

Via electronic service only due to Emergency Order at M-2020-3019262

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Petition of PECO Energy Company for a Finding : P-2021-3024328
Of Necessity Pursuant to 53 P.S. § 10619 that the :
Situation of Two Buildings Associated with a Gas :
Reliability Station in Marple Township, Delaware :
County Is Reasonably Necessary for the :
Convenience and Welfare of the Public :

**INTERIM ORDER
PROVIDING INFORMATION TO *PRO SE* PROTESTANTS**

NOTE: Please read this document in its entirety as it provides important information about this case.

On February 26, 2021, PECO Energy Company (PECO) filed a Petition for a Finding of Necessity Pursuant to 53 P.S. § 10619 that the Situation of Two Buildings Associated with a Gas Reliability Station in Marple Township, Delaware County Is Reasonably Necessary for the Convenience and Welfare of the Public (Petition). In the Petition, PECO requests that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission), pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.41 and Section 619 of the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), 53 P.S. § 10619, make a finding that: (1) the situation of two buildings (Buildings) for a proposed gas reliability station (Gas Reliability Station) is reasonably necessary for the convenience and welfare of the public and, therefore, exempt from any zoning, subdivision, and land development restriction of the Marple Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and the Marple Township Zoning Code pursuant to MPC § 619, and (2) a proposed security fence appurtenant to the Gas Reliability Station is a “facility” under 66 Pa.C.S. § 102 and is therefore exempt from local zoning requirements.

Pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.14(d)(9), applications to secure exemption under Section 619 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. § 10619) must be published in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* and are subject to a 15-day protest period.

On March 10, 2021, the Commission issued a Telephonic Prehearing Conference Notice scheduling a prehearing conference for 10:00 a.m. on April 21, 2021.

On March 27, 2021, notice of the Petition and the prehearing conference was published in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*. The published notice further advised that the protest deadline was April 12, 2021.¹ PECO also published notice of the Petition and the protest deadline in the *Daily Times and Sunday Times* as well as the *Daily and Sunday Times Digital* on March 26, 2021.²

On March 11, 2021, Marple Township, Delaware County (Marple Township) filed a Petition to Intervene in the proceeding. A ruling on this Petition to Intervene is still outstanding.

On March 18, 2021, PECO filed an Answer to Marple Township's Petition to Intervene, advising it does not oppose it.

On April 1, 2021, the undersigned's legal assistant received an email containing comments regarding the above-captioned matter. By Interim Order dated April 2, 2021, the comments were attached to the record.

On April 5, 2021, a Prehearing Conference Order was issued.

On April 12, 2021, Marple Township filed an Answer, New Matter, and Formal Protest to the Petition.

¹ Fifteen days from March 27, 2021, is April 11, 2021, a Sunday. Therefore, the protest deadline was set for the next business day, Monday, April 12, 2021.

² PECO filed proof of publication on April 8, 2021.

On April 12, 2021, the County of Delaware, Pennsylvania (Delaware County) filed a Petition to Intervene. A ruling on this Petition to Intervene is still outstanding.

A number of protests were filed by *pro se* protestants. A list of the individuals who have filed a Protest with the Secretary's Bureau is attached to this Order as Attachment A. Two individuals filed a Petition to Intervene in addition to their Protest, Theodore Uhlman and Julie Baker. A ruling on these Petitions to Intervene is still outstanding.

In addition to the individuals listed in Attachment A (individuals who are shown in the Commission's online docket system to have filed Protests with the Commission's Secretary), there are other individuals who emailed documents to the undersigned on or about April 12, 2021, but as of the issuance of this Order, are not shown in the online docket system to have made filings with the Commission's Secretary's Bureau. **Please note: Only individuals who have filed Protests with the Commission's Secretary's Bureau and are listed in Attachment A are considered to be Protestants in this matter at this time.**

If you have filed a *pro se* Protest with the Commission's Secretary's Bureau in this matter, you may:

a. **Choose not to attend the Prehearing Conference.** You are not required to attend the prehearing conference on April 21, 2021 or any public input hearings or evidentiary hearings³, if these proceedings are held. If you do not attend the prehearing conference, your name will be removed from the full service list (meaning you **will not** receive any pleadings, filings, discovery requests, or written testimony), and you will be placed on the limited service list (meaning you **will** receive copies of interim orders, hearing notices, the Administrative Law Judge's Recommended Decision, and the Commission's Final Order). If you choose not to attend the prehearing conference, you may still attend and testify at a public input hearing, if one is scheduled, as explained below. Additionally, if you testify at a public input hearing you may still attend the evidentiary hearing, if one is held, but you will attend in an observational capacity only and you

³ Just like the prehearing conference, any evidentiary hearing or public input hearing held in this matter will be held via telephone conference bridge.

may not provide testimony or evidence at the evidentiary hearing. Regardless of whether you choose not to attend the prehearing conference, your Petition will remain on the record, but it is not considered evidence.

b. **Choose to attend the Prehearing Conference.** The purpose of the prehearing conference is to get the parties together to discuss procedural matters such as the setting of a litigation schedule (i.e., deadlines for the service of discovery, written testimony, evidentiary hearing dates, deadlines for the filing of briefs, etc.), the modification of discovery rules (if appropriate), and the appropriateness and scheduling of public input hearings. Additionally, the Administrative Law Judge may rule on any outstanding petitions to intervene and address other procedural matters the parties may raise. **The purpose of the prehearing conference is not to discuss whether the Petition for a finding of Necessity Pursuant to 53 P.S. § 10619 should or should not be granted.** There will be no opportunity for anyone to provide testimony, and no evidence will be considered or admitted. If you attend the prehearing conference, you will be given an opportunity to ask questions of the Administrative Law Judge, but she can only answer procedural questions and cannot provide legal advice. Additionally, you may be asked whether you wish to become a party of record (described below) or whether you wish to be placed on the limited service list.

