pennsylvania
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Revised 10/6/2022

SCRO & Huntingdon County Conservation District

Application No. **PAD310013**

CHAPTER 102 INDIVIDUAL NPDES PERMIT FACT SHEET

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:	**M & G Realty, Inc.**	Project Name:	**Huntingdon Rutter's Store #93**
Applicant Address:	**2295 Susquehanna Trail, Suite C**	Project Address:	**William Penn Highway**
	York, PA 17404-9601		**Huntingdon, PA 16652**
Municipality:	**Smithfield Township**	County:	**Huntingdon**
Receiving Water(s):	**Wetlands tributary to UNT Juniata River**	Ch. 93 Class:	**WWF, MF**
Date Application Received:	**February 17, 2023**	Earth Disturbance:	**7.03** acres
Application Type:	**New**		
Project Description:	**Construction of new convenience store with parking lot and fuel island**		

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).	☒	☐	
2.	102.6(a)(1) – One original and one copy of the complete GIF (0210-PM-PIO0001).	☒	☐	
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.	☒	☐	☐
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.	☒	☐	☐
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.	☒	☐	☐
a.	102.4(b)(5)(ix) – Details were provided for all E&S BMPs (Question 5 of E&S Plan Information) (can be provided on the E&S Plan Drawings).	☒	☐	
b.	102.4(b)(5)(viii) – Standard E&S Worksheets from the E&S Manual (or their equivalent) were attached.	☒	☐	

Approve	Deny	Signature	Date
☒	☐	**Staci Spertzel Black** CCD Application Manager Name	**12/19/2023**
☐	☐	CCD Professional Engineer (if CCD is PCSM Delegated)	
☒	☐	**Celina Seftas** CCD Manager Name	**12/19/2023**
☒	☐	**Matthew Zeigler** DEP Application Manager Name	**1-31-2024**
☒	☐	**Nathan Phillips** DEP Permits Chief / Program Manager Name	**1/31/24**

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).	☒	☐	☐
	d.	102.4(c) – An Off-site Discharge Analysis was provided, if applicable.	☒	☐	☐
	e.	102.4(b)(5)(v) – If hydric soils are present, a wetland determination was submitted.	☒	☐	☐
6.		102.4(b)(5)(ix) – Three sets or copies of E&S Plan Drawing(s) were submitted.	☒	☐	☐
	a.	102.4(b)(5)(i) – The Drawing(s) include existing and proposed topography (including any temporary contours) with appropriate contour labels.	☒	☐	
	b.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) include the project site boundary.	☒	☐	
	c.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) include the limit of earth disturbance within the project site.	☒	☐	
	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.	☒	☐	
	e.	102.4(b)(5)(ix) – The Drawing(s) identify all discharge points.	☒	☐	
	f.	102.4(b)(5)(vi) – The Drawing(s) show the location of all BMPs and drainage areas to the BMPs as applicable.	☒	☐	
	g.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed utilities and site improvements.	☒	☐	
	h.	102.4(b)(5)(xv) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed riparian buffer(s), if applicable.	☐	☐	☒
	i.	102.4(b)(5)(iii) – The Drawing(s) show proposed off-site support activities, if applicable.	☐	☐	☒
	j.	102.4(c) – The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed PNDI receipt, if applicable. [1]	☐	☐	☒
	k.	102.4(b)(5)(vii) – The Drawing(s) provide for protection of infiltration PCSM BMPs until drainage areas are completely stabilized, if applicable.	☐	☐	☒
	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).	☒	☐	☐
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.	☒	☐	☐
	a.	102.8(n) – The project qualifies as a Site Restoration Project. [2]	☐	☒	
	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).	☒	☐	☐
	c.	102.8(g)(1) – Soil/geologic test results were attached.	☒	☐	☐
	d.	102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(2) & 102.8(g)(4) – Printout of DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet – Volume Worksheet was attached. [3]	☒	☐	☐
	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]	☒	☐	☐
	f.	102.8(f)(8), 102.8(g)(3) & 102.8(g)(4) – Printout of DEP's PCSM Spreadsheet – Rate Worksheet was attached. [4]	☒	☐	☐
	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]	☒	☐	☐

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.	☒	☐	☐
	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.	☐	☐	☒
8.		102.8(f)(9) – Three sets or copies of PCSM Plan Drawing(s) were submitted.	☒	☐	☐
	a.	102.8(f)(1) – The Drawing(s) include existing and proposed topography with appropriate contour labels.	☒	☐	
	b.	102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) include the project site boundary.	☒	☐	
	c.	102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) include the limit of earth disturbance within the project site.	☒	☐	
	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.	☒	☐	
	e.	102.8(f)(9) – The Drawing(s) identify all discharge points.	☒	☐	☐
	f.	102.8(f)(6) – The Drawing(s) show the location of all BMPs with identifiers cross-referenced to PCSM Module 2.	☒	☐	
	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).	☒	☐	
	h.	102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed utilities and site improvements.	☒	☐	
	i.	102.8(f)(14) – The Drawing(s) show existing and proposed riparian buffer(s), if applicable.	☐	☐	☒
	j.	102.8(f)(3) – The Drawing(s) show proposed off-site support activities, if applicable.	☐	☐	☒
	k.	102.8(f)(15) – The Drawing(s) show the Avoidance Measures specified on the signed PNDI receipt, if applicable. [1]	☐	☐	☒
	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).	☒	☐	☐
	m.	102.8(f)(2) – The Drawing(s) show sensitive features including sinkholes, surface depressions, soil contamination hot spots, and wetlands, if applicable.	☒	☐	☐
	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.	☒	☐	☐
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.	☒	☐	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒
11.		102.6(a)(1) – PHMC clearance letter (for projects > 10 acres of disturbance).	☐	☐	☒

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

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:

1st E&S Technical Review identified deficiencies. A Technical Deficiency Letter sent to the applicant on August 10, 2022. Revisions were received on September 9, 2022. A 2nd E&S Technical Review found each of the previously identified E&S deficiencies to have been adequately addressed. Revised plans were received on January 5, 2023. A 3rd E&S Technical Review, completed on January 27, 2023, did not identify any additional E&S deficiencies. The E&S Control Plan follows the guidelines and regulations of Chapter 102.

