, etc.) that exceeds 10 acres.
  - The MRC BMP will be designed to discharge to waters classified as impaired due to siltation/sediment or flow alterations, regardless of whether the water is under an approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).

**NOTE 8** – Projects that use floodplain restoration and gravity stormwater wells (e.g., EPA Class V Injection Wells) are not eligible for coverage under PAG-02. These NOIs will be reviewed by DEP's RPCO through an Individual NPDES Permit application.

2. **Renewal NOIs** – This section is reserved for future use.
3. **Amendment NOIs** – The contents of a complete and technically adequate PAG-02 NOI for an existing permittee seeking a Major or Minor Amendment must include 1) a complete NOI, and 2) other information to be determined by DEP/CCD in consultation with the permittee and

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**

following the guidelines in DEP’s [Frequently Asked Questions \(FAQ\) for Chapter 102 Permit Amendments](#). The PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet is optional for amendment NOIs.

**NOTE 9** – The Compliance History and Certification Module should contain at a minimum all violations that have been recorded in eFACTS. The applicant is expected to report any violations of a regulation, permit, order, or schedule of compliance that are not recorded in eFACTS in a truthful and accurate manner. If an Application Manager has concerns with the information in this section, the DEP Application Manager can query the internal version of eFACTS and the CCD Application Manager can query the public version of eFACTS following the guidelines contained in Section 12 of the E&S and NPDES Administrative Manual.

**NOTE 10** - Under the following conditions DEP/CCD may request the submission of plan drawings on paper to facilitate review:

- When the plan view is split between three or more sheets.
- The measure feature is not accurate on the electronically provided plan drawings.
- Large projects where the earth disturbance is equal to or greater than 100 acres.
- Projects which discharge to two or more receiving surface waters.

If the Application Manager (if a CCD is the permitting authority) has questions concerning eligibility for PAG-02, the Application Manager should create the Eligibility Determination Task Detail in the ePermit system (with the DEP Program Manager as the person assigned to the Task Detail) or communicate with the applicant to obtain clarification as necessary and/or issue a Correction Notice through the ePermit system as described in Section III.E, below.

**B. Determination – Project is Ineligible for PAG-02.**

1. If the applicant’s project is determined to be ineligible for PAG-02 coverage, and the NOI is for a new project, the Application Manager will begin the Completeness Determination Task Detail and assign the CCD Manager or DEP Program Manager/Permits Chief to the Task Detail. An ineligibility letter will be prepared and will identify why stormwater discharges associated with the project are ineligible for coverage under PAG-02, with regulatory citations under 25 Pa. Code Chapter 92a, as applicable, and provide the applicant with options to 1) submit a new NOI for coverage under PAG-02 if the issue causing ineligibility can be resolved, or 2) submit an application an Individual NPDES Permit.
2. Renewal NOIs – This section is reserved for future use.
3. If the NOI is for an amendment to existing coverage, the ineligibility letter will 1) identify the reasons for ineligibility, and 2) specify that the applicant must submit an Individual NPDES Permit Application to cover the entire project site if the applicant wishes to proceed with the changes to earth disturbance activities that triggered the need for an amendment, otherwise earth disturbance activities previously authorized may continue.

**NOTE 11** – When the ineligibility is related to not utilizing non-discharge or ABACT BMPs, in accordance with Section III.B.13 or 14 of the General Permit, the Application Manager, at their discretion, can contact the applicant and try to address the ineligibility issue in accordance with Section III.D. If a sufficient response is not received within two (2) business days to correct the ineligibility, the Application Manager will proceed to return the NOI due to ineligibility.

**NOTE 12** – If an NOI is returned, no *Pennsylvania Bulletin* notice is required.

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**

**NOTE 13** – If an NOI is returned, the Base Administrative Filing Fee (\$500) and Disturbed Acreage Fee will not be refunded. However, the Disturbed Acreage Fee does not have to be re-paid upon submission of a new NOI or application for the exact same project (whether or not it is the same applicant). A new Base Administrative Filing Fee (\$500 or \$1,500) must however be paid for a new NOI or application.

C. Determination – Project is Eligible and NOI is Complete.

If none of the criteria in the PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet (NOI Completeness Review Checklist) are found to be deficient or technically inadequate, and the applicant's project is eligible for PAG-02 coverage, the Application Manager or DEP/CCD administrative staff will complete the steps below and proceed to Section IV.

1. Finish the Completeness Review Task Detail and save the Task Detail with a Task Status of Complete.
2. Finish the Completeness Determination Task Detail and save the Task Detail with a Recommended Decision of Complete. The ePermit system will send an electronic notice to the Applicant notifying them that the NOI was deemed complete.

