

April 26, 2011

Jerry S. McDevitt
D 412.355.8608
F 412.355.6501
jerry.mcdevitt@klgates.com

Via Fax 724-942-5022

Peters Township Council
C/O Michael Silvestri
610 East McMurray Road
McMurray, PA 15317

Dear Council Members and Mr. Silvestri,

It is my understanding that council is considering a challenge to the Township's zoning ordinance and a proposed curative amendment which, if granted, would permit a crematoria to be built in and on the premises of the former Lazy Boy store on Route 19.

By this letter, I request to formally intervene to protect my individual rights. I live at 110 Sherborne Drive and, together with those on Sussex and Sherborne, will be directly affected by the proposed crematoria. I am an attorney and will be representing my individual interests. I have read the reports which have been submitted by the entity challenging the zoning ordinance, as well as the reports submitted by the expert retained by the Township.

I intend to be present at the next scheduled meeting of Council on May 2, 2011, and would appreciate the opportunity to address Council, present evidence, and otherwise advocate against this action.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter and please advise if my request to formally intervene is granted.

Sincerely,



Jerry S. McDevitt

JSM/kr

Dale Thomas D.M.D. 113 Old Oak Road McMurray, PA 15317

This letter is being sent to you in regards to the proposed crematorium on the Lazy Boy site on Rt.19. I understand Mrs. Belusko's proposal was struck down twice by a 5-0 vote, yet it is still scheduled for your planning commission's meeting in April/May. I would like to inform you of our objection to this proposed use of land right in our main corridor Rt. 19. I live in Peters Twp. near the proposal site with my wife and three children. My family has a financial concern in the remaining lots in Crossgates plan #14 less than ¼ miles from the proposed crematorium. Also, my family and my children and future grandchildren have a financial interest in Thomas Plaza located ¼ to ½ miles away. I could also have a dental office in Thomas Plaza in the future, and would work there for 15-20 yrs. and possibly pass that office to one of my children. So the future of my family and future generations are going to be affected by your decision.

My wife and I are dentists. With my dental background I am aware of the mercury and its use in the dental field, so I have a unique perception on the major pollutant being discussed at these meetings. Amalgams or silver fillings, are not a danger to my patients because it is chelated form. Air borne mercury toxicity has its worst effects when introduced as an airborne toxin as with all the other particulate matter which will be inhaled. The most toxic gases are odorless and colorless for the most part. Residents, people who own and work in the businesses nearby will be at the most risk, particularly kids and expectant mothers. Pregnant women are advised to immediately contact their physician if knowingly exposed to these types of hazards. Are these the types of risks we want to bring in to our area- Rt. 19 filled with businesses, shopping areas, daycares, churches, and homes is the major corridor in Peters Twp.

Which brings me to another issue with the board; Twelve years ago, Thomas Plaza had to go before for the planning commission because of complaints from 4-5 residents about how the light in that development affected their neighborhood. LIGHTS- the result was that the development, 4 two story retail offices, and commercial buildings had 36 conditions placed on them. Such as: No restaurants, no food prep, no chain link fences, no automotive of any kind, no retail on the second floor, no mechanic shops, etc..... Many of these restrictions negatively impacted our ability to develop the land. Now, 12 years later the board is being asked to accept this crematorium. It should have never gotten this far. Common sense dictates these types of businesses be located in the outer regions of a community.

Peters Township has established itself as a unique community with good infrastructure and a good blend between owning a business and raising a family. The school system is a draw as are the parks and recreational areas. This proposal would have a negative impact on the community, lowering property values, making these areas a less desirable place to move to or establish a new business in.

For all these reasons, my family and I strongly object to the crematory proposal. We will attend the appropriate meetings in the future. Thank you for your time and consideration to this matter.

Dale Thomas D.M.D.

Silvestri, Michael A.

From: CF [cferris@me.com]
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2011 9:30 AM
To: Atkison, Robert L.; Merrell, Monica R.; Arcuri, Frank; Ball, David M.; Berquist, James F.; Lewis, Robert J.; Stiegel, Gary J.; Silvestri, Michael A.; Zuk, Edward J.
Subject: Crematory - an analogy

Dear Peters Township officials,

I spoke at the March 21st public hearing related to the crematory application and continue to be very concerned over the pollutants, particularly mercury and dioxin/furans, this crematory (and potentially more crematories to follow) will emit into the township.