PCSM Technical Review Checklist [1, 2]

	TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
1.	The CCD is not PCSM delegated.	☒	☐	☐
2.	102.11(a)(2) – PCSM BMPs have been designed in accordance with the BMP Manual.	☒	☐	☐
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).	☒	☐	☐
4.	102.11(b) – Alternative PCSM BMPs are consistent with the Approved Alternative PCSM BMP List.	☐	☐	☒
5.	102.2(b) – There will be discharges directly to waters impaired for siltation, sediment, turbidity, water/flow variability, flow alterations/modifications, or nutrients.	☐	☒	☐
	a. 102.2(b) – The applicant has proposed PCSM BMPs to treat such discharges consistent with a non-discharge alternative or ABACT.	☒	☐	☐
6.	102.8(f)(1) – Existing topography of project site and immediate surrounding area were adequately explained (E&S Module 1, Question 1).	☒	☐	
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).	☒	☐	
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).	☒	☐	
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).	☒	☐	
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.	☒	☐	
11.	102.8(f)(6) – All PCSM BMPs have been identified in PCSM Module 2 (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 1) and located on PCSM Plan Drawing(s).	☒	☐	☐
12.	102.8(f)(6) – PCSM BMP design details were provided on PCSM Drawing(s) and specifications for permanent stabilization were included on PCSM or E&S Plan Drawing(s) (E&S Module 1, Question 15, for stabilization only).	☒	☐	☐
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).	☒	☐	☐
14.	102.8(f)(8) – Supporting calculations for the design of PCSM BMPs were provided and are technically sound.	☒	☐	☐
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.	☒	☐	☐
16.	102.8(f)(11) – Procedures ensuring proper measures for recycling or disposal of materials associated with or from PCSM BMPs were provided (PCSM Plan Drawings or PCSM Module 2, Long-Term O&M).	☒	☐	☐
17.	102.8(f)(12) – The applicant identified naturally occurring geologic formations or soil conditions that may have the potential to cause pollution and prepared a plan to avoid or minimize potential pollution (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 6).	☒	☐	☐
18.	102.8(f)(13) – The applicant has identified potential thermal impacts from post-construction stormwater and has proposed BMPs that will avoid, minimize or mitigate potential impacts (PCSM Module 2, PCSM Plan Information, Question 7).	☒	☐	☐

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.	☐	☐	☒
20.	102.8(g) – A stormwater analysis was completed on a discharge point basis or on a watershed basis (i.e., all discharges to specific receiving waters analyzed collectively).	☒	☐	☐
21.	102.8(g)(1) – A pre-development site characterization and assessment of soil and geology was conducted and is within the recommendations of Appendix C of the Stormwater BMP Manual or are otherwise technically sound.	☒	☐	☐
22.	102.8(g)(2) – Calculations were provided to demonstrate the net change in volume up to the 2-year/24-hour storm event and the calculations are technically sound, or the PCSM Spreadsheet, Volume Worksheet was submitted.	☒	☐	☐
23.	102.8(g)(2) – A volume reduction standard contained in an approved and current Act 167 Plan was used, and the Application Manager has confirmed that 1) the Act 167 Plan was approved within the past five years, and 2) the standard from the Plan was applied appropriately.	☐	☐	☒
24.	102.8(g)(2)(iv) – An alternative design standard has been proposed for managing the net change in volume and an adequate demonstration has been made that the alternative standard is at least as stringent as management of the net change up to the 2-year/24-hour storm.	☐	☐	☒
25.	102.8(g)(2) – The PCSM Spreadsheet, Quality Worksheet was submitted, illustrating the net change in water quality (pollutant loading) up to the 2-year/24-hour storm event.	☒	☐	☐
26.	102.8(g)(2)(i) – All existing non-forested pervious areas have been considered meadow in good condition or better (if exceptions at § 102.8(g)(2)(i) apply select "N/A") (PCSM Spreadsheet, Volume Worksheet or supporting calculations).	☒	☐	☐
27.	102.8(g)(2)(ii) – 20% of existing impervious surfaces to be disturbed has been considered meadow in good condition or better (if exceptions at §§ 102.8(g)(2)(ii) or (iii) apply select "N/A") (PCSM Spreadsheet, Volume Worksheet or supporting calculations).	☒	☐	☐
28.	102.8(g)(4) – The precipitation depth for the 2-year/24-hour storm event is based on NOAA Atlas 14 or other reputable sources.	☒	☐	☐
29.	102.8(g)(4) – Land covers and curve numbers have been appropriately determined to calculate pre- and post-construction runoff volumes and pollutant loadings.	☒	☐	☐
30.	102.8(g)(2) – Structural and non-structural BMPs were proposed that will eliminate or manage the net change in volume and pollutant loading up to the 2-year/24-hour storm event, and the calculations demonstrating this are technically sound or the PCSM Spreadsheet was used.	☒	☐	☐
31.	102.8(g)(3) – Calculations were provided to demonstrate the net change in peak rates for the 2, 10, 50, and 100-year/24-hour storm events and the calculations are technically sound, or the PCSM Spreadsheet, Rate Worksheet was submitted.	☒	☐	☐
32.	102.8(g)(3) – Rate requirements contained in an approved and current Act 167 Plan were used, and the Application Manager has confirmed that 1) the Act 167 Plan was approved within the past five years, and 2) the standard from the Plan was applied appropriately.	☐	☐	☒
33.	102.8(g)(3)(iii) – An alternative design standard has been proposed for managing the net change in peak rates and an adequate demonstration has been made that the alternative standard is at least as stringent as management of the net change for the 2, 10, 50, and 100-year/24-hour storm events.	☐	☐	☒
34.	102.8(g)(3) – Structural and non-structural BMPs were proposed that will eliminate or manage the net change in peak rates, and the calculations demonstrating this are technically sound or the PCSM Spreadsheet was used.	☒	☐	☐
35.	102.11(b) – Managed Release Concept (MRC) BMP(s) were proposed, MRC Design Summary Sheets were adequately completed, and MRC design standards have been met or alternative MRC design standards are considered technically sound.	☐	☐	☒
36.	102.8(b)(8) – There are wetlands on the project site and adequate efforts have been made to ensure no significant changes to pre-construction hydrology that would affect the wetlands.	☒	☐	☐
37.	102.14(d)(1), 102.14(f)(2) & 102.14(f)(3) – If Riparian Buffer Module 4 is completed, the project qualifies for an exception or is an allowed or allowable activity.	☐	☐	☒

PCSM Technical Review Checklist (Continued)

	TECHNICAL REVIEW ITEM	TRUE	FALSE	N/A
38.	Act 162 – If Riparian Buffer Module 4 is completed, the project does not propose the use of a waiver, which is allowed only for E&S Permits.	☐	☐	☒
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).	☐	☐	☒
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.	☐	☐	☒
41.	Act 162 – If Riparian Buffer Module 4 is completed, and offsetting is proposed, the offset riparian forest buffer is in the same drainage list as the project site riparian forest buffer, authorization for use of the offset site has been attached, and the offset buffer meets the criteria in 25 Pa. Code § 102.14(b).	☐	☐	☒

Footnotes:

1 An answer of FALSE to any the questions that are applicable may be considered a technical deficiency except #1. If #5.a is FALSE and #5 is TRUE, it is a deficiency. If all answers in the following groups are FALSE, it is a deficiency: #22/23/24 and #31/32/33.