D. Determination – Project is Eligible and NOI Contains Minor Deficiencies.

1. Save the Completeness Review Task Detail with a Task Status of "Incomplete".
2. If the NOI contains deficiencies that are determined to be minor (i.e., an item that in the Application Manager's judgment can be corrected within two (2) business days), the Application Manager will not consider the NOI incomplete, but a Correction Notice which identifies the minor deficiencies will be sent (the box for "Only Minor Deficiencies" will be checked and the box for "Include PDG Strike" will be left blank).

**NOTE 14** – After the Application Manager has entered the information into the Correction Notice, they will notify the appropriate DEP/CCD manager that the Correction Notice has been completed and is ready for their review. The Application Manager will then assign the appropriate Task Detail to the DEP/CCD manager. The DEP/CCD manager will review and send the Correction Notice. Staff level reviewers will not click the "Send to Operator" button for the Correction Notice. After sending the Correction Notice the DEP/CCD manager will reassign the Task Detail back the Lead Reviewer (or whomever it was previously assigned to).

3. If any communication is made with the Applicant or their consultant, the Application Manager will enter and save the Applicant Communication Task Detail as a Completeness Task.
4. After the necessary materials have been received, and assuming the NOI can then be considered complete, the Application Manager will follow the steps in Section III.C, above.
5. If a submission is not received, the Application Manager will Recall the Correction Notice and proceed to Section III.E. If a submission is received but does not correct the original minor deficiencies, the Application Manager will proceed to Section III.E.

E. Determination – Project is Eligible and NOI is Incomplete.

1. Save the Completeness Review Task Detail with a Task Status of "Incomplete".
2. If the NOI is incomplete or if the applicant does not respond to or correct minor deficiencies, the Application Manager will officially deem the NOI to be incomplete. The Application Manager will prepare and send a Correction Notice (the box for "Only Minor Deficiencies" will be left

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**

blank and the box for “Include PDG Strike” will be checked), which will be reviewed and approved by the CCD Manager or DEP Program Manager/Permits Chief before being sent.

**NOTE 14** – Only one (1) incompleteness Correction Notice (where the box for “Only Minor Deficiencies” will be left blank and the box for “Include PDG Strike” will be checked) will be sent by the Application Manager.

- a. The correction notice will cite the statutory or regulatory requirement(s) that were not met.
- b. The applicant will be given 60 calendar days to respond. This 60 calendar-day period is referred to as the deficiency correction period. If the applicant does not respond within the 60 calendar days, DEP/CCD will consider the NOI to be withdrawn by the applicant (per 25 Pa. Code § 102.6(c)(2)).
- c. The applicant may request, through the ePermit system, to extend the time to respond beyond the 60 calendar days. The request must identify the additional amount of time to respond and the justification/reason for the extension. If a request is submitted, the Application Manager will coordinate with the DEP Program Manager/Permits Chief to decide whether to grant the extension. The Application Manager will complete and save the Extension Request Review Task Detail. Unless otherwise warranted based on consultation with the DEP Program Manager/Permits Chief, the time to respond will not exceed an additional 30 calendar days.

**NOTE 15** – In order for the extension request to be considered, the justification must relate to the completeness deficiencies identified and not related to revisions to the plan/project from another approving agency (e.g., municipality, PennDOT, etc.). If the extension request is related to another approving agency’s comments, the request will not be granted and the applicant should consider withdrawing their NOI.

3. If a submission is received within the deficiency correction period that corrects the deficiencies, the Application Manager will consider the NOI complete and follow the steps in Section III.C, above.
4. If no submission is received by the end of the deficiency correction period, or if the applicant voluntarily elects to withdraw the NOI through the ePermit system, the Application Manager will save the Completeness Determination Task Detail with a Recommended Decision of Withdrawn.

**NOTE 16** – If an NOI is withdrawn, no *Pennsylvania Bulletin* notice is required.

**NOTE 17** – If an NOI is withdrawn, the Base Administrative Filing Fee (\$500) and Disturbed Acreage Fee will not be refunded. However, the Disturbed Acreage Fee does not have to be re-paid upon submission of a new NOI or application for the exact same project (whether or not it is the same applicant). A new Base Administrative Filing Fee (\$500 or \$1,500) must however be paid for a new NOI or application.

5. If a submission is received by the end of the deficiency correction period that does not correct the deficiencies, the Application Manager will notify the CCD Manager or DEP Program Manager, who will then save the Completeness Review Task Detail with a Recommended Decision of Denied.

**NOTE 18** – The permitting authority is under no obligation to identify to the applicant if their response submission does not make their NOI complete. However, if there are only minor deficiencies, as described above, the Application Manager can proceed as described in Section III.D above to try and resolve the minor deficiencies.