c. **Attend a public input hearing if one is scheduled.** Regardless of whether you choose to attend the prehearing conference, you may attend a public input hearing if one is scheduled in this matter. Public input hearings are held for the purpose of giving citizens an opportunity to express appropriate concerns regarding the Company's proposal. Any individual, not just individuals who have filed Protests, may attend a public input hearing. Any individual, not just individuals who have filed Protests, may testify at a public input hearing. An individual who chooses to attend a public input hearing is not required to testify. In order to testify at a public input hearing, all an individual has to do is pre-register. If you testify at a public input hearing, and do so under oath, your testimony, subject to objection and cross-examination by a party, will be considered evidence and will be considered by the Administrative Law Judge in the preparation of the Recommended Decision. Notice of the public input hearing, if one is scheduled, will be

published in your local newspaper at least two weeks before it is held and will include instructions on how to pre-register.

d. **Become a party of record.** As a party of record, you will be served with all of the pleadings, filings, discovery requests, written testimony and orders and decisions served and issued in this proceeding. These documents will be voluminous. Your *rights* as a party of record include the ability to present your own testimony and admissible evidence and to cross-examine other witnesses at an evidentiary hearing, and to file exceptions to the Administrative Law Judge's Recommended Decision. Your *duties* as a party of record are that you must answer all discovery requests served upon you in accordance with the Commission's rules. If you file any documents, you must serve a copy upon the Administrative Law Judge and each party appearing on the service list, as modified after the Prehearing Conference. If you intend to present evidence at the formal evidentiary hearing, you will be required to submit your testimony (and any associated exhibits) in writing in advance, in accordance with the schedule to be set at the Prehearing Conference, and to provide a copy of your written testimony to each party on the service list. You will be expected to participate in accordance with the rules of Commission practice appearing in Title 52 of the Pennsylvania Code Chapters 1, 3, and 5 and follow the Commission's rules of evidence. **The Pennsylvania Code is available on-line** at <http://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/>. If you become a party of record, you must register for e-service through the Commission's website.

e. **Represent yourself in an individual capacity.** An individual may represent him- or herself in an individual capacity or as a sole proprietor. If you intend to represent some other entity, such as a corporation, partnership, municipality, church, non-profit, etc., the Commission's rules at 52 Pa.Code §§ 1.21 & 1.22 require that you be represented by an attorney. A non-attorney cannot represent any entity or individual other than him- or herself.

If you have filed a *pro se* Protest in this matter and do not intend to participate in the proceeding as a party of record, you are **not required** to file or serve a Prehearing Memorandum in this matter.

The Administrative Law Judge received emailed documents on or about April 12, 2021, from individuals who are not listed in Attachment A. Copies of these emails are attached to this Order as Attachment B, so as to cure any *ex parte* communication issue. If you emailed the Administrative Law Judge documents, and your name does not appear in Attachment A, there is no record of you filing a Protest with the Commission’s Secretary’s Bureau and you are not considered a Protestant at this time. **The only way to become a Protestant in this matter is to timely e-file a Protest with the Commission’s Secretary’s Bureau.** Individuals who emailed the Administrative Law Judge documents, but did not successfully file a Protest with the Commission’s Secretary’s Bureau, will receive a courtesy copy of this Order, but future Orders will be sent only to parties and Protestants.

If you email the Administrative Law Judge any documents or correspondence, you must simultaneously copy all individuals listed in the party’s list attached to this Order.

Finally, motions or other requests for relief **must be filed** with the Commission’s Secretary’s Bureau **and then served** upon the Administrative Law Judge and all individuals listed in the party’s list attached to this Order. If a motion or other request for relief is not filed with the Commission’s Secretary’s Bureau, but is nevertheless emailed to the Administrative Law Judge, **it will be disregarded.**⁴

Date: April 14, 2021

_____/s/
Emily I. DeVoe
Administrative Law Judge

⁴ On April 12, 2021, the Administrative Law Judge received an emailed document from Mr. Uhlman entitled “Petition for Reconsideration from Staff Action.” It does not appear in the Commission’s online docket system, however, it contains a certificate of service indicating it has been served upon PECO and the other parties. In an abundance of caution and to cure any *ex parte* issue, this correspondence is attached to this Order as Attachment C. This correspondence will be disregarded by the Administrative Law Judge unless and until it is properly filed with the Commission’s Secretary’s Bureau.

ATTACHMENT A

Last Name	First Name
Adaman	Jill
Amoroso	Sabina
Atkinson	Amanda
Avedisian	Tom
Baker	Julie
Barrabee	Matthew
Blake	Amy
Blum	Norma
Callaghan	John
Carnaroli	Felicia
Colagreco	Joseph
Coleman	Stephen
Collins	Linda
Cross	Holly
Cross	John
Darby	Marion
DiCampli	Teresa
DiDomenico	Casaundra
DiMarco	Steve
D'Orazio	Bob
Fat	Gregory
Favazza	Carolina
Favazza, Jr.	Salvatore
Felfelis	Kyriaki
Felfelis	Christos
Fender	Ronald
Gillan	Henry and Linda
Giovanetti	Richard
Goldhorn	Eileen
Heagerty	David
Henderson	Maria
Howarth	Nicole
Jordan	Robert
Kailath	Ashok
Karamitopoulos	Mary
Kuchan	Sarah
Lenahan	William
Mancini-Strong	Marilia
Marziano, Jr.	Anthony
Masciantonio	Anna
McGeehan	Marissa
Okur	Nilgun

Pagliara	Jessica
Pagliara	Michael
Pickering	Kevin
Plotnick	Alyssa
Redding	Lynne
Redding	Andrew
Rich	Maria
Robbins	Luisa
Scace	Lucinda
Spector	Karen
Strong	Jeffrey
Svenson	Petra
Trader	Alessia
Uhlman	Theodore
Wegener	William
Welsh	Tracey
Welsh	Steven
Wendel	Bridgett
Willig	Anna
Yiantsos	Kosmas
Zemaitis	Natalie

[External] Docket # P-2021-3024328 - Message (HTML)

File Message Help Tell me what you want to do

Delete Archive Reply Reply All Forward

Quick Steps Move Tags Editing Speech Zoom Insights

[External] Docket # P-2021-3024328

Donahue, Nancy <nancy.donahue@genesishcc.com>

To DeVoe, Emily

Cc jjbyrne@mbmlawoffice.com; ksearls@mbmlawoffice.com; lewis@blankrome.com; ftamulonis@blankrome.com; szumbrun@blankrome.com; uhlmantr@yahoo.com; + 6 others

Yellow Category

NancyDonahueProtest01.docx (1).pdf 108 KB

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

Please see the attached protest.