2 A technical review of the PCSM Plan is not required for renewal Applications or for amendment Applications where there is no new earth disturbance.

Application Manager's Technical Review Comments:

This project was originally submitted on March 3, 2022 under a Notice of Intent (NOI) to proceed under the PAG-02 General NPDES Permit and was assigned the number PAC310027. During the permit review process of the NOI, the applicant chose to submit for an Individual Chapter 102 NPDES (Individual) permit in-lieu of the general. All project documents from the PAC310027 submittal package were incorporated into the Individual application package on February 17, 2023

The first PCSM technical review identified deficiencies. A technical deficiency Letter sent to the applicant on August 10, 2022. Then revisions were received on September 9, 2022. A second round of PCSM reviews identified PCSM items that were not adequately addressed. An elevated review letter was sent on November 21, 2022 on remaining PCSM deficiencies. The responses to the elevated review deficiencies on December 9, 2022 were received to the department. Revised PCSM Plans were received on January 5, 2023 and received a technical review and completed on January 27, 2023, with no additional PCSM deficiencies. Since the project discharges to non-special protection waters of the Commonwealth and it complies with the rules and regulations of Chapter 102, no revisions to the E&S and PCSM Plans were determined to be necessary after the applicant submitted the Individual NPDES Permit application.

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:

N. Pyritic Rock

The site geology includes pyritic rock. A qualified person shall be onsite for all excavations to identify pyritic material and shall have the authority to direct the management of pyritic material. Any pyritic material excavated shall be stored and/or permanently placed in an area and in a manner that limits the pyritic material's contact with stormwater and interaction with groundwater.

Rationale: The permittee's geotechnical report identified pyritic material as a concern. The report recommended that a qualified individual be on-site at all time to be able to identify pyritic material and manage it appropriately. Runoff from pyritic material could cause the stormwater's pH to be lowered and if not properly treated or managed, could be lowered to a pH level that may violate water quality standards. The condition is necessary to ensure that the permittee properly identifies and manages any pyritic rock or material in a proactive manner in the event that such material may be encountered.

O. Native Species

Temporary and permanent seeding and vegetative plantings shall only include those species native to the area in which the seed mix and plantings will be applied.

Rationale: DEP received several comments recommending the use of only native vegetative species for stabilization and various vegetative plantings at the site. Some commentators identified non-native vegetation that may be a component of seed mixes proposed in the permittee's seeding plans. Further, in consultation with DEP's Waterways and Wetlands environmental review staff, they concurred that in order to minimize the potential spread of invasive or non-native vegetative species to adjacent surface waters, including wetlands, this condition is appropriate.

P. The permittee shall implement the facility "Lighting Photometrics Plan" plan approved by the Smithfield Township Board of Supervisors.

Rationale: See rationale in Q below.

Q. The permittee shall implement the "Rutter's Trash and Fuel Spills Standard Practices for Store #93" and in accordance with the following:

1. The 6-foot high solid vinyl fence shall be of a natural color that blends with the natural landscape if determined to be feasible by the permittee.

Rationale: DEP also consulted with environmental review staff within the DEP Waterways and Wetlands Program regarding the permit applicant's "Lighting Photometrics Plan" and the "Rutter's Trash and Fuel Spills Standard Practices for Store # 93" that the applicant provided to DEP. The DEP environmental review staff concurred that implementation of both plans would be anticipated to contribute to protecting the wetland and water quality from excessive facility lighting and trash, litter, and fuel spills vs. not having such plans in place or implementing such plans.

Public Comments:

☒ Notice of the receipt of the application and a tentative decision to <u>issue a permit</u> will be published in *Pennsylvania Bulletin* on:

April 1, 2023

30-day public comment end date: May 1, 2023, however DEP incorporated an extension to submit public comments to 15days after the public hearing identified below. The public comment period ended on May 18, 2023

☐ 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: May 3, 2023

☒ 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.

Additional Comments related to public comments received, final recommendations, and decision making on this application:

Article I, Section 27
DEP has considered the full impact of the project in accordance with our statutory authority and Article 1, section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution. During the permit review process for this authorization, the Department coordinated about this project internally with biologists with expertise related to wetlands, air program staff, storage tank program staff, and safe drinking water program staff. The Department coordinated with PennDOT about the wetland and drainage concerns, as well as traffic concerns.

DEP received multiple comments before and after the permittee submitted an application, which suggested that the wetlands should be classified as Exceptional Value due the alleged sightings of bird species near the site that were either listed as threatened or endangered under state or federal law. The Department consulted with the Pennsylvania Game Commission regarding comments received about threatened and endangered bird species near the proposed project site.

However, as identified above in this Fact Sheet, M&G Realty, Inc. conducted the required Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Index (PNDI) search to identify potential Threatened or Endangered (T&E) Species that may be present at or near the project site and any potential impacts to such species. No potential conflicts with T&E Species were identified. Pursuant to 25 Pa. Code Chapters 93 and 105, the wetlands at and adjacent to the site do not meet the criteria to be classified as Exceptional Value wetlands.

The site that lays adjacent (generally to the west) to the proposed Rutter's 93 project site is a Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Bank that was permitted, constructed, and established by the PA Department of Transportation (PennDOT). The project is known as the Old Crow wetland. The wetland mitigation bank's primary purpose is to provide compensatory wetland mitigation credits for PennDOT which may compensate for wetland impacts at PennDOT roadway improvement or other projects. DEP understands that wetland bank is still active, still producing wetland credits, and is still monitored by PennDOT as required by their wetland mitigation banking requirements. The hydrology for the Old Crow wetlands was designed to be and is manipulated through two mechanical water control structures. PennDOT manages the water levels to maintain adequate habitat and wetland mitigation goals accordingly. It is inherent to the Commonwealth's interests that the designated and existing uses, functions and values the Old Crow wetlands be protected and maintained through implementation of the BMPs and the approved plans, just as any other surface water receiving stormwater discharges would be protected and maintained under a Chapter 102 permit.

Many comments that DEP received expressed concern about whether permission is needed or was provided for the permittee to discharge into the Old Crow wetland. The approval of coverage under this Individual NPDES permit does not convey any property rights, or any exclusive privilege. DEP understands that PennDOT's review of the required Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) includes drainage onto PennDOT property. As part of PennDOT HOP review, they evaluate drainage onto PennDOT lands. PennDOT's Publication No. 282 governs HOP program implementation with specific references to drainage concerns in Appendix B2 and C1. As provided for in the HOP Project application checklist in Appendix C1 of PennDOT Pub. 282, and as explained to DEP by PennDOT, if a project draining onto PennDOT lands is required to obtain a Ch. 102 NPDES permit, the HOP applicant is required to provide proof of that permit to PennDOT prior to PennDOT approval of the HOP. For the purposes of obtaining this Chapter 102 individual permit, the applicant is

not required to provide or identify their legal right to discharge stormwater onto an adjacent property. As previously stated, this permit does not convey property rights. Such property rights are typically a private matter between landowners.

