

April 11, 2021

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

I am writing this letter to support the Marple Township zoning board's decision to deny the special exception in regards to the location of the proposed PECO Gas Expansion Plant/Reliability Station at the corner of Sproul and Cedar Grove Roads.

Some of my reasons are as follows:

1. My community and I were not properly notified of the plan to build this expansion plant. I found out in January 2021 when I began to see lawn signs on Cedar Grover Road. I live 3 short blocks behind where the proposed site would be I never received a letter, post card or any communication from PECO about their proposal. It appears, only a few people were notified, none of my neighbors have been. We are still waiting. A few zoom meetings were held, where PECO selected who would attend each meeting. During these meetings PECO refused to answer detailed questions (i.e. what type/model of heaters would be used, what type of contaminants they would spew, what is the noise decibel output for these six heaters combined, etc.) and did not allow enough public input, limiting people to three minutes (which included the question and answer) and often muting people mid-sentence. Their claim to "extensive written communications with numerous local residents" is just not true.
2. I feel that PECO is not being honest about their plant. Each time we have a public hearing with them, some of the information they provide changes. They told us this was the 'first animal of this kind' two months ago and now they state there are 30 such facilities such as this one in the USA. It's hard to have faith in a company that does not provide a consistent message.
3. If it wasn't for social media I would not know of the public meetings PECO has been having. I joined Marplesafe.com to keep myself informed, if it wasn't for that group I would be completely in the dark. I still do not understand why PECO has not notified me and my neighbors. The lot they purchased is an old gas station, it is not very large for a 'plant' of this magnitude. Why can't they put it in a different location away from homes, a school & a busy shopping center? We have an industrial park 5 minutes from this very location.
4. I am very concerned for the safety of my family, my neighbors and my home. My husband has already had stage 3 cancer at the age of 45. PECO has not disclosed the amount of pollution this plant will cause. How will this affect my children who play outside and my husband? We only live 3 short blocks away.
5. How will this plant affect the property value of my home? I have spent 15 years here maintaining a lovely home in a great neighborhood and I worry the pollution, noise and the tall smoke stacks will ruin the value of our properties.
6. In the 3 of the artistic renderings of the facility, PECO completely omitted to show the industrial heaters and the 18 feet high stacks that will protrude behind their lovely landscaping. They will have 5 heaters, each of them the equivalent of 20 residential ones. There are 2 homes adjacent to this lot and a restaurant. What kind of heat will be omitted besides gas fumes and noise? Let alone the fact that this will be a total eye sore to our lovely residential community.

7. During one meeting, PECO admitted that this is the "first of its kind" facility in the PECO network and they have no experience constructing or operating such a facility. I am very concerned that something that may not have been properly tested in such a location could be catastrophic in terms of lives lost and property damage.
8. This lot is in close proximity to numerous residential homes, Russell Elementary School, a busy fast-food restaurant (Freddy's), and a strip of small local business including a Wawa. It also sits at a busy intersection which is prone to vehicular accidents. The speed limit is 40 mph, but is often exceeded.
9. PECO's argument that a collision of a truck with the natural gas expansion plant cannot result in an explosion and/or fire is misleading. The Operations spokesman for PECO said (in a public forum via Zoom) that if a truck collided with the facility it would only result in a gas leak, not an explosion, because the natural gas is conveyed in an oxygen deficient engineered environment and therefore cannot explode. That's true if and only if the gas remains in the controlled conditions of the engineered facility. Once the system is breached by a collision, operating accident or other event, the natural gas could mix with the oxygen in the atmosphere and potentially be explosive. PECO cannot legitimately argue that explosion or fire at such a facility is not possible.
10. Another PECO spokesman (their attorney I believe) conflated the meaning of the word "gas" when he commented that this location was once a "gas station" and will now just be a "gas reliability station" as if gasoline and natural gas were the same thing. This is profoundly misleading. Gasoline and natural gas share the fact that they are both derived from crude oil/fossil fuel deposits, but their physical and chemical properties and handling risks rapidly diverge from there through processing, distribution and end use. Liquid gasoline is not natural gas, and to suggest by the misuse of the word "gas" is disingenuous and misleading to the public.
11. PECO argues that they must locate this facility in close proximity to the existing gas main running along Sproul Road. They claim it must be within a ½ mile radius of Lawrence and Sproul Rds. But this was before they even began replacing pipe all along Sproul Rd for miles many months ago. This appears to be purely a financial consideration lacking any safety consideration. I see on the docket they claim to have looked at ten other locations, however on the recorded video they claim to have only looked at a few which were all too far away.
12. Alternatively, it would be more advantageous from a public safety perspective to locate this proposed natural gas facility in the Lawrence Park Industrial Center rather than the currently proposed location. At least the Industrial Park is already "industrial".
13. PECO argues this is part of a ten-year plan for future gas needs. Why should future potential residents and businesses be more important than currently existing residents and businesses? How do we know that gas usage will actually go up when Pennsylvania's goal is to develop more clean energy and move away from fossil fuels?
14. It is apparent to me that the proposed PECO Natural Gas Expansion Plant location at Sproul and Cedar Grove Roads was made with disproportionate weight given to PECO's convenience and project costs considerations, not public safety. The site selection process should have first defined areas that meet