--
Nancy J. Donahue
Sr. Business Analyst
Genesis HealthCare
610-925-4105

This e-mail and any attachments may contain information which is confidential, proprietary, privileged or otherwise protected by law. The information is solely intended for the named addressee (or a person responsible for delivering it to the addressee). If you

Attachment to Donahue email (7 pages):

**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 a Gas Reliability Station in Marple Township, Delaware County Is Reasonably Necessary for the Convenience and Welfare of the Public : Docket No. P-2021-3024328

PROTEST OF NANCY J. DONAHUE

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.51, ET SEQ., Nancy J. Donahue, 401 Yale Ave. Broomall, PA, 19008 hereby files this Protest in the above-captioned proceeding. In support thereof, they state as follows:

- 1 Petitioner is Nancy J. Donahue, residing for more than 3 years at 401 Yale Avenue, , Broomall, PA 19008.
- 2 Nancy J. Donahue is protesting PRO SE, and has no attorney. All documents should be served by electronic mail to Nancy.Donahue@GenesisHcc.com as provided in 52 Pa. Code § 1.54(b (3))

**NANCY J. DONAHUE'S
INTEREST IN THE PROCEEDINGS**

- 3 Section 5.51 of the Public Utility Commission's regulations govern eligibility of parties to protest in PUC proceedings.

4 Nancy J. Donahue objects to the approval of PECO's application filed with the Commission. Accordingly, Nancy J. Donahue satisfies the Public Utility Commission's standards for protest set forth in 52 PACode § 5.51(a)

**THE GROUNDS FOR NANCY J. DONAHUE'S
PROTEST**

5 Marple Township officials and residents have made repeated attempts to provide alternative locations in industrial areas of the town, to which PECO continuously refuses. PECO petitioning the Public Utility Commission after being denied a Special Exception for the location is the exact opposite of working with the community that will be directly affected by this construction. As such, we are respectfully requesting a Public Input Hearing on this docket so that all affected stakeholders have the opportunity to hear this case and be heard.

6 In Paragraph 16 of PECO's filing, it is stated that, "...PECO considered at least ten sites in the vicinity but eliminated these alternatives due to size restrictions, zoning codes, availability, or distance from the gas main terminus." However, PECO has been unable to provide details about when, where, or how those ten or more sites were considered.

7 In 2018 my husband and I sold the home in which we raised our family in order to down-size. My husband is social security disabled and requires one floor living, so we were thrilled to be able to purchase a rancher in the lovely, family friendly community of Broomall.

8 We are shocked that PECO is attempting to override the decision of our community (Denying their request to build the plant) and it seems they are proceeding with their plans to install this experimental monstrosity at a very busy intersection just one block from the Marple Newtown Elementary School, and 1.5 blocks from our home.

How dare they put our children and families in harm's way! I am losing sleep every night with nightmares about the possible catastrophes this could bring about.

9 As this type of plant has never been installed in a residential neighborhood, I am very concerned that an accident at the site would cause a domino effect - impacting the surrounding homes in the neighborhood that have gas lines for heating, cooking, appliances, etcetera.

10 Please do not allow this project to go through. Regardless of the investment PECO has already made, please show that you put the safety and lives of our families and children FIRST. I do not know .

**NANCY J. DONAHUE'S
REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

11 Nancy J. Donahue protests in order to request the following relief:

11.1 That the commission schedule a series of Public Input Hearings on this docket so that all affected stakeholders have the opportunity to hear this case and be heard.

11.2 That the Commission deny PECO's request for relief as PECO has failed to demonstrate that the proposed facility is reasonably necessary or that the proposed location is reasonably necessary or appropriate.

WHEREFORE, Nancy J. Donahue respectfully requests that the Commission grants this Petition to Protest, providing the protester with full-party status in this proceeding and any hearings or conferences held, and with the ability to comment.

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/
Nancy J. Donahue April 11, 2021
401 Yale Avenue,
Broomall, PA 19008
Nancy.Donahue@GenesisHcc.com
484/435-5930

VERIFICATION

I, Nancy J. Donahue, hereby verify that the facts contained in the foregoing pleading are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and that I am duly authorized to make this verification, and that I expect to be able to prove the same at any hearing held in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/

Nancy J. Donahue April 11, 2021
401 Yale Avenue,
Broomall, PA 19008
Nancy.Donahue@GenesisHcc.com
484/435-5930

**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 : Docket No. P-2021-3024328
Buildings Associated with 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:

ATTACHMENT B

<p>BY EMAIL Emily I. DeVoe Administrative Law Judge edevoe@pa.gov</p>	<p>BY EMAIL J. Adam Matlawski, Esq. Kaitlyn T. Searls, Esq. McNichol, Byrne & Matlawski, P.C. 1223 N. Providence Road Media, PA 19063 jjbyrne@mbmlawoffice.com ksearls@mbmlawoffice.com</p>
<p>BY EMAIL JACK R GARFINKLE ESQUIRE PECO ENERGY COMPANY 2301 MARKET STREET PO BOX 8699 PHILADELPHIA PA 19101-8699 215.841.6863 jack.garfinkle@exeloncorp</p>	<p>BY EMAIL 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 Representing PECO Energy Company</p>
<p>BY EMAIL TED UHLMAN uhlmantr@yahoo.com, HOLLY CROSS & JOHN CROSS crossh12@gmail.com, SARAH KUCHAN SarahKuchan@gmail.com,</p>	<p>BY EMAIL STEPHEN COLEMAN scc5153@psu.edu, LYNN GARRITY Lynne.metzler@gmail.com, JESSICA PAGLIARA javino0524@gmail.com.</p>

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/
Nancy J. Donahue April 11, 2021
401 Yale Avenue,
Broomall, PA 19008
Nancy.Donahue@GenesisHcc.com
484/435-5930

The screenshot shows an Outlook window titled "[External] Docket # P-2021-3024328 - Message (HTML)". The ribbon includes "File", "Message", and "Help". The "Message" ribbon has sections for "Delete" (Delete, Archive), "Respond" (Reply, Reply All, Forward), "Quick Steps" (BHA Inbox, PECO Zoning P..., To Manager), "Move", "Tags", "Editing", "Speech", "Zoom", and "Insights".