DEP consulted with environmental review staff within the Waterways and Wetlands Program regarding the permit applicant's proposed discharges and potential effect to the Old Crow wetland adjacent to the proposed Rutter's 93 site. After review of the project plans and a visit to the proposed Rutter's 93 site and Old Crow wetland, the environmental staff member, an Aquatic Biologist and wetland expert, concurred that the proposed Rutter's 93 project is designed and anticipated to mimic existing hydrologic conditions and therefore would not degrade the wetland if the Permit, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Post-Construction Stormwater Management Plan are implemented as approved. The August 15, 2023 site visit to the proposed Rutter's 93 site and the Old Crow wetland was attended by representatives of the DEP, PennDOT, M&G Realty, Inc., and the Huntingdon County Conservation District.

The Department has determined that the applicant has satisfied the applicable Commonwealth statutory and regulatory requirements for obtaining the Chapter 102 permit associated with this project. The stormwater management criteria in Chapter 102 require management and treatment of stormwater discharges for rate, volume, and water quality in accordance with the regulations prior to discharge of the stormwater to surface waters. The permittee has demonstrated that the project will manage stormwater runoff from the project consistent with the regulations.

The permit requires that the designated and existing uses of the UNT to Juniata River, and the associated wetlands will be protected and maintained through implementation of the BMPs and the approved plans.

The Department also coordinated with the local municipality about traffic, lighting, litter, and noise concerns. To provide for enhanced protection of water quality at the site, the Department inserted special conditions in the permit for the policing of litter and fuel spills at the site. Further, in order to provide enhanced protection of the wetland, a special condition was included to require the permittee to implement the Lighting Photometrics Plan that is approved by the local municipality.

Additionally, the Department considered the permit applicant's compliance history. DEP performed a current compliance check of the applicant prior to taking action on this permit. No violations were noted which would have precluded DEP's action on the permit. More specifically related to compliance with Chapter 102, the Department previously executed a consent assessment of civil penalty ("CACP") through which the permit applicant and co-permittee paid a $73,153.00 civil penalty for violations which occurred during construction of a different Rutter's project. The Department also ensured that the violations at the site were resolved before assessing the civil penalty through the CACP.

Both before and during DEP's review of the permittee's application, DEP received and considered comments about the project. DEP received comments from 111 commentators, 29 of which provided testimony at the Public Hearing that DEP held for the application, draft permit and notice of intent to issue the permit for this project. As stated above in this Fact Sheet, DEP developed a comprehensive Comment Response Document for this project.

Environmental Justice

M&G Realty, Inc's application was submitted prior to DEP's adoption of its current interim Final Environmental Justice policy. However, DEP has fulfilled its commitment to our Environmental Justice principles during its review of M&G Realty, Inc.'s application through the robust public participation process. DEP considered comments from the community and provided responses about the proposed project and the Old Crow wetland prior to when the NOI was submitted, during the initial review of the NOI, and both prior to and subsequent submission of the Individual permit application. The public participation process also included a public hearing and extended comment period prior to DEP's action on M&G Realty Inc.'s application. DEP provided the permittee's application and other information related to the proposed project on DEP's Southcentral Regional Office webpage as another way to simplify the public's ability to obtain information about the proposed project and the Individual NPDES application.

EXPANDED E&S CONTROL PLAN TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

This checklist is intended for instructional purposes only
(For use by new technicians or to illustrate check items in standard technical review checklist)

Project: Rutters Huntingdon Store #93 NPDES/Project No. PAC310027

Project Location: Rt 22/Smithfield Township Date: 4/8-5/20/2022; 9/12-11/15/2022; 1/27/2023

Check-off: c = Complies, d = Deficient, na = Not applicable
Item Location: D = E&S Drawings, N = E&S Narrative, D&N = Drawings and Narrative

"The E&S Plan shall be prepared by a person trained and experienced in E&S control methods and techniques applicable to the size and scope of the project being designed" *25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(3)*

	Item Location
Name of Plan Designer Provided ☑ Business Address ☑ Telephone No. ☑	D&N

"The existing topographic features of the project site and the immediate surrounding area"
25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(i)

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
Legible mapping				D
Printing and numbering can be easily read	☑	☐	☐	
Scale is large enough to clearly depict the topography	☑	☐	☐	
Clutter has been avoided	☑	☐	☐	
Match Lines provided for adjacent sheets	☑	☐	☐	
Existing contours				D
Dashed lines easily visible and labeled at 10' maximum intervals	☑	☐	☐	
Maximum contour interval is 2 feet	☑	☐	☐	
Type of Cover				D
Vegetative Cover shown on the plan map(s)	☑	☐	☐	
Existing improvements, i.e. roads, buildings, utilities, etc.				D
All public and private roadways on or adjacent to the site/labeled	☑	☐	☐	
All existing buildings, including those to be razed, on or adjacent	☑	☐	☐	
All existing waterlines, sewer lines, power lines, gas lines, etc.	☑	☐	☐	
Sufficient surrounding area				D
Drainage areas and receiving waters clearly shown	☑	☐	☐	
Complete mapping symbols legend and north arrow				D
All symbols used on the maps are clearly identified	☑	☐	☐	
North arrow provided on each map	☑	☐	☐	
Location map, i.e. USGS 7½ Min. Quad Map(s)				D or N
Site Outline on Legible photo copy of appropriate Quad Map(s)	☑	☐	☐	
Quad Name(s) provided	☑	☐	☐	
Existing Vegetation	☑	☐	☐	D

"The types, depth, slope, locations and limitations of the soils"
25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(ii)

Types, slopes, and locations of soil types				D or N
Soil boundaries clearly shown on plan maps	☑	☐	☐	
Legible photo copy of NRCS soil map with site outline provided	☑	☐	☐	
Soil symbols identified	☑	☐	☐	
Soil type use limitations and resolutions				N
Appropriate use limitations identified	☑	☐	☐	
Resolutions to use limitations adequately described	☑	☐	☐	
How resolutions are addressed in the E&S Plan described	☑	☐	☐	

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
Hydric soils			☐	**N**
All Potentially hydric soils identified	☑	☐	☐	
Wetland Determination provided	☑	☐	☐	
Wetland Delineation provided	☑	☐	☐	

"The characteristics of the earth disturbance activity, including the past, present, and proposed land uses and the proposed alteration to the project site"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(iii)

