EXHIBIT H

Conewago Creek UNT Floodplain Restoration at Elizabethtown Crossing

Pre-Application Meeting
LSI Project No. D-2171.2-26
July 29, 2026

Attendees

LandStudies (LS)

- Cory Rathman – Project Manager
- Nick McKnight
- Katie Samus
- Tanner Wolpert
- Alyssa Hannigan

Land Development Team
(Rettew, Catalyst)

- Kim Fasnacht
- Ryan Coleman
- Andy Miller

USACE

- Mike Dombroskie

PA DEP Central Office – Chapter 105

- Andrew Foley
- Jeffrey Hartranft

PA DEP MPPD – Chapter 102

- Michael Luciani
- Rebecca Albert
- Deanna Stolpe
- Katie Seymore
- Robert Jevin

Lancaster County Conservation District (LCCD)

- Eric Hout

Project Overview

Cory Rathman (LS) reviewed the project location in Mount Joy Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The project is located near the intersection of Route 283 and Hershey Road. The purpose of the meeting is to review floodplain restoration design and permitting, along with other stream and wetland impacts, in conjunction with the land development plan processing coordinated by Rettew. The restoration intent is to restore the stream and wetland corridor as close as practical to the historical conditions given the limitations of modern-day constraints. The restoration is intended to provide stormwater management (peak flow and infiltration) for a portion of the land development area on the west side of Hershey Road to meet PA DEP Chapter 102 and Mount Joy Township requirements.

Project Site Overview

Cory provided the following overview

- The land development components include commercial, retail, industrial warehousing, and some residential
- The floodplain restoration component will occur west of Hershey Road and is currently anticipated to impact approximately 1,242 linear feet of stream and 0.21 acres of wetlands and cover 2.5 acres. The drainage area to the floodplain restoration is approximately 120 acres.

- Stream and wetland impacts associated with the land development project are present on both sides of Hershey Road but outside of the floodplain restoration area. There are approximately 175 linear feet of stream impact and roughly 0.06 acres of wetlands impacts.
- FEMA data is not available for the project area, so a 50-foot floodway boundary is assumed.
- Channel incision can be found along the streambanks. Also, large ironstone boulders are found on the surface and below grade, which are unique to this area.

Mike Dombroskie (USACE) requested clarification regarding the 175 linear feet of stream impact associated with land development on the east side of Hershey Road.

- Kim Fasnacht and Ryan Coleman (Rettew) described the existing condition of the stream in this area as intermittent and explained that the upper portion would be filled in as part of the land development, while the lower portion of the stream would remain as-is. Rettew will complete an additional site visit to determine the flow source and location(s) within this stream channel to aid in overall impact determinations since the intermittent stream flows into a perennial stream on site. No impacts are anticipated on the perennial stream. Mike stated that he would prefer to see the springs in this area remain rather than be filled in.
- The 0.037-acre isolated wetland located west of Hershey Road was also discussed. Rettew explained that this wetland will be impacted by a driveway extension, that is required due to a Hershey Road median extension where the current driveway is located.

Mike Dombroskie asked if stormwater outfalls will have pre-treatment before discharging to the stream.

- While the design is still underway, Rettew explained that for Tract 1, a surface basin will treat stormwater from the warehouse prior to entering the floodplain restoration.
- Discharge from Tract 3 may discharge directly into the floodplain restoration, however surface pre-treatment BMPs will be installed.
- Tract 4 may have one or two direct discharges with upland BMPs installed for pre-treatment.

Cory reviewed historical impacts and existing impairments.

- Historical aerial imagery shows that the site was historically comprised of agricultural and wooded areas until the 1970s when Route 283 was constructed. The shape of the disturbed area in the 70's photo (assumed large fill area) on the project site correlates with the steep slopes adjacent to the existing stream.
- As development continued upstream of the project area, the stream was piped under the upstream property to a point where the proposed floodplain restoration project begins.

