

April 10, 2021

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

I am writing this letter to support the Marple Townships 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 family and I live on the block behind the proposed Reliability Station. We have been in contact with several real estate professionals who have confirmed that the value of our home will be significantly negatively impacted by the building of this station.
2. I have 2 toddler daughters and I am extremely concerned about the environmental effects and the safety of this Reliability station. PECO was not able to elaborate on these effects during any of their meetings because it was "the first of its kind." I do not feel that a neighborhood full of families should be a testing site for a station that is the first of its kind. PECO should be able to adequately inform residents of both the environmental and safety impacts of such a station.
3. PECO made it very clear during one of their first meetings with the township for the zoning exception that this station would not benefit Marple Township. Rather, it would benefit other counties. It is completely ridiculous that our neighborhood should bear the risk and burden of this unsightly station.
4. PECO has released many misleading drawings of this station. It looks like they have purposely left out the large smoke stacks in their renderings for the community so that it looks less industrial than it will actually be.
5. My community and I were not properly notified of the plan to build this expansion plant. I only found out when a neighbor advised me of the plan. It appears, only a few people living within 150 feet were notified. I live on the block behind the proposed Reliability Station and we were never notified.
6. 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 would they 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.
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 damaged.
8. This lot is in close proximity to numerous residential homes (including my own), 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 was breached by a collision, operating accident or other event, the natural gas would mix with the oxygen in the atmosphere and potentially then 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.

Sincerely,

Marissa McGeehan & David Heagerty

2102 Boxwood Drive, Broomall, PA 19008

[marissa.mcgeehan@gmail.com](mailto:marissa.mcgeehan@gmail.com)

484-431-7246

**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).

Date: 4/10/2021

Respectfully Submitted,  
*/s/*

Print Name: David Heagerty

Address: 2102 Boxwood Drive  
Broomall, PA 19008

Email: daveheagerty@hotmail.com

Phone: 484-467-7368