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**

**NOTE 19** – If an NOI is denied, a *Pennsylvania Bulletin* notice is required, which should be published in the special notices section of the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* or as otherwise determined by the DEP regional office.

**NOTE 20** – If an application is denied, the Base Administrative Filing Fee (\$500) and Disturbed Acreage Fee will not be refunded. Both fees must be included in any resubmission, even for the exact same project.

#### **IV. Technical Review (Application Manager)**

NOIs will be reviewed in order of priority as determined under the PRP/PDG Policy; in the event of a conflict, the matter will be resolved by the DEP Program Manager. After the NOI has been deemed complete (Section III.C), the Application Manager will conduct the First Technical Review in accordance with Section IV.A below. Technical Review of PAG-02 NOIs will be documented on the Fact Sheet.

##### **A. First Technical Review.**

The review period objective for the First Technical Review is 22 business days.

##### **1. New NOIs**

- a. Erosion and Sediment Control (E&S) Plan Technical Review – Application Managers will conduct a technical review of all E&S Plans for new NOIs utilizing either the Standard E&S Control Plan Technical Review Checklist or the Expanded E&S Control Plan Technical Review Checklist as contained on pages 357 or 360 (depending on the reviewer’s knowledge and experience), respectively, of the [Erosion and Sediment Pollution Control Program Manual](#) (E&S Manual). Documentation of the use of the checklist will be identified in the PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet and the completed checklist will be attached to the PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet (as an alternative, the completed checklist can be uploaded separately from the PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet).

**NOTE 21** – Upon the Completeness Determination Task Detail being deemed complete, the ePermit system will automatically generate the E&S Technical Review Task Detail and assign the Task Detail to the Lead Reviewer.

- b. Post-Construction Stormwater Management (PCSM) Plan Technical Review (Delegated CCD or DEP) – Where DEP is the permitting authority and where a CCD is the permitting authority and is delegated to conduct technical reviews of PCSM Plans, the Application Manager will conduct a technical review of the PCSM Plan using the PCSM Plan Technical Review Checklist in the PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet.

The Application Manager will create either the CCD PCSM Technical Review Task Detail (if the CCD is PCSM Delegated and will be performing the Technical Review of the PCSM Plan), the PWD PCSM Review Task Detail (if the project is located in Philadelphia County and the Philadelphia Water Department is coordinating the PCSM Plan review with DEP’s Southeast Regional Office’s Waterways and Wetlands Program), and/or the DEP PCSM Technical Review Task Detail (if the project is located in Beaver, Forest or Philadelphia County or if DEP is otherwise performing the Technical Review of the PCSM Plan).

E&S and PCSM Plan technical reviews will be conducted concurrently, as applicable.

**NOTE 22** – If there are multiple offices reviewing the same NOI (e.g., a project that spans 2 counties), a separate E&S Technical Review Task Detail should be created for each office to document their review.



**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**

2. **Renewal NOIs** – This section is reserved for future use.
3. **Amendment NOIs** – If necessary, the Application Manager will perform the Technical Review on the amended E&S and/or PCSM Plans in accordance with Section IV.A.1 above.

B. Determination – The E&S and PCSM Plans do not contain technical deficiencies.

If the E&S and PCSM Plans do not contain technical deficiencies, the Application Manager or DEP/CCD administrative staff will complete the steps below and proceed to Section VI.

1. Finish and save the E&S Technical Review Task Detail (and any applicable PCSM Technical Review Task Detail) with a Recommended Decision of “No Technical Deficiency”.
2. Create, finish, and save the Final Recommendation Task Detail with a Decision of Authorize.
3. Create and save the Management Final Sign-off Task Detail, and assign this Task Detail to the CCD Manager or DEP Program Manager.

C. Determination – The E&S and/or PCSM Plans contain minor technical deficiencies.

1. Save the E&S Control Technical Review Task Detail (and any applicable PCSM Technical Review Task Detail) with a Recommended Decision of “Technical Deficiency”.
2. If the E&S and/or PCSM Plans contain technical deficiencies that are determined to be minor (i.e., an item that in the Application Manager’s judgment can be corrected within two (2) business days), the Application Manager will send a Correction Notice which identifies the minor deficiencies (the box for “Only Minor Deficiencies” will be checked and the box for “Include PDG Strike” will be left blank).
3. If any communication is made with the Applicant or their consultant, the Application Manager will enter and save the Applicant Communication Task Detail as a Technical Task.
4. After the necessary materials have been received, and assuming the minor technical deficiencies have been addressed, the Application Manager will follow the steps in Section IV.B, above.
5. If a submission is not received or if a submission is received but does not correct the original minor technical deficiencies, the Application Manager will proceed to Section IV.D.