The email header shows the subject "[External] Docket # P-2021-3024328" and the sender "yvonski@aol.com". The recipients are "To: DeVoe, Emily" and "Cc: marplesafe@gmail.com". The date and time are "Mon 4/12/2021 8:41 AM".

A "Yellow Category" is applied to the email. An attachment is shown: "Protest Document.docx" (8 KB).

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

Dear Your Honor ,
Please find attached in word format my Notice of Opposition to the Proposed PECO facility on the corner of Cedar Grove Road and Sproul Road in Marple Township.
Yours respectfully,
Yvonne Arch

Attachment to Yvonne Arch email (1 page):

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED PECO FACILITY. DOCKET # 2021-3024328

I, Yvonne Arch resident at 9 Honeysuckle Lane, Broomall, Pa., 19008 hereby notify all interested parties of my vehemently strong opposition to the proposed PECO facility in Marple Township, the subject of the above Docket number.

I oppose this proposal on eminently well documented health and safety grounds. Please refer to marplesafe.com for a short video presentation.

I oppose it based on there being several more appropriate nearby locations for the facility one such being the Industrial Park.

I oppose it based on the fact that our Marple Township Zoning Board unanimously rejected the case made by PECO for the location of the facility.

I oppose it along with the majority of my community. Our voices are raised and should be heard. That is the essence of a democracy. In this case not only is it about all being heard but about the rights of the individual (community) vis a vis the power and influence of corporate America and big business.

I oppose this based on the fact that it serves a commercial and utilitarian purpose in the middle of a well established and settled residential area full of families, churches and schools.

I thank you for your time in this most important matter.

Yvonne Arch.

[External] Notice of Protest. Docket # P-2021-3024328 - Message (HTML)

File Message Help Tell me what you want to do

Delete Archive Reply Reply All Forward To Manager Move Tags Editing Speech Zoom Insights

[External] Notice of Protest. Docket # P-2021-3024328

SA Scot Arch <beatleubeatleme@yahoo.com> To DeVoe, Emily Mon 4/12/2021 9:49 AM

Yellow Category

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED PECO FACILITY. DOCKET # 2021-3024328

I, Scot Arch resident at 9 Honeysuckle Lane, Broomall, Pa., 19008 hereby notify all interested parties of my vehemently strong opposition to the proposed PECO facility in Marple Township, the subject of the above Docket number.

I oppose this proposal on eminently well documented health and safety grounds. Please refer to marplesafe.com for a short video presentation.

I oppose it based on there being several more appropriate nearby locations for the facility one such being the Industrial Park.

I oppose it based on the fact that our Marple Township Zoning Board unanimously rejected the case made by PECO for the location of the facility.

I oppose it along with the majority of my community. Our voices are raised and should be heard. That is the essence of a democracy. In this case not only is it about all being heard but about the rights of the individual (community) vis a vis the power and influence of corporate America and big business.

I oppose this based on the fact that it serves a commercial and utilitarian purpose in the middle of a well established and settled residential area full of families, churches and schools.

I thank you for your time in this most important matter,

Scot Arch

[External] Docket No. P-2021-3024328 - Message (HTML)

File Message Help Tell me what you want to do

Delete Archive Reply Reply All Forward To Manager Move Tags Editing Speech Zoom Insights

[External] Docket No. P-2021-3024328

 Kurt Herwig <kurt.herwig@gmail.com>
To DeVoe, Emily

Reply Reply All Forward

Mon 4/12/2021 1:45 PM

Yellow Category

Follow up. Start by Monday, April 12, 2021. Due by Monday, April 12, 2021.
Click here to download pictures. To help protect your privacy, Outlook prevented automatic download of some pictures in this message.

MARPLE.docx 22 KB MARPLE2.docx 20 KB

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

Dear Your Honor,
Please see attached Protest (Word version) in Docket No. P-2021-3024328.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
/s/
Kurt Herwig

Freddy's Frozen Custard & Steakhburgers
2084 Sproul Rd Broomall, PA 19008
610-883-6857

Attachment to Herwig Email MARPLE.docx (4 pages):

April 12th 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 community and I were not properly notified of the plan to build this expansion plant. I only accidentally found out when reading a neighbor's comment on social media in October 2020. It appears, only a few people living within 150 feet were notified. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.

6. 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.
7. 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".
8. 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?
9. 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,
Kurt Herwig

Kurt Herwig
2084 Sproul Rd
Kurt.Herwig@gmail.com
610-883-6857

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).