defined and accepted public safety criteria and then within that geographic “safe” envelope, project cost, schedule and PECO convenience factors could optimize the final location. PECO seems to have overlooked, or at least undervalued, public safety considerations in selecting the proposed site. This facility should not be constructed where currently proposed.

Thank you,

/s/

Carolina Favazza
2006 Kerwood Dr
Broomall PA 19008
Carolina.favazza@villanova.edu
610-353-3314

VERIFICATION

I swear that the facts I am presenting in this Protest are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. I understand that the statements I am making in this Protest are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. § Section 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/

Date: April 11, 2021 Print Name: Carolina C Favazza

Address: 2006 Kerwood Dr

Broomall, PA 19008

Email: carolina.favazza@villanova.edu

Phone: 610-353-3314

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Petition of PECO Energy Company for a Finding :
Of Necessity Pursuant to 53 P.S §10619 that
the Situation of Two Buildings Associated with : Docket No. P-2021-3024328
a Gas Reliability Station in Marple Township,
Delaware County Is Reasonably Necessary for :
the Convenience and Welfare of the Public :

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Protest upon the parties listed below, in accordance with the requirements of 52 PA Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant) in the manner listed below upon the parties listed below:

Emily I. DeVoe Administrative Law Judge Public Utility Commission 400 North Street Keystone Bldg. Harrisburg, PA 17120	JACK R GARFINKLE ESQUIRE PECO ENERGY COMPANY 2301 MARKET STREET PO BOX 8699 PHILADELPHIA PA 19101-8699 215.841.6863 jack.garfinkle@exeloncorp Accepts eService
CHRISTOPHER A LEWIS ESQUIRE FRANK L TAMULONIS ESQUIRE STEPHEN C ZUMBRUN ESQUIRE BLANK ROME LLP ONE LOGAN SQUARE 130 NORTH 18TH STREET PHILADELPHIA PA 19103 215-569-5793 lewis@blankrome.com ftamulonis@blankrome.com szumbrun@blankrome.com Accepts eService	KAITLYN T SEARLS ESQUIRE J. ADAM MATLAWSKI ESQUIRE MCNICHOL, BYRBE & MATLAWSKI, P.C. 1223 N PROVIDENCE ROAD MEDIA PA 19063 ksearls@mbmlawoffice.com amatlawski@mbmlawoffice.com Accepts eService

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/

Date: __April 11, 2021____ Print Name: __Carolina C Favazza__

Address: __2006 Kerwood Dr____

__Broomall, PA 19008____

Email: __carolina.favazza@villanova.edu____

Phone: __610-353-3314__