D. Determination – The E&S and/or PCSM Plans contain technical deficiencies.

1. Save the E&S Control Technical Review Task Detail (and any applicable PCSM Technical Review Task Detail) with a Recommended Decision of “Technical Deficiency”.
2. If the E&S and/or PCSM Plan contain technical deficiencies that are not determined to be minor or if the applicant does not respond to or correct minor technical deficiencies, the Application Manager will prepare and send a Correction Notice (the box for “Only Minor Deficiencies” will be left blank and the box for “Include PDG Strike” will be checked), which will be reviewed and approved by the CCD Manager or DEP Program Manager/Permits Chief before being sent.

**NOTE 23** – Only one (1) technical Correction Notice (where the box for Only Minor Deficiencies will be left blank and the box for Include PDG Strike will be checked) will be sent by the Application Manager.

- a. The Correction Notice will cite the statutory or regulatory requirement(s) that were not met.

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**

- b. The applicant will be given 30 calendar days to respond unless otherwise warranted based on consultation with the DEP Program Manager/Permits Chief. This 30 calendar-day period is referred to as the deficiency correction period. If the applicant does not respond within the deficiency correction period, the Application Manager will proceed to Step IV.D.4, below.
- c. The applicant may request, through the ePermit system, to extend the time to respond beyond initial deficiency correction period. The request must identify the additional amount of time to respond and the justification/reason for the extension. If a request is submitted, the Application Manager will coordinate with the DEP Permits Chief or Program Manager to decide whether to grant the extension. The Application Manager will complete and save the Extension Request Review Task Detail. Unless otherwise warranted based on consultation with the DEP Program Manager/Permits Chief, the time to respond will not exceed an additional 15 calendar days.

**NOTE 24** – In order for the extension request to be considered, the justification must relate to the technical deficiencies identified and not related to revisions to the plan/project from another approving agency (e.g., municipality, PennDOT, etc.). If the extension request is related to another approving agency's comments, the request will not be granted and the applicant should consider withdrawing their NOI.

3. If a submission is received within the deficiency correction the Application Manager will follow the steps in Section IV.E, below.
4. If the applicant voluntarily elects to withdraw the NOI through the ePermit system, the Application Manager will create the Final Recommendation Task Detail and save the task with a Decision of Withdraw. The Application Manager will create and save the Management Final Sign-off Task Detail, and assign this Task Detail to the CCD Manager or DEP Program Manager. The CCD Manager or DEP Program Manager will then complete and finish the Management Final Sign-off Task Detail, saving with a Decision of Withdraw.

**NOTE 25** – If an NOI is withdrawn, no *Pennsylvania Bulletin* notice is required.

**NOTE 26** – If an NOI is withdrawn, the Base Administrative Filing Fee (\$500) and Disturbed Acreage Fee will not be refunded. However, the Disturbed Acreage Fee does not have to be re-paid upon submission of a new NOI or application for the exact same project (whether or not it is the same applicant). A new Base Administrative Filing Fee (\$500 or \$1,500) must however be paid for a new NOI or application.

5. If the applicant does not respond to the technical deficiency letter by the deadline provided, the DEP Application Manager will proceed to Section V.

**E. Second Technical Review.**

If a submission is received by the end of the deficiency correction period, the Second Technical Review process will begin. The review period objective for the Second Technical Review is 17 business days.

1. The Application Manager will conduct a technical review of the revised E&S and/or PCSM Plans in accordance with Section IV.A, above.
2. If the revised E&S and/or PCSM Plans do not contain technical deficiencies, the Application Manager or DEP/CCD administrative staff will follow the steps in Section IV.B, above.

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs  
Final, January 25, 2021**

3. If the revised E&S and/or PCSM Plans contain technical deficiencies that are determined to be minor (i.e., an item that in the Application Manager's judgment can be corrected within two business days), the Application Manager will follow the steps in Section IV.C, above.
4. If the revised E&S and/or PCSM Plans contain technical deficiencies or if the applicant does not respond to or correct the minor technical deficiencies, the Application Manager will save the E&S Control Technical Review and/or the applicable PCSM Technical Review Task Detail with a Decision of Technical Deficiency and then proceed to Section V.

**V. Elevated Review Process (Application Manager & DEP Program Manager)**

If the response to a technical deficiency correction notice does not correct the technical deficiencies, the application will move to the Elevated Review Process. The applicant can also request the Elevated Review Process at any time during the Technical Review of the NOI.

**NOTE 27** – To initiate an Elevated Review, when not otherwise triggered by the Permit Review Process, the applicant must submit the request, in writing, to the authorizing entity.