April 10, 2021
Date: _____

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/ Kurt Herwig
Print Name: _____

Address: 2084 Sproul Rd Broomall, PA
19008 _____

Email: Kurt.herwig@gmail.com _____

Phone: __6108836857_____

**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: _____ Print Name: _____

Address: _____

Email: _____

Attachment to Herwig email MARPLE2.docx (3 pages):

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/

April 10, 2021

Date

Herwig Name ____Kurt

Address _____2084 Sproul Rd Broomall, PA
19008

Email
____kurt.herwig@gmail.com

Phone _____610-883-
6857

**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:

<p>Emily I. DeVoe Administrative Law Judge Public Utility Commission 400 North Street Keystone Bldg. Harrisburg, PA 17120</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

April 10, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/

Date

Name

Kurt Herwig

ATTACHMENT B

Address _____2084 Sproul Rd Broomall, PA
19008_____

Email
_____kurt.herwig@gmail.com_____

Phone_____610-883-6857_____

The screenshot shows an Outlook window with the title bar "[External] PECO PROTEST -Docket No. P-2021-3024328. - Message (HTML)". The ribbon includes "File", "Message", and "Help". The "Message" ribbon has sections for "Delete" (Delete, Archive), "Respond" (Reply, Reply All, Forward), "Quick Steps" (BHA Inbox, PECO Zoning P..., To Manager), "Move" (Move), "Tags", "Editing", "Speech", "Zoom", and "Insights".

The email content starts with the subject "[External] PECO PROTEST -Docket No. P-2021-3024328." and the sender "Rob Donofrio <robert_19@verizon.net>". The recipient is "To DeVoe, Emily". The date and time are "Mon 4/12/2021 2:47 PM".

A "Yellow Category" is applied to the email. A "Follow up" icon indicates "Start by Monday, April 12, 2021. Due by Monday, April 12, 2021." An attachment is shown: "PECO Protest _000327.pdf" (2 MB).

The main body of the email contains the following text:

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

Dear Your Honor,
Please see attached Protest (Word version) in Docket No. P-2021-3024328.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
/s/
Robert & Deborah Donofrio, 2110 Boxwood Dr. Broomall, Pa. 19008, robert_19@verizon.net, 484-802-7487

Attachment to Donofrio email (2 pages):

4/12/2021

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 community and I were not properly notified of the plan to build this expansion plant. I only accidentally found out when reading a neighbor's comment on social media in October 2020. It appears, only a few people living within 150 feet were notified. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.

6. 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.
7. 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".
8. 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?
9. 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,



Robert Donofrio & Deborah Donofrio
2110 Boxwood Dr. Broomall, Pa. 19008
robert_19@verizon.net
484-802-7487

The screenshot shows an Outlook window titled "[External] - Message (HTML)". The ribbon includes "File", "Message", and "Help". The "Message" ribbon has sections for "Delete" (Delete, Archive), "Respond" (Reply, Reply All, Forward), "Quick Steps" (BHA Inbox, PECO Zoning P..., To Manager), "Move", "Tags", "Editing", "Speech", "Zoom", and "Insights".

[External]

 Ca Anderson <cahapp282@gmail.com>
To  DeVoe, Emily

Yellow Category

Reply Reply All Forward

Mon 4/12/2021 8:03 PM

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

Dear Your Honor,
Please see attached Protest (Word version) in Docket No. P-2021-3024328.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
/s/

The screenshot shows an Outlook window titled "[External] PECO plant protest - Message (HTML)". The ribbon includes "File", "Message", and "Help". The "Message" ribbon has groups for "Delete" (Delete, Archive), "Respond" (Reply, Reply All, Forward), "Move" (Move), "Tags" (Mark Unread, Categorize, Follow Up), "Editing" (Translate), "Speech" (Read Aloud), and "Zoom" (Zoom). The email content includes a header with the sender's name and email address, a "Yellow Category" tag, a warning about external links, and a body of text regarding a protest document. An attachment named "PUS_sample_letter_blank" is listed at the bottom.

[External] PECO plant protest

 Caitlin Turner <cturner0516@gmail.com>
To: DeVoe, Emily

Mon 4/12/2021 8:41 PM

Yellow Category

 If there are problems with how this message is displayed, click here to view it in a web browser.
[Click here to download pictures.](#) To help protect your privacy, Outlook prevented automatic download of some pictures in this message.

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

Dear Your Honor,
Please see attached Protest (Word version) in Docket No. P-2021-3024328.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Caitlin Turner

 PUS_sample_letter_blank

Attachment to Turner email (4 pages):⁵

April 12, 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 community and I were not properly notified of the plan to build this expansion plant. I only accidentally found out when noticing a neighbor's sign on a van outside of his home in approximately November 2020. It appears, only a few people living within 150 feet were notified. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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

⁵ Originally, the attachment was 4 pages, but due to formatting in this Attachment, it takes 5 pages.

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.

6. 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.
7. 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".
8. 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?
9. 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,

Caitlin Turner

Caitlin Turner
1 Allison Drive
Broomall, PA 19008
cturner0516@gmail.com
267-980-0445

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,
Caitlin Turner

Date: 04/12/2021_ Print Name: Caitlin
Turner_____

Address: 1 Allison Drive, Broomall, PA 19008

Email: cturner0516@gmail.com_____

Phone: 267-980-
0445_____

**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:

<p>Emily I. DeVoe Administrative Law Judge Public Utility Commission 400 North Street Keystone Bldg. Harrisburg, PA 17120</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

Accepts eService	
------------------	--

Respectfully Submitted,
Caitlin Turner

Date: 04/12/2021

Print Name: Caitlin Turner_____

19008_____

Address: 1 Allison Drive, Broomall, PA

Email:

cturner0516@gmail.com_____

Phone: 267-980-0445_____

The screenshot shows an Outlook window titled "[External] Docket No. P-2021-3024328 - Message (HTML)". The ribbon includes "File", "Message", and "Help". The "Message" ribbon has sections for "Delete" (Delete, Archive), "Respond" (Reply, Reply All, Forward), "Quick Steps" (BHA Inbox, PECO Zoning P..., To Manager), "Move" (Move), "Tags", "Editing", "Speech", "Zoom", and "Insights".

The email header shows the subject "[External] Docket No. P-2021-3024328". The sender is Ted Uhlman <uhlmantr@yahoo.com> with a profile picture showing "TU". The recipient is DeVoe, Emily. The email was received on Mon 4/12/2021 11:55 PM. Action buttons for Reply, Reply All, Forward, and a menu icon are visible.

An attachment is shown: PFR_FSA03.pdf, 89 KB.