My continued research as it relates to mercury only increases these fears. The following scenario, based on data provided by Audia Group, illustrates the significant risk posed by mercury emissions from a crematory.

- As a body is cremated, mercury from amalgam fillings is released in a spike about 40 minutes into the 2 hour process.
- Audia Group estimates one cremation releases 15,000 milligrams (mg) of mercury.
- They also ran a model at 1,500 mg per cremation, which is considered a low figure by Congress.
- Let's assume that a cremated body releases 1,500mg - 15,000mg of mercury vapor.
- One compact fluorescent bulb (CFL) has approximately 2mg of mercury.
- One cremation is equivalent to smashing 750 - 7,500 CFLs all at one time (to represent the spike of mercury release during a cremation).
- Audia Group's analysis and model estimates 12 cremations in 24 hours for 365 days a year.
- Based on their model, the crematory would release the same amount of mercury as the destruction of 9,000 - 90,000 CFLs per day or 3,285,000 - 32,850,000 CFLs in one year.
- For a relatively conservative and realistic estimate, if 4 cremations releasing 2,900mg of mercury vapor each are performed a day for 300 days per year, this scenario equates to smashing 1,450 CFLs at one time per cremation with a total of 5,800 CFLs in one day or 1,740,000 CFLs in one year.

As I am sure you are aware, the Federal Government regulates how to address and properly dispose of damaged CFLs. I continue to struggle with how Peters Township will potentially allow vaporized mercury from a crematory when schools and apartment buildings have been evacuated when ONE CLF with 2mg of mercury breaks. I also found it extremely interesting that Peters Township refused to accept my CLF light bulbs during Saturday's recycle day. The response I received was, "We have no idea how to dispose of them properly."

Please view this video of Congressional testimony on the dangers of CFL light bulbs. It is a little over 5 minutes, however the part most applicable to the crematory is 1:10 - 4:35 of the video.

<http://www.lewrockwell.com/blog/lewrw/archives/75548.html>

I also have a link to a video from the University of Calgary that provides scientific evidence of the effect of low exposure to mercury on live brain neurons. (specifically about 2 - 2.5 minutes into the video and 3:47 to the end)

<http://www.youtube.com:80/watch?v=XU8nSn5Ezd8>

I hope PT has consulted with specialized legal counsel who have experience in dealing with polluting industry, nuisance, and land use in order to effectively and legally protect its residents. Anything short of this exposes PT residents to unnecessary health risks. From a residents' perspective, it is difficult to know which action items (Kulpmont, PA Code, PA constitution, nuisance laws, land use laws, etc.) are being strongly considered by Council to properly protect PT residents.

Sincerely,
Cheryl Ferris, PhD

Silvestri, Michael A.

From: Will Martin [wmartin_961@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, May 01, 2011 5:57 PM
To: Atkison, Robert L.; Merrell, Monica R.; Arcuri, Frank; Ball, David M.; Berquist, James F.; Lewis, Robert J.; Stiegel, Gary J.; Silvestri, Michael A.; Zuk, Edward J.
Subject: Crematory Issue

We are Peters Township residents and live at 249 Molly Drive. We will be unable to attend the council meeting on May 2, so we are writing to express our strong opposition to the pending request to construct a crematorium on a site very near our home. While we appreciate the need for the Township to encourage responsible commercial activities, there must be some reasonable boundaries. Permitting a crematorium with its attendant carcinogenic emissions in such close proximity to a heavily residential area is not in anyone's best interest. We hope that our Township officials will listen to the voters and do the right thing in respect to the pending zoning request.

Regards,

Willard and Karen Martin

Silvestri, Michael A.

From: Fedor Salva [fedorsal@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 01, 2011 5:11 PM
To: Silvestri, Michael A.; Zuk, Edward J.; Atkison, Robert L.
Subject: Crematory on Rt. 19

I have been a resident of Peters Township at 143 Pleasantview Drive since 1983. I have always felt that the elected and appointed officials of the township have looked after both my interests and the interests of the township in a fair and reasonable manner. In that spirit, I encourage you NOT to allow a crematory at the old Lazy Boy location on Rt. 19. I would point out that among the many nearby residents who oppose this is a funeral home operator who probably understands better than most of us the problems such a facility would cause. I do not oppose a funeral home in this location, and wonder why the crematory could not be located in a more remote part of the township where its presence would not be near homes and restaurants. Surely the tax revenue from a crematory cannot be that important that it would negate what commonsense seems to indicate.