The Elevated Review Process will be as follows:

- A. Create the Elevated Review Task Detail and save it with a Decision of Technical Deficiency.
- B. The Application Manager will create a new Correction Notice which identifies the remaining technical deficiencies with the NOI (the Correction Notice will not be sent at this Step). The Application Manager will coordinate with the DEP Program Manager (this can be done by assigning the Elevated Review Task Detail to the DEP Program Manager).
- C. DEP/CCD staff will discuss and agree on next steps, which may include making a permit decision, scheduling a meeting or call with the applicant and their consultant, and/or providing an additional opportunity to correct technical deficiencies through the transmission of a Correction Notice. The Application Manager will complete the Task Activities in the Elevated Review Task Detail.
  1. If a permit decision will be made, the Application Manager will proceed to Section VI.
  2. If a meeting will be held, the Application Manager will proceed to Section V.D.
  3. If a correction notice will be sent without scheduling a meeting, the Application Manager will proceed to Section V.E.
- D. If a meeting will be held, the Application Manager will schedule the Elevated Review with the applicant. The first notice of scheduling an elevated review meeting will be done by filling out the Notification Language in the Task Activities of the Task Detail, and the clicking on the Send Notice to Schedule Elevated Review. Additional coordination with the applicant may be necessary through email or via the telephone to schedule the elevated review meeting.
  1. After the elevated review meeting has been scheduled with the applicant, the Application Manager will enter the Scheduled Meeting Date in the Task Activities of the Task Detail. Then the Application Manager will send the correction notice with a due date of 10 business days after the date of the scheduled elevated review meeting.
  2. The applicant and their consultant should review the correction notice and come to the meeting prepared to discuss resolution of the technical deficiencies. A response submission is not expected or encouraged prior to the meeting.

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs  
Final, January 25, 2021**

3. The attendees at the meeting should include the DEP Program Manager, the Application Manager, the CCD Manager (if the CCD is the permitting authority), the applicant, and the applicant's consultant, at a minimum.
4. If the meeting results in an agreement to resolve the technical deficiencies, the applicant will be given 10 business days from the date of the meeting to provide a response. The DEP Regional Director may provide the applicant with up to an additional 10 business days to respond upon receipt of a written request from the applicant.

**NOTE 28** – If additional days are granted to respond, the Application Manager will recall the correction notice and provide the additional days and resend the correction notice.

5. If the meeting results in no agreement to resolve the technical deficiencies, DEP's Program Manager will consult with the Bureau of Clean Water Director and, as necessary, the Deputy Secretaries of Water Programs and Field Operations, to arrive at a decision on the NOI. Once the decision is communicated to the Application Manager, the Application Manager will proceed to Section VI or otherwise conduct additional steps at the direction of DEP's Program Manager.
- E. If a correction notice will be sent without having an elevated review meeting, the correction notice will be sent by the Application Manager.

The applicant will be given 10 business days to respond. If the applicant does not respond within the 10 business days, the Application Manager will proceed to Section VI. If the applicant responds within 10 business days, the Application Manager will consult with the DEP Program Manager and Permits Chief on the response and proceed to Section VI.

- F. If a submission is received and all technical deficiencies have been corrected, the Application Manager will proceed to Section VI.A.
- G. If a submission is not received or if a submission is received but all technical deficiencies have not been corrected, the Application Manager will proceed to Section VI.B.

**VI. Permit Decision and Final Processing (Application Manager and DEP/CCD Manager)**

A. Decision – Approve Coverage.

1. The Application Manager will begin and complete the Final Recommendation Task Detail. The Task Detail will be saved with a Decision of Authorize.

**NOTE 29** – The fully signed PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet will be uploaded as an attachment to the Final Recommendation Task Detail.

2. The Application Manager will create the Management Final Sign-Off Task Detail and assign the Task Detail to their DEP/CCD Manager.
3. The DEP/CCD Manager will review the final documents (e.g. cover letter & permit) and complete and save the Management Final Sign-Off Task Detail with a Disposition of Issue. The Application Manager will then click the Finalize button in the Task Activities to transmit the documents through the ePermit system.
4. The DEP/CCD Manager will add and begin the PA Bulletin Final Action Notice Task Detail and assign it the DEP Regional Office's clerical support. The DEP Regional Office's clerical support will do the following:

**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs**  
**Final, January 25, 2021**

- a. Click the Generate PA Bulletin Notice link and prepare the information for notice into the PA Bulletin.
- b. The date of anticipated publishing shall be identified in the Internal Review Comments.
- c. The Task Detail will then be saved with a Decision of Closed.