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

Please see the attached
PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION FROM STAFF ACTION

Attachment to Uhlman email (7 pages):

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Petition of PECO Energy Company for a Finding : P-2021-3024328
Of Necessity Pursuant to 53 P.S. § 10619 that the :
Situation of Two Buildings Associated with a Gas :
Reliability Station in Marple Township, Delaware :
County Is Reasonably Necessary for the :
Convenience and Welfare of the Public :

**TED UHLMAN'S
PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION
FROM STAFF ACTION**

- 1 WHEREAS Volume 51, Issue 13 of the Pennsylvania Bulletin¹ (Saturday, March 27, 2021) states, "Formal protests and petitions to intervene must be filed in accordance with 52 Pa. Code (relating to public utilities) on or before April 12, 2021.", and
- 2 WHEREAS 52 Pa. Code § 5.53 states that, "A protest shall be filed within the time specified in the published notice of the application. If no protest time is specified, the protest shall be filed within 60 days of publication of the notice.", and
- 3 WHEREAS 52 Pa. Code § 5.44 states that "Actions taken by staff, other than a presiding officer, under authority delegated by the Commission, will be deemed to be the final action of the Commission unless reconsideration is sought from the Commission within 20 days after service of notice of the action, unless a different time period is specified in this chapter or in the act. ", and
- 4 WHEREAS, to the best of Ted Uhlman's knowledge, the decision to set the deadline only 15 days after publication of the docket was not made by a presiding officer, and

¹ <https://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/Display/pabull?file=/secure/pabulletin/data/vol51/51-13/498.html>
Accessed on April 12, 2021 at 7:50PM

- 5 WHEREAS a large number of protests from Marple Township residents were submitted in the last few days before the deadline for this docket, and
- 6 WHEREAS (due to the coronavirus, the poor quality of PECO's community engagement, and other factors) a significant number of Marple Township residents are STILL unaware of this project and their ability to engage the PUC in order to support the Marple Zoning Hearing Board, and
- 7 WHEREAS an extension of the time period for the submission of Petitions to Intervene and/or Protest will allow additional residents to make known their opposition to PECO's petition in this matter,
- 8 Ted Uhlman respectfully seeks reconsideration from the Commission, extending the period for at least an additional 45 days, so that additional residents of Marple Township can have the opportunity to learn about this issue and their rights to protest in the case, and to file petitions and/or protests in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,



Ted Uhlman
2152 Sproul Rd.
Broomall, PA 19008
(484) 904-5377
UhlmanTR@yahoo.com

**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 : Docket No. P-2021-3024328
Buildings Associated with a Gas Reliability :
Station in Marple Township, Delaware County :
Is Reasonably Necessary for the Convenience :
and Welfare of the Public :

VERIFICATION

I, Theodore Robert (Ted) Uhlman, hereby verify that the facts contained in the foregoing pleading are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and that I am duly authorized to make this verification, and that I expect to be able to prove the same at any hearing held in this matter.



Ted Uhlman
2152 Sproul Rd
Broomall, PA 19008
uhlmantr@yahoo.com
(484) 904-5377

**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 a Gas Reliability Station in Marple Township, Delaware County Is Reasonably Necessary for the Convenience and Welfare of the Public : : Docket No. P-2021-3024328

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:

BY EMAIL

Emily I. DeVoe
Administrative Law Judge
edevoe@pa.gov

J. Adam Matlawski, Esq.
Kaitlyn T. Searls, Esq.
McNichol, Byrne & Matlawski, P.C.
1223 N. Providence Road
Media, PA 19063
jjbyrne@mbmlawoffice.com
ksearls@mbmlawoffice.com

JACK R GARFINKLE ESQUIRE
PECO ENERGY COMPANY
2301 MARKET STREET
PO BOX 8699
PHILADELPHIA PA 19101-8699
215.841.6863
jack.garfinkle@exeloncorp

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
Representing PECO Energy Company

Holly Cross
322 Candlewood Rd
Broomall, PA, 19008
crossh12@gmail.com

ATTACHMENT C

John Cross
322 Candlewood Rd
Broomall, PA,19008
jcross0209@gmail.com

Stephen Coleman
100 N Sproul RD
Broomall, PA,19008
scc5153@psu.edu

Jessica Pagliara
18 Stanfield Lane
Broomall, Pa,19008
avino0524@gmail.com

Lynne Redding
104 Allison Circle
Broomall, PA,19008
lynne.metzler@gmail.com

Sarah Kuchan
114 Martins Run
Broomall, PA,19063
sarahkuchan@gmail.com

William A Wegener
22 Stanfield Lane
Broomall, PA,19008
wwegener@gmail.com

Natalie Zemaitis
2651 Old Cedar Grove Rd.
Broomall, PA,19008
nattyz@hotmail.com

Lucinda L. Scace
728 Cedar Grove Rd.
Broomall, PA,19008
cynsca@comcast.net

William D. Lenahan
1 Stanfield Ln.
Broomall, PA,19008
wrlenahan@gmail.com

Nicole Howarth2508
Selwyn Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
nicolehowarth2@gmail.com

Jeffrey Strong
8 Grove Lane
Broomall, PA,19008
Jeffstrong5150@gmail.com

Marilia Mancini-Strong
8 Grove Lane
Broomall, PA,19008
mariliamstrong@hotmail.com

John D. Callaghan
17 Tower Rd
Broomall, PA,19008
jdcalla1956@gmail.com

Robert Jordan
2623 Springfield Road
Broomall, PA,19008
rcjordanjr@gmail.com

Andrew Redding
104 Allison Circle
Broomall, PA,19008
andrewredding@gmail.com

Matthew Barrabee
2959 Dogwood Lane
Broomall, PA,19008
mbarrabee@gmail.com

Casaundra DiDomenico
114 S. Sproul Rd.
Broomall, PA,19008
Schwartzc14@gmail.com

Ashok Kailath
2516 Parke Lane
Broomall, PA,19008
ashokkailath@yahoo.com

Carolina Favazza
2006 Kerwood Dr
Broomall, PA,19008
Carolina.favazza@villanova.edu