**Fedor R. Salva
143 Pleasantview Dr.
McMurray**

Silvestri, Michael A.

From: susans1587@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, May 01, 2011 10:40 AM
To: Ball, David M.; Lewis, Robert J.; Stiegel, Gary J.; Silvestri, Michael A.; Zuk, Edward J.
Subject: crematorium

Hello

As residents of Crossgates, we do NOT want a crematorium in our neighborhood! We are the parents of a small child and do not want him exposed to these health risks!

Susan and George Andrewson
100 Bremen Lane
McMurray, Pa

Silvestri, Michael A.

From: Dave Miller [dmiller@associnrehab.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 01, 2011 8:04 AM
To: Arcuri, Frank; Ball, David M.; Berquist, James F.; Atkison, Robert L.; Merrell, Monica R.; Lewis, Robert J.; Stiegel, Gary J.; Silvestri, Michael A.; Zuk, Edward J.
Subject: Proposed Crematory

Good morning, I had previously signed the petitions AGAINST the proposed crematory for Rte 19 @ Old Lazy Boy Building. I just wanted to voice my opinion again the as a resident of PT and Crossgates we are AGAINST the proposed Crematory.

David J. Miller
President/CEO
Associates In Rehabilitation Management, Inc.
2741 Noblestown Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15205
(888) 351-5790 Ext 11
cell (412) 216-1616
fax (412)922-9056
www.associnrehab.com

CONFIDENTIAL

This e-mail and any attachments contained within are confidential and may contain personal and private information. The information is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you have received the e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and be advised that any review, disclosure, reproduction or distribution of the information is strictly prohibited. The views expressed in the e-mail do not necessarily represent the views of Associates In Rehabilitation.

Silvestri, Michael A.

From: Lynn Williams [mk.lynn@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 5:27 PM
To: Silvestri, Michael A.
Subject: crematorium

144 Driftwood Dr.
McMurray, PA 15317
April 29th, 2011

Dear Council Members and Town Officials,

I or my husband has attended the meetings with regards to the crematorium, and we have tried to keep up with any information regarding this issue. I am very disturbed that more research has not been done by the Peter's town solicitor and town officials as to the legality of the request for a crematorium. It seems that all the work is being done by the people of the community and not the people who have been voted into office and those who are paid by the town people. Mr. Zuk has been defending the crematorium by saying that the township has to let all businesses into the township. But, he has never mentioned what the state code is for crematoriums. It seems that he is representing and supporting Ms. Belusko instead of his own townspeople. He did not bother to hand out the information that was collected for the council by the townspeople to review before the last meeting before this continuation that is to occur on May 2nd. What about the people of our community? Who is representing us and looking out for our welfare and wishes?!

It is difficult for me to understand why all of you continue to let the issue of a crematorium be reintroduced. This is the third site Ms. Belusko has tried to get our ordinances changed to suit her needs. The community has been very clear on how we feel about the negative issues that a crematorium will bring into the township. No matter how Ms. Belusko and her support system stretch the truth to make everything look safe and desirable, there are far more negative issues at hand. Anyone can make an issue sound favorable. Look at the real facts. A big concern of ours is that if some law is not put into effect for our township to prevent crematoriums from being easily built near schools, day cares, and residences, our township will become a crematorium haven. Other funeral directors are anxiously watching what we do here. They, too, would love to build a crematorium.

Please, listen to the people. Put some law into effect that will prevent the issue of a crematorium being built near schools, day cares, and residences. It is neither fair nor desirable that we, the townspeople, have to go through the ordeal of making our wishes known again and again every time someone, at the moment, Ms Belusko, wants to change an ordinance to fit their needs.

I will not go into detail as to all the reasons we object to a crematorium. Enough witnesses have done that. Please, listen to us. Care about our health and welfare and our desires. We have lived in Peters for over thirty years. We have found it to be a wonderful township to raise a family in and have chosen to retire here. Allowing crematoriums near homes will change the class of Peter Township drastically. Please do not let us down and make us regret our decision.

Sincerely,

Lynn D. Williams