**B. Decision – Deny Coverage.**

1. The Application Manager will ensure that the PAG-02 Fact Sheet is fully signed and uploaded to the Final Recommendation Task Detail.
2. The Application Manager will begin and complete the Final Recommendation Task Detail. The Task Detail will be saved with a Decision of Deny.

**NOTE 30** - The fully signed PAG-02 ePermit Fact Sheet will be uploaded as an attachment to the Final Recommendation Task Detail.

3. The Application Manager will create the Management Final Sign-Off Task Detail and assign the Task Detail to their DEP/CCD Manager.
4. The DEP/CCD Manager will then complete and save the Management Final Sign-Off Task Detail with a Disposition of Deny. The Application Manager will then click the Finalize button in the Task Activities to transit the documents through the ePermit system.
5. The DEP/CCD Manager will then begin the PA Bulletin Final Action Notice Task Detail and assign it the DEP Regional Office's clerical support. The DEP Regional Office's clerical support will do the following:
  - a. Click the Generate PA Bulletin Notice link and prepare the information for notice into the PA Bulletin.
  - b. The date of anticipated publishing shall be identified in the Internal Review Comments.
  - c. The Task Detail will then be saved with a Decision of Closed.

**NOTE 31** – If an NOI is denied, a *Pennsylvania Bulletin* notice is required, which should be published in the special notices section of the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* or as otherwise determined by the DEP regional office.

**NOTE 32** – If an application is denied, the Base Administrative Filing Fee (\$500) and Disturbed Acreage Fee will not be refunded. Both fees must be included in any resubmission, even for the exact same project.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**CHAPTER 102 PRE-APPLICATION  
MEETING RECORD FORM**



**CHAPTER 102 PRE-APPLICATION MEETING RECORD FORM**

Project Site Name:	
Applicant Name:	
Meeting Date:	Time:
Meeting Location:	<input type="checkbox"/> Conference Call
Application Manager Name (if known):	
Meeting Attendees:	
Name	Company/Organization / Contact Information
Recommended Agenda:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Introductions</li> <li>II. Overview of Permit Review Process (DEP/CCD)</li> <li>III. DEP/CCD expectations</li> <li>IV. Overview of Permit Decision Guarantee (DEP/CCD, if applicable)</li> <li>V. Project overview (Applicant/Consultant)           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Brief description of project</li> <li>b. Identification on unique site features on the Project Site</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

c. Identification of status of design; including potential E&S and PCSM BMPs

d. Status of PNDI Search

VI. Identification of required Chapter 102 Permit (DEP/CCD)

VII. Review NOI/Application forms and Instructions (DEP/CCD)

VIII. Discussion of common completeness and technical deficiencies (DEP/CCD)

IX. Questions and answers

X. Next steps (DEP/CCD)

Meeting Notes:

Handouts Provided by DEP During Meeting:

Name of DEP/CCD Representative Recording Notes:

Date Record Form Provided to Applicant:



**ATTACHMENT B**

**PAG-02 ePERMIT FACT SHEET**



( DISTRICT OR DEP OFFICE NAME )

Application No. \_\_\_\_\_

**NPDES PAG-02 GENERAL PERMIT  
ePERMIT FACT SHEET**

The checklists contained in this fact sheet are intended to provide guidance to staff reviewing the NOI 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.

Applicant and Project Information	
Applicant Name: _____	Project Name: _____
Applicant Address: _____	Project Address: _____
Municipality: _____	County: _____
Receiving Water(s): _____	Ch. 93 Class: _____
Date Application Received: _____	Earth Disturbance: _____ acres
NOI Type: <u>      ( New / Renewal / Amendment )      </u>	
Project Description: _____	

**NOI Completeness Review Checklist**

COMPLETENESS ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
1. 102.6(a)(1) – The County and Municipal Notification Forms (3800-FM-BCW0271b and 3800-FM-BCW0271c, respectively) with county and municipal signatures or proof that the county and municipality received the forms were submitted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 102.6(a)(2) – The PNDI receipt (draft receipts not acceptable), which will not expire prior to anticipated authorization of permit coverage, was submitted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 102.6(a)(1) – The E&S Module was completed in ePermit as instructed in the PAG-02 NOI Instructions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) – Details were provided for all E&S BMPs (can be provided on E&S Plan Drawings).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 102.4(b)(5)(viii) – Standard E&S Worksheets from the E&S Manual (or their equivalent) were attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 102.4(b)(5)(viii) – Supporting E&S calculations were provided (for any calculation not handled by a Standard E&S Worksheet or an equivalent).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. 102.4(c) – An Off-site Discharge Analysis was provided, if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 102.4(b)(5)(v) – If hydric soils are present, a wetland determination was submitted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 102.4(b)(5)(xii) – If contaminated soils are present, documentation was provided that pollutant levels do not exceed residential or non-residential MSCs for soil in Chapter 250 (Appendix A, Tables 3 and 4) for residential and non-residential sites, respectively, unless a site-specific standard has been met under a state or federal cleanup program or the applicant provides documentation of naturally occurring contamination.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Approve	Deny	Signature	Date
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Application Manager Name	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CCD Manager / DEP Permits Chief or Program Manager Name	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CCD Professional Engineer (if CCD is PCSM Delegated and performed PCSM Technical Review)	