Proposed NPDES boundary and limits of construction			☐	**D**
Permit boundary is clearly shown on all plan maps	☑	☐	☐	
Limits of construction are clearly shown & within permit boundaries	☑	☐	☐	
Phase boundaries are clearly shown	☐	☐	☑	
Proposed contours/grades				**D**
All proposed grading is shown on Erosion Control Plan maps	☑	☐	☐	
Proposed contours are solid lines, darker than existing contours	☑	☐	☐	
Proposed contours tie into existing contours	☑	☐	☐	
Proposed waterways and stormwater management facilities				**D**
All proposed channels, swales, and pipes clearly shown & labeled	☑	☐	☐	
Transition points for all waterways clearly shown	☐	☐	☑	
All PCSM BMP locations clearly shown	☑	☐	☐	
All inlets identified/labeled	☑	☐	☐	
All proposed outfalls clearly shown and labeled	☑	☐	☐	
Proposed improvements, i.e., roads, buildings, utilities, etc.				**D**
All proposed roadways, including temporary access, clearly shown	☑	☐	☐	
Proposed building footprints, if known, are clearly shown	☑	☐	☐	
Lot boundaries and lot numbers are identified	☑	☐	☐	
Proposed utility mainlines, including sanitary, clearly shown	☑	☐	☐	
Station numbers provided	☐	☐	☑	
Proposed stockpile locations shown	☑	☐	☐	
Application has been made for required 105 permits	☐	☐	☑	
Past — at least 50 years, if known — present and proposed land uses				**N**
Brownfields identified, including reclaimed brownfields, abandoned landfills, old farm dumps, spill locations, underground fuel storage tanks and contaminated soil	☐	☐	☑	
Previously mined areas identified	☐	☐	☑	
Previous fruit orchards identified	☐	☐	☑	
Existing conditions adequately described	☐	☐	☑	
Proposed land use adequately described	☑	☐	☐	

"The volume and rate of runoff from the project area and its upstream watershed area"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(iv)

Maximum drainage areas during construction				**D or N**
Drainage areas for all proposed basins, traps and channels shown correctly on plan maps	☐	☐	☑	
Photo copy of work map showing drainage areas provided	☐	☐	☑	
Drainage areas used are maximums during construction	☐	☐	☑	
Offsite drainage area(s) on USGS quadrangle map				**N**
Drainage areas too large for the plan maps are shown on the Location map or other photo copy of USGS Quad map	☐	☐	☑	
Discharge analysis provided (non-surface water discharges)	☐	☐	☑	N
Flowage easements addressed	☐	☐	☑	

"The location of all surface waters of this Commonwealth which may receive runoff within or from the project site and their classification under Chapter 93"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(v)

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
Existing streams, wetlands, floodway, etc.			☐	**D**
All existing stream channels — defined bed and bank — within or adjacent to the site are shown on the plan map(s) & labeled	☐	☐	☑	
All existing wetlands and springs are shown on the plan map(s)	☑	☐	☐	
Wetlands shown are consistent with delineation report	☑	☐	☐	
For streams with FEMA study, 100-year floodways are shown	☐	☐	☑	
Receiving watercourses				**D**
All receiving storm sewer systems are clearly shown and labeled	☑	☐	☐	
Receiving waters beyond plan map coverage shown on USGS map	☑	☐	☐	
Downstream analysis provided for proposed discharges where needed	☐	☐	☑	N
Chapter 93 classification of streams or other water bodies				**N**
All special protection waters are clearly identified	☐	☐	☑	
All existing uses are clearly identified	☑	☐	☐	

"A narrative description of the location and type of perimeter and onsite BMPs used before, during and after the earth disturbance activity"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(vi)

☑ Description provided in the narrative — N

"A sequence of BMP installation and removal in relation to the scheduling of earth disturbance activities, prior to, during and after earth disturbance activities that ensure the proper functioning of all BMPs"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(vii)

Complete and site specific sequence of BMP installation				**D**
Access to site and perimeter BMPs is adequately addressed	☑	☐	☐	
Suitable BMPs are in place for clearing and grubbing and demolition operations	☑	☐	☐	
Sequence addresses installation of all proposed E&S BMPs	☑	☐	☐	
Proper handling of base flow during work within stream channels	☐	☐	☑	
Runoff from access roads and utility lines properly addressed	☑	☐	☐	
BMPs outletting to proposed structures are adequately addressed	☑	☐	☐	
Suitable BMPs are in place for all stages of construction	☑	☐	☐	
Suitable BMPs are in place for PCSM BMP installation	☑	☐	☐	
Appropriate instructions provided to avoid compaction of infiltration areas	☑	☐	☐	
Information is detailed and site specific	☑	☐	☐	
No maintenance items	☑	☐	☐	
Activities planned to limit exposed areas				**D**
Special value areas are kept outside the limits of construction	☑	☐	☐	
Initial clearing is limited to areas of perimeter BMPs	☑	☐	☐	
Sequence addresses field-marking the limits of disturbance	☑	☐	☐	
Cuts and fills are stabilized in regular vertical increments	☑	☐	☐	
Limits are placed on utility trenching	☑	☐	☐	
Disturbed subareas are stabilized upon reaching final grade	☑	☐	☐	
Blanketing is specified for disturbances in critical areas	☑	☐	☐	
Immediate stabilization provided in special protection watersheds	☑	☐	☐	

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
Removal of temporary BMPs				**D**
Instructions provided for topsoil replacement, addition of soil amendments, seeding and mulching	☑	☐	☐	
Conditions of stabilization are adequately defined	☑	☐	☐	
Specific instructions given for removal/conversion of basins & traps	☐	☐	☑	
Removal of all temporary BMPs is addressed	☑	☐	☐	
Instructions provided for proper installation of PCSM BMPs	☑	☐	☐	
"Supporting calculations and measurements" and "Plan Drawings"				**D**
25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(viii) and 25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(ix)				
General				
Plan Drawings meet standards in Appendix D	☑	☐	☐	
Standard Notes added to plan drawings	☑	☐	☐	
Appropriate Optional Notes added to plan drawings	☑	☐	☐	
Grading Standards added to plan drawings	☑	☐	☐	
Site Access (Chapter 3)				**D**
Rock Construction Entrances provided where needed	☑	☐	☐	
Standard Construction Detail # 3-1 and/or 3-2 provided	☑	☐	☐	
Temporary and Permanent Access Roads shown	☐	☐	☑	
Standard Construction Detail # 3-3 and/or 3-4 provided	☐	☐	☑	
Broad-based Dips used on active haul roads	☐	☐	☑	
Standard Construction Detail # 3-6 and/or 3-7 provided	☐	☐	☑	
Spacing complies with Table 3.2	☐	☐	☑	
Open-top Culverts used on active haul roads	☐	☐	☑	
Standard Construction Detail #3-8 provided	☐	☐	☑	
Water Deflectors used on haul roads	☐	☐	☑	
Standard Construction Detail #3-9 provided	☐	☐	☑	
Ditch Relief Culverts used on haul roads	☐	☐	☑	
Standard Construction Detail #3-10 provided	☐	☐	☑	
Spacing Complies with Table 3.3	☐	☐	☑	
Turnouts provided where needed on haul roads	☐	☐	☑	
Compost Filter Sock Trap provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	
Temporary Stream Crossings provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	
Standard Construction Detail # 3-12-14 provided	☐	☐	☑	
Figure 3.4 provided for temporary bridges	☐	☐	☑	
Temporary Wetland Crossings provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	
Figure 3.5 3.6, or 3.7 provided	☐	☐	☑	
Figure 3.8 provided where Causeway is proposed	☐	☐	☑	
Temporary Bypass System provided for in-stream work	☐	☐	☑	
Figure 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, or 3.12 provided	☐	☐	☑	
Standard Construction Detail #3-15 or Figure 3.13 provided for Coffer Dams	☐	☐	☑	
Silt Curtain details comply with Figure 3.14, 3.15, 3.16, or 3.17	☐	☐	☑	
Pumped Water Filter Bags provided where needed	☑	☐	☐	
Standard Construction Detail # 3-16 provided	☑	☐	☐	
Standard Construction Detail #3-17 provided for sump pits	☐	☐	☑	
Sediment Barriers (Chapter 4)				
All sediment barriers are shown on existing level contour	☑	☐	☐	D
Barrier ends extended upslope or tied into constructed berms	☑	☐	☐	D
Sediment barriers avoid concentrated flows	☑	☐	☐	D
Slope lengths comply with Figure 4.2, Figure 4.3 or Table 4.4	☑	☐	☐	D
Typical details are provided for each type of barrier proposed	☑	☐	☐	D