Michael Pagliar
18 Stanfield Ave
Broomall, Pa,19008
Mikepags11@yahoo.com

Petra Svenson
4 Hunters Run
Broomall, PA,19008
petrasvenson@msn.com

Richard Giovanetti
1 Arbordale Lane
Broomall, PA,19008
Richard.giovanetii@g-sa.com

ATTACHMENT C

Joseph Colagreco
2202 Rutgers Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
Colagreco@comcast.net

Maria Henderson
1 Madonna Ln.
Broomall, PA,19008
mdhcpa@verizon.net

Norma Blum
2164 Sproul Rd
Broomall, Pa,19008
myspang7@comcast.net

Anna Masciantonio
2739 brierwood rd
Broomall, pa,19008
anna2739@verion.net

Linda Collins
523 Warren Boulevard
Broomall, PA,19008
Lindacollins225@gmail.com

Marion H. Darby
907 Cedar Grove Road
Broomall, PA,19008
mdarby232@gmail.com

Eileen Goldhorn
196 Cranbourne Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
mrsgoldee@comcast.net

Marissa McGeehan
2102 Boxwood Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
marissa.mcgeeahan@gmail.com

David Heagerty
2102 Boxwood Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
marissa.mcgeeahan@gmail.com

Bob D'Orazio
2148 Mary Lane
Broomall, PA,19008
bobdorazio44@gmail.com

Karen E. Spector
403 Briar Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
kspector@yahoo.com

Maria S. Rich
2691 Old Cedar Grove Rd.
Broomall, PA,19008
mariarich@verizon.net

Anna Willig
640 Cedar Grove Rd
Broomall, PA,19008
anna413@comcast.net

Salvatore P. Favazza
Jr. 2006 Kerwood Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
cnsspf@yahoo.com

Amy E Blake
22 Stanfield Ave.
Broomall, PA,19008
Aeb817@gmail.com

Alyssa Plotnick
2203 Graymoor Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
dollgirl.plotnick27@gmail.com

Jill Adaman
2160 Mary Lane
Broomall, PA,19008
Jea905@comcast.net

Gregory Fat
2201 St. Paul Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
gregfat@gmail.com

Bridgett Wendel
117 Academy Lane
Broomall, PA,19008
BridgettWendel@gmail.com

Ronald G. Fender
250 6Parke Lane
Broomall, Pa,19008
captainron73@yahoo.com

Anthony Marziano
Jr. 237 Talbot Drive
Broomall, PA,19008
managerptp@aol.com

Luisa Robbins
411 Langford Rd
Broomall, PA,19008
luisa0411@hotmail.com

Respectfully Submitted,



Ted Uhlman
2152 Sproul Rd
Broomall, PA 19008
uhlmantr@yahoo.com
(484) 904-5377

P-2021-3024328 - PETITION OF PECO ENERGY COMPANY FOR A FINDING OF NECESSITY PURSUANT TO 53 P.S. § 10619 THAT THE SITUATION OF TWO BUILDINGS ASSOCIATED WITH A GAS RELIABILITY STATION IN MARPLE TOWNSHIP, DELAWARE COUNTY IS REASONABLY NECESSARY FOR THE CONVENIENCE AND WELFARE OF THE PUBLIC.

Revised 4/14/21

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
Representing PECO Energy Company

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

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
Representing Marple Township

THEODORE R UHLMAN
2152 Sproul Rd
BROOMALL PA 19008
484-904-5377
uhlmantr@yahoo.com
Accepts EService

HOLLY CROSS
JOHN R CROSS
322 Candlewood Rd
BROOMALL PA 19008
4847161353
crossh12@gmail.com
Accepts EService

JESSICA PAGLIARA
18 Stanfield ave
BROOMALL PA 19008
javino0524@gmail.com
Accepts EService

LYNNE GARRITY REDDING
ANDREW I REDDING
104 Allison Cir
BROOMALL PA 19008
6107166660
lynne.metzler@gmail.com
Accepts EService

SARAH KUCHAN
114 Martins Run
MEDIA PA 19063
6108831089
sarahkuchan@gmail.com

STEPHEN COLEMAN CUSTOMER
SERVICE REP
100 N Sproul Rd
BROOMALL PA 19008
7175864291
scc5153@psu.edu
Accepts EService

TRACEY WELSH
STEVEN WELSH
2162 Mary Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
2153601818
twelsh22@hotmail.com
Accepts EService

JEFFREY STRONG
8 grove lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
jeffstrong5150@gmail.com
Accepts EService

ROBERT JORDAN
2623 Springfield Road
BROOMALL PA 19008
6103573865
rcjordanjr@gmail.com
Accepts EService

MICHAEL PAGLIARA
18 Stanfield ave
BROOMALL PA 19008
610-662-8602
mikepags11@yahoo.com
Accepts EService

CAROLINA FAVAZZA
2006 Kerwood Dr
BROOMALL PA 19008
6105196412
Carolina.favazza@villanova.edu
Accepts EService

MARILIA MANCINI-STRONG
8 grove lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
6107319022
mariliamstrong@hotmail.com
Accepts EService

ASH KAILATH
2516 Parke Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
6104201208
ashokkailath@yahoo.com
Accepts EService

PETRA SVENSON
4 Hunters Run
BROOMALL PA 19008
petrasvenson@msn.com
Accepts EService

JOHN CALLAGHAN
17 TOWER RD
BROOMALL PA 19008
jdcalla1956@gmail.com
Accepts EService

MATTHEW BARRABEE
2959 Dogwood Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
2677676582
mbarrabee@gmail.com
Accepts EService

JOSEPH COLAGRECO
2202 Rutgers Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
6103892269
Colagreco@comcast.net
Accepts EService

RICHARD GIOVANETTI
GSA
1 Arbordale Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
16105475318
richard.giovanetti@g-sa.com
Accepts EService