**NOI Completeness Review Checklist (Continued)**

COMPLETENESS ITEM		TRUE	FALSE	N/A
4.	102.4(b)(5)(ix) – The E&S Plan Drawing(s) were submitted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a.	102.4(b)(5)(i) – The Drawing(s) include existing and proposed topography (including any temporary contours) with appropriate contour labels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) include the project site boundary.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) include the limit of earth disturbance within the project site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d.	102.4(b)(5)(v) – The Drawing(s) show receiving surface water(s) and watershed boundaries, if applicable, within the project site and floodway or floodplain.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e.	102.4(b)(5)(ix) – The Drawing(s) identify all discharge points.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	102.4(b)(5)(vi) – The Drawing(s) show the location of all BMPs and drainage areas to the BMPs as applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
g.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed utilities and site improvements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h.	102.4(b)(5)(xv) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed riparian buffer(s), if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) show proposed off-site support activities, if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j.	102.4(c) – The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed PNDI receipt, if applicable. <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k.	102.4(b)(5)(vii) – The Drawing(s) provide for protection of infiltration PCSM BMPs until drainage areas are completely stabilized, if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l.	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 of materials (not necessary if a separate narrative is attached).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	102.6(a)(1) – The PCSM/SR Module was completed in ePermit as instructed in the PAG-02 NOI Instructions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a.	102.8(n) – The project qualifies as a Site Restoration Project. <sup>3</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b.	102.8(g)(1) – A pre-development site characterization was provided (i.e., soils and geotechnical testing results and narrative of methods and results).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	102.8(g)(1) – Soil/geologic test results were attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(2) & 102.8(g)(4) – Printout of DEP’s PCSM Spreadsheet – Volume Worksheet was attached. <sup>4</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(2) & 102.8(g)(4) – Stormwater Analysis – Runoff Volume questions were answered and information provided. <sup>4</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(3) & 102.8(g)(4) – Printout of DEP’s PCSM Spreadsheet – Rate Worksheet was attached. <sup>5</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(3) & 102.8(g)(4) – Stormwater Analysis – Peak Rate questions were answered and information provided. <sup>5</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### NOI Completeness Review Checklist (Continued)

COMPLETENESS ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
h. 102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(2) & 102.8(g)(4) – Printout of DEP’s PCSM Spreadsheet – Quality Worksheet was attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. 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 engineer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 102.8(f)(9) – The PCSM Plan Drawing(s) were submitted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. 102.8(f)(1) – The Drawing(s) include existing and proposed topography with appropriate contour labels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. 102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) include the project site boundary.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. 102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) include the limit of earth disturbance within the project site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. 102.8(f)(5) – The Drawing(s) show receiving surface water(s) and watershed boundaries, if applicable, within the project site and floodway or floodplain.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e. 102.8(f)(9) – The Drawing(s) identify all discharge points.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 102.8(f)(6) – The Drawing(s) show the location of all BMPs with identifiers cross-referenced to the PCSM/SR Module.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 102.8(f)(9) – Details were provided for all PCSM BMPs (required for any PCSM BMP identified in the PCSM/SR Module).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
h. 102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed utilities and site improvements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
i. 102.8(f)(14) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed riparian buffer(s), if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. 102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) show proposed off-site support activities, if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. 102.8(f)(15) – The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed PNDI receipt, if applicable. <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. 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 for recycling or disposing of materials, and critical stages of BMP implementation (not necessary if a separate narrative is attached).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. 102.8(f)(2) – The Drawing(s) show sensitive features including sinkholes, surface depressions, soil contamination hot spots, and wetlands, if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. 102.8(g)(1) – The Drawing(s) show the location of test pits used for infiltration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Footnotes:**

- 1** In addition to eligibility restrictions contained in Section III.B of the PAG-02 General Permit, see the list of reasons for coordinating with DEP in Section III.A.1 of the PAG-02 SOP (ID No. BCW-PMT-042-E).
- 2** 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.
- 3** If the entire project meets 25 Pa. Code § 102.8(n), then responses to Questions 6.c– 6.i may be omitted.
- 4** The response to either Question 6.d or 6.e must be TRUE for the project to be deemed complete.
- 5** The response to either Question 6.f or 6.g must be TRUE for the project to be deemed complete.