Cory reviewed fieldwork that was completed to date

- Rettew performed the wetland delineation
- LandStudies performed infiltration testing and trench investigation. Infiltration testing yielded poor results due to clay soils and bedrock was encountered shallower than anticipated. This condition was corroborated by the three trenches installed throughout the proposed floodplain restoration area.
- Indicators of the historical floodplain were observed and radiocarbon dating samples were collected to correlate these observations.
- Cross sections from the plan set were reviewed illustrating the location of weathered parent material and an estimated proposed floodplain elevation. At this stage of design, the floodplain elevation is roughly 6 inches above weathered parent material and aligns with observations of likely historical floodplain indicators.

Rettew reviewed anticipated clearances associated with PHMC and PNDI.

- PHMC: A Phase 2 Archaeological Study is currently underway
- PNDI: Bat studies were performed with no findings regarding rare or endangered species.
- Rettew intends for both of these items to be cleared prior to permit submission.

Restoration Approach & Expected Outcomes

LS provided an overview of the floodplain restoration design intent.

- Preliminary restoration design proposes filling the incised channel and excavating existing grade to create a floodplain roughly six inches above weathered parent material.
- Preliminary design includes a floodplain bottom occupying approximately 2.5 acres, including a ballpark estimate of 6,000 cubic yards of excavated legacy sediment.
- The average floodplain longitudinal slope is approximately 1.5%. Woody material is proposed in the floodplain restoration; specific wood locations or wood throughout the restoration will be worked out during the design process.
- The restoration will have an anastomosing system with no predefined channel and will disperse water from the upstream existing channel across the width of the restoration. This approach will maximize hydrology across the valley and increase the potential for wetland creation.
- By spreading the existing flow across the width of the valley and adding wood, the restoration condition will be more stable and is unlikely to create another vertically incised channel that is present in the existing conditions.

Anticipated Authorizations

LS opened discussion regarding permit authorizations anticipated for the project. Jeff Hartranft and Andrew Foley (PA DEP – Chapter 105), Robert Jervin and Katie Seymore (PA DEP – Chapter 102), Mike Drombroskie (USACE), and Eric Hout (LCCD) provided confirmations and additional input on permit submission and authorizations.

- DEP – the project requires a Joint Permit Application (JPA) where MPPD will be the lead and Jeff & Drew will review floodplain restoration, providing their feedback to MPPD.
- DEP – based on preliminary information provided (historical impacts, impairments, trench data) floodplain restoration approach is appropriate.
- Stormwater outfalls and stream crossings will be authorized as part of the JPA.
- Robert indicated that the applicant can use either the GP fee structure (for impacts that would qualify for a GP) or the impact acreage fee associated with the Joint Permit. Generally, the impact acreage fee ends up being cheaper option
- Robert confirmed that the JPA authorization will cover future maintenance for stream crossing and outfalls.
- DEP confirmed that the floodplain restoration and land development impacts would be reviewed separately but under the same JPA. A floodplain restoration package and a land development package will be submitted under one JPA
- LandStudies will develop E&S controls associated with the floodplain restoration to be reviewed by Drew/Jeff, while Rettew will develop E&S controls associated with the land development to be reviewed by MPPD/LCCD. Rettew stated that stockpiling of legacy sediment for use on land development site is likely but specifics haven't been developed at this stage of the design. Chapter 102 and 105 boundaries will be clearly delineated on the plans with overlap likely in order to address stockpiling of legacy sediment.

- Rebecca indicated that permit applications are to be submitted through the DEP public upload portal and to be sure that the submissions are directed to MPPD.
- Mike stated that PASPGP-7 seems appropriate but that if any issues are revealed during the Phase 2 Archaeological Study, the permit approach may change.
- LCCD – will review the NPDES application for administrative completeness determination and will coordinate with MPPD regarding concurrent joint technical review.
- Eric requested that LCCD be contacted in advance regarding accurate calculation of 115 fees prior to submission. Rettew indicated they would initiate a second pre-application meeting to review fee calculations prior to submission when design is closer to finalization.

Questions & Action Items

Discussion regarding mitigation for impacts outside of the floodplain restoration. LS indicated that mitigation for these impacts are not anticipated to be associated with the floodplain restoration. Rettew indicated that mitigation has not yet been determined.

LS to provide pre-application meeting minutes.