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
Details comply with standard details in Chapter 4, including notes	☑	☐	☐	D
Standard Construction Detail #4-3 and/or 4-4, or 4-5 provided for Weighted Sediment Filter Tubes	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail # 4-6 provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Det. #4-11 provided for Sediment Filter Log	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Det. # 4-12 provided for Wood Chip Berm	☐	☐	☑	D
Vegetative Filter Strip complies with Table 4.5	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard E&S Worksheet #1 completed for Compost Filter Socks	☑	☐	☐	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #2 completed for Compost Filter Berms	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #3 completed for Standard Silt Fence	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #4 completed for Reinforced Silt Fence	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #5 completed for Alt. Reinforced SF	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #6 completed for Super Silt Fence	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #7 completed for Straw Bale Barriers	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #8 completed for Rock Filters	☐	☐	☑	N

Note: Plan preparer may provide the information on the standard worksheets in another format as long as it is present in the narrative and identified as such.

Channels (Chapter 6)

All proposed channels shown and labeled on plan map(s)	☐	☐	☑	D
Channel locations are accessible	☐	☐	☑	D
Conflicts with utility lines, roadways, buildings, cuts & fills avoided	☐	☐	☑	D
Sharp turns and flow obstructions avoided	☐	☐	☑	D
Steep slope problems avoided	☐	☐	☑	D
Temporary crossings provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	D
Diversions located upslope of disturbed areas	☐	☐	☑	D
Diversions and outlet channels discharge to waterways or adequately sized storm sewers	☐	☐	☑	D
Collectors located below disturbed areas	☐	☐	☑	D
Collectors discharge to upslope sides of basins or traps	☐	☐	☑	D
Outlet channels protected from adjacent disturbed areas	☐	☐	☑	D
Positive grade provided throughout length of channel	☐	☐	☑	D
Channel bed slopes consistent with those used in calculations	☐	☐	☑	D
Drainage areas are maximums for life of each channel	☐	☐	☑	D
Typical detail provided for each channel shape and lining	☐	☐	☑	D
Manufacturer's installation & stapling details provided	☐	☐	☑	D
All critical dimensions specified	☐	☐	☑	D
Dimensions and linings consistent with those in calculations	☐	☐	☑	D
Temporary liners provided for vegetated channels	☐	☐	☑	D
Underlayment specified for riprap channels	☐	☐	☑	D
Transition zones identified (change in lining)	☐	☐	☑	D
No rock filters or check dams during earthmoving operations	☐	☐	☑	D
Peak flow calculations provided for all channels	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #s 9 and 10 used for Rational Equation	☐	☐	☑	N
Runoff coefficients consistent with Table 5.2	☐	☐	☑	N
Weighted coefficients used for mixed cover drainage areas	☐	☐	☑	N
2-Yr/1-Hr storm used for temporary channels	☐	☐	☑	N
5-Yr/1-Hr storm used for temps in special protection	☐	☐	☑	N
10-Yr/1-Hr storm used for permanent channels	☐	☐	☑	N
Overland flow $\leq$ 150 feet	☐	☐	☑	N
Shallow concentrated flow consistent with Figure 5.1	☐	☐	☑	N

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
Standard E&S Worksheet # 11 completed properly	☐	☐	☑	N
All channels addressed, including outlet channels for basins and traps	☐	☐	☑	N
Multipliers (1.6, 2.25, 2.75) used properly	☐	☐	☑	N
Significant changes in channel bed slope addressed	☐	☐	☑	N
Manning's "n" adjusted for flow conditions	☐	☐	☑	N
$Q \geq Q_r$	☐	☐	☑	N
D ≥ d + minimum required freeboard	☐	☐	☑	N
Flow width:flow depth ratios ≤ 12 w:1 d	☐	☐	☑	N
$V \leq V_a$	☐	☐	☑	N
$\tau_d \leq \tau_a$	☐	☐	☑	N
2 sets of calculations provided for vegetated channels, one for temporary liner and one for vegetated condition	☐	☐	☑	N

Note: Plan preparer may provide the information on the standard worksheets in another format as long as it is present in the narrative and identified as such.

Sediment Basins (Chapter 7)

All proposed sediment basins shown and labeled on plan map(s)	☐	☐	☑	D
Basin locations are accessible	☐	☐	☑	D
Conflicts with utility lines, roadways, buildings, cuts & fills avoided	☐	☐	☑	D
Steep slope problems avoided	☐	☐	☑	D
Basins located below disturbed areas	☐	☐	☑	D
Stream channels and wetlands avoided	☐	☐	☑	D
Drainage areas are maximums for life of each basin	☐	☐	☑	D
Construction Detail provided for each basin	☐	☐	☑	D
Interior and exterior contours provided on each detail	☐	☐	☑	D
Principal and emergency spillway locations shown	☐	☐	☑	D
All proposed baffles, silt curtains, and forebays shown	☐	☐	☑	D
Sediment clean-out stake location shown	☐	☐	☑	D
Bottom elevation above seasonal high water table, adjacent wetlands, or perennial stream	☐	☐	☑	D
Required flow lengths, turbidity barrier or forebay provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Typical cross-section provided for each type of principal spillway	☐	☐	☑	D
All critical dimensions and elevations shown	☐	☐	☑	D
Sediment clean-out elevation ≥ 1 ft above basin bottom	☐	☐	☑	D
18" permanent pool provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	D
Dimensions and elevations consistent with those in calks	☐	☐	☑	D
Z1 + Z2 ≥ 5	☐	☐	☑	D
Z1 and Z2 ≥ 3 for permanent basin	☐	☐	☑	D
Embankment top width ≥ 8 feet	☐	☐	☑	D
Key trench and anti-seep collars shown	☐	☐	☑	D
Impervious core shown	☐	☐	☑	D
Typical Detail provided for each type of principal spillway	☐	☐	☑	D
All critical dimensions and elevations shown	☐	☐	☑	D
Dimensions and elevations consistent with those in calcs	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail # 7-6 provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Typical provided for anti-seep collars	☐	☐	☑	D
Typical provided for outlet barrel in concrete bed	☐	☐	☑	D
Typical filter diaphragm detail provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail #7-12 provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail #7-13 provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	D