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

**E&S Technical Review Checklist <sup>1, 2</sup>**

TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
1. The Standard E&S Control Plan Technical Review Checklist is attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The Expanded E&S Control Plan Technical Review Checklist is attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 102.11(a)(1) – E&S BMPs have been designed in accordance with the E&S Manual.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 102.11(b) – Alternative E&S BMPs are consistent with the <a href="#">Approved Alternative E&amp;S BMP List</a> .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 102.2(b) – There will be discharges to waters impaired for siltation, sediment, turbidity, water/flow variability, flow alterations/modifications, or nutrients with or without a TMDL (including Chesapeake Bay).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. 102.2(b) – The applicant has proposed E&S BMPs to treat such discharges consistent with a non-discharge alternative or ABACT.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Footnotes:

- 1 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 NOIs or for amendment NOIs where there is no new earth disturbance.

**Application Manager's E&S Technical Review Comments:**

**PCSM Technical Review Checklist <sup>1, 2</sup>**

TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
1. The CCD is not PCSM delegated or otherwise has elected not to complete this checklist. <sup>3</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 102.11(a)(2) – PCSM BMPs have been designed in accordance with the BMP Manual.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 102.11(b) – Alternative PCSM BMPs are consistent with the <a href="#">Approved Alternative PCSM BMP List</a> .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 102.2(b) – There will be discharges to waters impaired for siltation, sediment, turbidity, water/flow variability, flow alterations/modifications, or nutrients with or without a TMDL (including the Chesapeake Bay).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. 102.2(b) – The applicant has proposed PCSM BMPs to treat such discharges consistent with a non-discharge alternative or ABACT.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 102.8(f)(1) – Existing topography of project site and immediate surrounding area were adequately explained (see E&S Module).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. 102.8(f)(2) – The types, depth, slope, locations and limitations of the soils and geologic formations were accurately characterized (see E&S Module).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
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 (see E&S Module).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
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 (see PCSM/SR Module).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
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 PAG-02 NOI.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. 102.8(f)(6) – All PCSM BMPs have been identified in PCSM/SR Module and located on PCSM Plan Drawing(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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) (see E&S Module, for stabilization only).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 (see PCSM Module).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. 102.8(f)(8) – Supporting calculations for the design of PCSM BMPs were provided and are technically sound.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. 102.8(f)(10) – A long-term O&M schedule for PCSM BMPs including BMP repair and maintenance activities was provided (see PCSM Module) and is consistent with the Stormwater BMP Manual or is otherwise technically sound.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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/SR Module).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 (see PCSM/SR Module).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 (see PCSM/SR Module).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 §§ 102.8(g)(2)(ii) or (iii) apply select "N/A") (PCSM Spreadsheet, Volume Worksheet or supporting calculations).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31. 102.8(g)(2) – Structural and non-structural BMPs were proposed that meet the volume reduction and water quality requirements in an approved and current Act 167 Plan. <sup>4</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. 102.8(g)(2)(iv) – Structural and non-structural BMPs were proposed that will be at least as stringent as management of the net change for the 2-year/24-hour storm event. <sup>4</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33. 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. <sup>5</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34. 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. <sup>5</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35. 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. <sup>5</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36. 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37. 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

38. 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Footnotes:**

- 1 An answer of FALSE to any of the following may be considered a technical deficiency: 2 and 3 (both), 4, 5.a (if 5 is TRUE), 6 – 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23 and 24 (all three), 25, 26, 29, 30 and 31 and 32 (all three), 33 and 34 and 35 (all three), 36, 37, and 38. If the project qualifies for site restoration then Questions 20 – 37 may be skipped.
- 2 A technical review of the PCSM Plan is not required for renewal NOIs or for amendment NOIs where there is no new earth disturbance.
- 3 If Question 1 is TRUE, the PCSM Technical Review Checklist will not be completed.
- 4 Question 30, 31 or 32 must be True.
- 5 Question 33, 34, or 35 must be True.

**Application Manager’s Technical Review Comments:**

**PNDI Review:**

- 102.6(a)(2) – PNDI search receipt contained no potential impacts and/or avoidance measures were signed by the applicant. <sup>1</sup>
- 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. <sup>1</sup>

**Footnotes:**

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

**Public Comments:**

- Public comments were received and considered during the review of the NOI.
- No public comments were received during the review of the NOI.



**SOP – ePermit Review of PAG-02 General NPDES Permit NOIs  
Final, January 25, 2021**

**Version History**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Revision Reason</b>
1/25/2021	1.0	Draft