

**CHAPTER 102 INDIVIDUAL NPDES PERMIT
FACT SHEET**

Application No. PAD060076

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

Applicant and Project Information			
Applicant Name:	<u>Steven Wolfson, Maiden Creek Associates, L.P.</u>	Project Name:	<u>Proposed Warehouse Facility</u>
Applicant Address:	<u>120 W. Germantown Pike Plymouth Meeting, PA, 19462</u>	Project Address:	<u>Route 222 & Evansville Road Blandon, PA, 19510</u>
Municipality:	<u>Maidencreek Township</u>	County:	<u>Berks</u>
Receiving Water(s):	<u>Peter's Creek</u>	Ch. 93 Class:	<u>EV, MF</u>
Date Application Received:	<u>4/23/2022</u>	Earth Disturbance:	<u>80.77</u> acres
Application Type:	<u>(New / Renewal / Amendment)</u>		
Project Description:	<u>Maiden Creek Associates, L.P. proposes to build a 930,000 SF warehouse building on the property with the two (2) driveway connections to Allentown Pike. Additional improvements along Allentown Pike to support the development are also proposed.</u>		

Application Completeness Review Checklist

COMPLETENESS ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
1. 102.6(a)(1) – One original and one copy of the complete application form (3800-PM-BCW0408b) were submitted and were completed as instructed in the Application Instructions (3800-PM-BCW0408a).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. 102.6(a)(1) – One original and one copy of the complete GIF (0210-PM-PIO0001).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. 102.6(a)(1) – Two copies of 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 102.6(a)(2) – Two copies of the PNDI receipt (draft receipts not acceptable), which will not expire prior to anticipated authorization of permit coverage, were submitted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 102.6(a)(1) – One original and two copies of the complete E&S Module 1 (3800-PM-BCW0406a) were submitted and were completed as instructed in the Application Instructions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. 102.4(b)(5)(ix) – Details were provided for all E&S BMPs (Question 5 of E&S Plan Information) (can be provided on the E&S Plan Drawings).	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Approve	Deny	Signature	Date
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Elijah Goheen CCD Application Manager Name	<i>Elijah Goheen</i> 11/15/2023
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Thomas J. Forsythe, PE CCD Professional Engineer (if CCD is PCSM Delegated)	<i>Thomas J. Forsythe</i> 11/15/2023
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Thomas J. Forsythe CCD Manager Name	<i>Thomas J. Forsythe</i> 11/15/2023
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DEP Application Manager Name	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nathan Phillips DEP Permits Chief / Program Manager Name	12/8/23

Application Completeness Review Checklist (Continued)

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.	102.4(b)(5)(ix) – Three sets or copies of E&S Plan Drawing(s) were submitted.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) include the project site boundary.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e.	102.4(b)(5)(ix) – The Drawing(s) identify all discharge points.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
g.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed utilities and site improvements.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j.	102.4(c) – The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed PNDI receipt, if applicable. ¹	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	102.6(a)(1) – One original and two copies of the complete PCSM Module 2 (3800-PM-BCW0406b) were submitted and were completed as instructed in the Application Instructions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a.	102.8(n) – The project qualifies as a Site Restoration Project. ²	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	102.8(g)(1) – Soil/geologic test results were attached.	<input checked="" 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. ³	<input checked="" 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 5 – 9 were answered and supporting calculations were provided. ³	<input checked="" 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. ⁴	<input checked="" 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 5 – 9 were answered and supporting calculations were provided. ⁴	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Application Completeness Review Checklist (Continued)

h.	102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(2) & 102.8(g)(4) – Printout of DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet – Quality Worksheet was attached.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	102.8(f)(9) – Three sets or copies of PCSM Plan Drawing(s) were submitted.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b.	102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) include the project site boundary.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c.	102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) include the limit of earth disturbance within the project site.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e.	102.8(f)(9) – The Drawing(s) identify all discharge points.	<input checked="" 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 PCSM Module 2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
g.	102.8(f)(9) – Details were provided for all PCSM BMPs (required for any PCSM BMP identified in Question 1 of PCSM Plan Information).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
h.	102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed utilities and site improvements.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
k.	102.8(f)(15) – The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed PNDI receipt, if applicable. ¹	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
n.	102.8(g)(1) – The Drawing(s) show the location of test pits used for infiltration testing as cross-referenced to PCSM Module 2, Infiltration Information.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	102.6(a)(1) – Three copies of the complete Antidegradation Analysis Module 3 (3800-PM-BCW0406c) were submitted and were completed as instructed in the Application Instructions if 1) there are proposed discharges to special protection waters, and/or 2) there are proposed discharges directly to waters impaired for siltation, sediment, turbidity, water/flow variability, flow alterations/modifications, or nutrients.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	102.6(a)(1) – Three copies of the complete Riparian Buffer Module 4 (3800-PM-BCW0406d) were submitted and were completed as instructed in the Application Instructions if the earth disturbance or project site is within 150 feet of a perennial or intermittent river, stream, or creek, lake, pond or reservoir designated for special protection.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Footnotes:

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

Application Manager's Completeness Review Comments:**E&S Technical Review Checklist**^{1,2}

TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
1. The Standard E&S Control Plan Technical Review Checklist is attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. The Expanded E&S Control Plan Technical Review Checklist is attached.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. 102.11(b) – Alternative E&S BMPs are consistent with the <u>Approved Alternative E&S BMP List</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. 102.2(b) – There will be discharges directly to waters impaired for siltation, sediment, turbidity, water/flow variability, flow alterations/modifications, or nutrients.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 Applications or for amendment Applications where there is no new earth disturbance.

Application Manager's E&S Technical Review Comments:

PCSM Technical Review Checklist^{1,2}

TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
1. The CCD is not PCSM delegated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 102.11(a)(2) – PCSM BMPs have been designed in accordance with the BMP Manual.	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 102.11(b) – Alternative PCSM BMPs are consistent with the <u>Approved Alternative PCSM BMP List</u> .	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 102.2(b) – There will be discharges directly to waters impaired for siltation, sediment, turbidity, water/flow variability, flow alterations/modifications, or nutrients.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. 102.8(f)(1) – Existing topography of project site and immediate surrounding area were adequately explained (E&S Module 1, Question 1).	<input checked="" 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 (E&S Module 1, Question 2).	<input checked="" 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 (E&S Module 1, Question 3).	<input checked="" 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 (PCSM Module 2).	<input checked="" 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 Application.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. 102.8(f)(6) – All PCSM BMPs have been identified in PCSM Module 2 (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 1) and located on PCSM Plan Drawing(s).	<input checked="" 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) (E&S Module 1, Question 15, for stabilization only).	<input checked="" 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 (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 2).	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 (PCSM Module 2, Long-Term O&M) and is consistent with the Stormwater BMP Manual or is otherwise technically sound.	<input checked="" 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 Module 2, Long-Term O&M).	<input checked="" 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 (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 6).	<input checked="" 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 (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 7).	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31. 102.8(g)(3) – Calculations were provided to demonstrate the net change in peak rates for the 2, 10, 50, and 100-year/24-hour storm events and the calculations are technically sound, or the PCSM Spreadsheet, Rate Worksheet was submitted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. 102.8(g)(3) – Rate requirements contained in an approved and current Act 167 Plan were used, and the Application Manager has confirmed that 1) the Act 167 Plan was approved within the past five years, and 2) the standard from the Plan was applied appropriately.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
33. 102.8(g)(3)(iii) – An alternative design standard has been proposed for managing the net change in peak rates and an adequate demonstration has been made that the alternative standard is at least as stringent as management of the net change for the 2, 10, 50, and 100-year/24-hour storm events.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34. 102.8(g)(3) – Structural and non-structural BMPs were proposed that will eliminate or manage the net change in peak rates, and the calculations demonstrating this are technically sound or the PCSM Spreadsheet was used.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35. 102.11(b) – Managed Release Concept (MRC) BMP(s) were proposed, MRC Design Summary Sheets were adequately completed, and MRC design standards have been met or alternative MRC design standards are considered technically sound.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36. 102.8(b)(8) – There are wetlands on the project site and adequate efforts have been made to ensure no significant changes to pre-construction hydrology that would affect the wetlands.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
37. 102.14(d)(1), 102.14(f)(2) & 102.14(f)(3) – If Riparian Buffer Module 4 is completed, the project qualifies for an exception or is an allowed or allowable activity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

PCSM Technical Review Checklist (Continued)

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

Footnotes:

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

Application Manager's Technical Review Comments:

PNDI Review:

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

Footnote:

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

Site-Specific Special Conditions and Rationale:

None

Public Comments:

- Notice of the receipt of the application and a tentative decision to issue a permit was published in *Pennsylvania Bulletin* on:
December 23, 2023 30-day public comment end date: January 23, 2024
- Notice of the receipt of the application and a tentative decision to deny the application was published in *Pennsylvania Bulletin* on:
_____ 30-day public comment end date: _____
- Comments were received from the applicant during the comment period and are addressed in the final permit cover letter or application denial letter.
- Public comments were received during the comment period and were considered in making a final decision on the application.
- A public hearing was held due to significant interest. Date of hearing: _____
- A comment-response document has been developed to address comments/testimony received from the public.
- No public comments were received during the review of the application.