MARIA HENDERSON
MARIA D HENDERSON CPA
1 Madonna Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
6103599843
mdhcpa@verizon.net
Accepts EService

NORMA BLUM
2164 Sproul rd
BROOMALL PA 19008
Myspang7@comcast.net
Accepts EService

ANNA MASCIANTONIO
2739 BRIERWOOD RD
BROOMALL PA 19008-1720
6103534172
anna2739@verizon.net
Accepts EService

KAREN E SPECTOR
403 Briar Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
6107646224
kspector@yahoo.com
Accepts EService

EILEEN GOLDHORN
196 Cranbourne Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
mrsgoldee@comcast.net
Accepts EService

LINDA A COLLINS
523 Warren Blvd
BROOMALL PA 19008
610-220-4661
lindacollins225@gmail.com
Accepts EService

MARIA RICH
2691 Old Cedar Grove Rd
BROOMALL PA 19008
Mariarich@verizon.net
Accepts EService

ANTHONY MARZIANO JR
237 Talbot Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
managerptp@aol.com
Accepts EService

ANNA WILLIG
640 Cedar Grove Road
BROOMALL PA 19008
610-213-1029
anna413@comcast.net
Accepts EService

BOB DORAZIO
2148 Mary Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
6103531910
bobdorazio44@gmail.com
Accepts EService

MARION H DARBY
907 Cedar Grove Road
BROOMALL PA 19008
mdarby232@gmail.com
Accepts EService

MARISSA MCGEEHAN
2102 Boxwood Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
484-431-7246
marissa.mcgeehan@gmail.com
Accepts EService

DAVID HEAGERTY
2102 Boxwood Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
484-467-7368
daveheagerty@hotmail.com
Accepts EService

SALVATORE P FAVAZZA JR
2006 Kerwood Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
(610) 353-3314
cnsspf@yahoo.com
Accepts EService

AMY BLAKE
--NONE--
22 STANFIELD AVE
BROOMALL PA 19008
6103534738
aeb817@gmail.com
Accepts EService

ALYSSA PLOTNICK
2203 Graymoor Dr
BROOMALL PA 19008
dollgirl.plotnick27@gmail.com
Accepts EService

RONALD G FENDER
2506 Parke Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
captainron73@yahoo.com
Accepts EService

JILL ADAMAN
2160 Mary Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
484-574-7448
jea905@comcast.net
Accepts EService

GREGORY FAT
2201 St Paul Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
6096107819
gregfat@gmail.com
Accepts EService

BRIDGETT WENDEL
117 ACADEMY LANE
BROOMALL PA 19008
610-353-1450
bridgettwendel@gmail.com
Accepts EService

LUISA ROBBINS
411 Langford Road
BROOMALL PA 19008
6105509017
luisa0411@hotmail.com
Accepts EService

WILLIAM A WEGENER
22 Stanfield Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
8622225102
WWEGENER@GMAIL.COM
Accepts EService

NICOLE HOWARTH
2508 Selwyn Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
7174182296
nicolehowarth2@gmail.com
Accepts EService

NATALIE ZEMAITIS
2651 Old Cedar Grove Rd
BROOMALL PA 19008
2156681035
nattyz@hotmail.com
Accepts EService

LUCINDA SCACE
728 Cedar Grove Rd
BROOMALL PA 19008
cynsca@comcast.net
Accepts EService

WILLIAM LENAHAAN
1 Stanfield Ave
BROOMALL PA 19008
7175852916
wdlenahan@gmail.com
Accepts EService

NILGUN OKUR ADMINISTRATOR
NILGUN
2163 MARY LANE
BROOMALL
BROOMALL PA 19008
6103562177
NILGUN.OKUR@GMAIL.COM
Accepts EService

TERESA DICAMPLI
121 1st Ave
BROOMALL PA 19008
tmdicamplici@gmail.com
Accepts EService

CHARLES THOMAS AVEDISIAN
2150 Sproul Road
BROOMALL PA 19008
6075927915
cta2@cornell.edu

HENRY J GILLIN
2149 Mary Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
hjj844@gmail.com
Accepts EService

JULIA M BAKER
OBJECTS CONSERVATION
ASSOCIATES
2150 Sproul Rd
BROOMALL PA 19008
6107458491
jbakeroca@msn.com
Accepts EService

FELICIA CARNAROLI
252 Warren Blvd
BROOMALL PA 19008
4845744947
famoroso13@rocketmail.com
Accepts EService

SABINA AMOROSO
2150 Kingswood Road
BROOMALL PA 19008
famoroso13@rocketmail.com
Accepts EService

AMANDA ATKINSON
SELECT
709 Cedar Grove Rd
BROOMALL PA 19008
617-935-9712
amanda.atkinson@gmail.com
Accepts EService

KEVIN PICKERING
915 Cedar Grove Road
BROOMALL PA 19008
6106394818
mr.kevinpickering@gmail.com
Accepts EService

STEPHEN DIMARCO PRESIDENT
FREDDYS FROZEN CUSTARD &
STEAKBURGERS
2084 Sproul Road
BROOMALL PA 19008
6105477040
sdimarco@pennoaksgolfclub.com
Accepts EService

CHRISTOS FELFELIS
KYRIAKI KARAMITOPOULOS FELFELIS
KYRA DESIGNS
2211 Glenspring Lane
BROOMALL PA 19008
6107332921
christosfelfelis@gmail.com
Accepts EService

MARY KARAMITOPOULOS
802 Saint Francis Drive
BROOMALL PA 19008
6106566069
kyriamaryk@gmail.com
Accepts EService

KOSMAS YIANTSOS
YIANTSOS RESIDENCE
2228 Windsor Circle
BROOMALL PA 19008
215-588-0630
kyiantsos@hotmail.com
Accepts EService

ROBERT W SCOTT ATTORNEY
CARL EWALD
ROBERT W SCOTT PC
205 North Monroe Street
MEDIA PA 19063
6108910108
rscott@robertwscottpc.com
carlewald@gmail.com
Accepts EService