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
Skimmer Details provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail #7-1 provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail #7-2, 7-3 and 7-4 provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Orifice diameter consistent with Figure 7.2	☐	☐	☑	D
Emergency spillway detail(s) provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Protective liner extends beyond toe of embankment	☐	☐	☑	D
Specs provided for embankment materials and compaction	☐	☐	☑	D
Baffle, silt curtain, forebay detail provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Cleanout stake detail provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Basin dewatering device detail provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Basins discharge to surface waters or approved alternative	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard E&S Worksheet #12 properly completed	☐	☐	☑	N
Total storage volume ≥ Total required storage volume	☐	☐	☑	N
Justification exists for all storage volume reductions	☐	☐	☑	N
Proper dewatering time provided	☐	☐	☑	N
Proper total basin discharge capacity provided	☐	☐	☑	N
Principal spillway discharge capacity ≥ 10 Yr./1 Hr storm	☐	☐	☑	N
If not discharging to a surface water, calcs provided to show accelerated erosion not a problem	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #13 properly completed	☐	☐	☑	N
Elevation 4 is at least 0.5 ft above Elevation 3	☐	☐	☑	N
Elevation 6 is at least 2.0 ft above Elevation 5	☐	☐	☑	N
Elevation 6 is at least 1.0 ft above Elevation 5 with Discharge capacity for 100-year storm (on Worksheet #12)	☐	☐	☑	N
Required flow length:width ratio at Elevation 3 provided	☐	☐	☑	N
Emergency spillway provided	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #14 properly completed	☐	☐	☑	N
Storage volume at water surface elevation equal to top of settling volume is ≥ "Total Storage Volume Provided" on E&S Worksheet #12	☐	☐	☑	N
Storage volume at water surface elevation equal to top of sediment storage volume ≥ "Required Sediment Storage Volume" on E&S Worksheet #12	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #15 properly completed	☐	☐	☑	N
Top elevation = Top of dewatering zone	☐	☐	☑	N
Bottom elevation = Top of sediment storage zone	☐	☐	☑	N
Diagonal symmetry evident	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #16 properly completed	☐	☐	☑	N
Figure 7.2 provided with dewatering volume and skimmer orifice size plotted	☐	☐	☑	N
Dewatering time measured from top of dewatering zone to top of sediment storage zone	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #17 properly completed	☐	☐	☑	N
Orifice flow is calculated for flow into top of riser	☐	☐	☑	N
Principal spillway capacity is lesser of riser and barrel	☐	☐	☑	N
Total discharge capacity ≥ Required discharge capacity	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #18 properly completed	☐	☐	☑	N
Lf is 1.1 X Ls for temp basin & 1.15 X Ls for perm. basin	☐	☐	☑	N
Downstream analysis OK	☐	☐	☑	N

Note: Plan preparer may provide the information on the standard worksheets in another format as long as it is present in the narrative and identified as such.

Sediment Traps (Chapter 8)

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
All proposed traps shown on plan map(s)	☐	☐	☑	D
Spillway locations shown	☐	☐	☑	D
Trap locations are accessible	☐	☐	☑	D
Conflicts with utility lines, roadways, buildings, cuts & fills avoided	☐	☐	☑	D
Steep slope problems avoided	☐	☐	☑	D
Traps located below disturbed areas	☐	☐	☑	D
Stream channels and wetlands avoided	☐	☐	☑	D
Drainage areas are maximums for life of each trap	☐	☐	☑	D
Construction Detail provided for each irregular-shaped trap	☐	☐	☑	D
Interior and exterior contours provided for such traps	☐	☐	☑	D
Bottom elevation above seasonal high water table, adjacent wetlands, or perennial stream	☐	☐	☑	D
Required flow lengths, turbidity barrier or forebay provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Compost sock trap details provided and comply with SCD #3-11	☐	☐	☑	D
Typical cross-section provided for each type of trap	☐	☐	☑	D
All critical dimensions and elevations shown	☐	☐	☑	D
Dimensions and elevations consistent with those in calcs	☐	☐	☑	D
Sediment clean-out elevation $\geq$ 1 ft above trap bottom	☐	☐	☑	D
Typical Detail provided for each type of spillway	☐	☐	☑	D
All critical dimensions and elevations shown	☐	☐	☑	D
Dimensions and elevations consistent with those in calcs	☐	☐	☑	D
Skimmer details provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail # 7-1 provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Details #7-2, 7-3 and 7-4 provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Orifice diameter consistent with Figure 7.2	☐	☐	☑	D
Specs provided for embankment materials and compaction	☐	☐	☑	D
Baffle, silt curtain, forebay detail provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Cleanout stake detail provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Trap Outlet Basin Detail provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Trap Dewatering Device Detail provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Traps Discharge to surface waters or approved alternative	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard E&S Worksheet #17 properly completed	☐	☐	☑	N
Tributary drainage areas do not exceed 5.0 acres	☐	☐	☑	N
Required storage capacity provided	☐	☐	☑	N
2:1 Flow length to width ratio provided at elevation h	☐	☐	☑	N
Embankment spillway width is 2 X # AC or 2 X h	☐	☐	☑	N
Barrel-riser spillway provides 1.5 CFS/AC discharge capacity	☐	☐	☑	N
Correct outlet basin dimensions specified	☐	☐	☑	N
Standard E&S Worksheet #13 provided for irregular shaped traps	☐	☐	☑	N
Downstream analysis OK	☐	☐	☑	N

Note: Plan preparer may provide the information on the standard worksheets in another format as long as it is present in the narrative and identified as such.

Outlet Protection (Chapter 9)

All temporary and permanent outfalls are shown and labeled	☑	☐	☐	D
Locations are accessible to construction equipment	☑	☐	☐	D
Outlet protection provided for all temporary & permanent outfalls	☑	☐	☐	D
Sufficient space exists to construct outlet protection	☑	☐	☐	D
Discharges are properly oriented	☑	☐	☐	D
Outlet areas properly protected from adjacent disturbed areas	☑	☐	☐	D

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
Typical Details are provided for all types of outlet protection	☑	☐	☐	D
All critical dimensions and elevations are provided	☑	☐	☐	D
Dimensions and elevations are consistent with calcs	☑	☐	☐	D
Standard E&S Worksheet #18 completed for all riprap aprons	☑	☐	☐	N
Calculations provided for adjusted discharge velocity	☑	☐	☐	N
Apron dimensions conform to Figure 9.3 or 9.4	☑	☐	☐	N
Flow transition mat lengths conform to Figure 9.6	☐	☐	☑	N
Stilling Basin Dimensions conform to Standard Construction Detail 9-4 and Figure 9.7	☐	☐	☑	N
Stilling Well Dimensions conform to Figures 9.8, 9.9, and 9.10	☐	☐	☑	N
Supporting calculations are provided for all other types of outlet protection	☐	☐	☑	N
Downstream stability analysis provided where needed	☐	☐	☑	N

Note: Plan preparer may provide the information on the standard worksheets in another format as long as it is present in the narrative and identified as such.

Other BMPs				
Waterbars specified on utility line ROWs and abandoned roads	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail # 3-5 provided	☐	☐	☑	D
Spacing complies with Table 3.1	☐	☐	☑	D
Storm sewer inlet protection provided where needed	☑	☐	☐	D
Standard Construction Detail # 4-15 and 4-16 provided for inlet filter bags	☑	☐	☐	D
Standard Construction Detail # 4-17 and 4-18 provided for stone and concrete block inlet protection	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail # 4-19 and 4-20 provided for stone inlet protection	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail # 4-21 provided for alternate type M stone inlet protection	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail # 4-22 provided for type C inlet not at grade	☐	☐	☑	D
Standard Construction Detail # 4-23provided for type M inlet not at grade	☐	☐	☑	D
Erosion Control Blanketing Locations shown on map(s)	☑	☐	☐	D
Complete installation detail(s) provided	☑	☐	☐	D
Typicals provided for on-lot BMPs	☐	☐	☑	D
Other BMPs (specify) _____				
Location(s) shown on plan map(s) & labeled	☐	☐	☑	D
Typical Detail provided with all pertinent dimensions and elevations	☐	☐	☑	D
Design calculations	☑	☐	☐	N

Temporary Stabilization				**D**
Seed type	☑	☐	☐	
Seed rate of application	☑	☐	☐	
Agricultural lime specified at 1 or 2 T/acre	☑	☐	☐	
Fertilizer type and application rate specified	☑	☐	☐	
Mulch type and application rate specified	☑	☐	☐	
Mulch anchoring type and application rate specified	☑	☐	☐	

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	D
Permanent Stabilization				
Topsoil replacement specs provided	☑	☐	☐	
Standard E&S Worksheet # 21 completed on plan drawings	☑	☐	☐	
Seed types suitable for soil and site conditions specified	☑	☐	☐	
Seed rate of application appropriate	☑	☐	☐	
Agricultural lime specified at 6 T/acre or as per soil test	☑	☐	☐	
10-20-20 fertilizer specified at ½ ton/acre or as per soil test	☑	☐	☐	
Mulch type and application rate specified	☑	☐	☐	
Mulch anchoring type and application rate specified	☑	☐	☐	
Blanketing shown in critical areas, steep slopes, & areas of concentrated flow	☑	☐	☐	
Stabilization of non-graded, but unstabilized, areas, including agricultural areas, within the project site boundaries addressed	☑	☐	☐	

"A maintenance program, which provides for the operation and maintenance of BMPs and the inspection of BMPs on a weekly basis and after each stormwater event, including the repair or replacement of BMPs to ensure effective and efficient operation. The program must provide for completion of a written report documenting each inspection and all BMP repair, or replacement and maintenance activities"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(x)

Maintenance Information				**D**
All E&S BMPs inspected weekly and after each runoff event	☑	☐	☐	
Plan specifies maintenance of inspection & maintenance logs	☑	☐	☐	
Maximum sediment storage elevation/level in BMPs specified	☑	☐	☐	
Time frames for completing specific maintenance and repairs for each type of BMP proposed.	☑	☐	☐	
Site stabilization repair parameters and directions	☑	☐	☐	
Disposal directions for sediment removed from BMPs	☑	☐	☐	

"Procedures that ensure that the proper measures for the recycling or disposal of materials associated with or from the project site will be undertaken in accordance with this title"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(xi)

Offsite Waste and Borrow Areas (see Standard notes 10 & 11 in Appendix C)				**D**
Project construction wastes are identified	☑	☐	☐	
Directions for recycling/disposal of construction wastes	☑	☐	☐	
Soil/rock disposal and borrow areas provided with BMPs	☐	☐	☑	
Note on plans regarding clean fill requirements	☑	☐	☐	

"Identification of naturally occurring geologic formations or soil conditions that may have the potential to cause pollution during earth disturbance activities and include BMPs to avoid or minimize potential pollution and its impacts from the formations"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(xii)

Potential for geologic or soil conditions to cause pollution during construction is addressed	☑	☐	☐	N
Soil sample locations shown on plan maps	☑	☐	☐	D
Instructions for proper handling and/or disposal of all materials that could cause pollution are provided	☑	☐	☐	D
Typical details are provided for proper handling and/or disposal of all such materials	☑	☐	☐	D
The locations of all such materials are clearly shown on the plan maps	☑	☐	☐	D

"Identification of the potential thermal impacts to surface waters of this Commonwealth from the earth disturbance activity including BMPs to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential pollution from thermal impacts"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(xiii)

	Complies	Deficient	N/A	
An analysis of how thermal impacts associated with the project will be avoided is provided	☑	☐	☐	N
If thermal impacts cannot be avoided, impacts are minimized	☑	☐	☐	D&N
BMPs provided to mitigate thermal impacts	☑	☐	☐	D&N

"The E&S Plan shall be planned, designed, and implemented to be consistent with the PCSM Plan under § 102.8 (relating to PCSM requirements). Unless otherwise approved by the Department, the E&S Plan must be separate from the PCSM Plan and labeled "E&S" or "Erosion and Sediment Control Plan" and be the final plan for construction"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(xiv)

Overall design of project supports managing of stormwater for erosion control during earth disturbance activities	☑	☐	☐	D&N
Erosion control BMPs can be integrated into structural and Non-structural PCSM practices and approaches	☑	☐	☐	D&N

"Identification of existing and proposed riparian forest buffers"

25 Pa. Code Section 102.4(b)(5)(xv)

Existing and proposed riparian forest buffers are shown on the plan drawings	☐	☐	☑	D