

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
1	Homeowner on Bossler Road has an open loop geothermal heating/cooling system with two wells (extraction and discharge wells) and has concerns that pumping will affect the wells.		1 Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson submitted a groundwater model to evaluate the hydrologic balance within the quarry and adjacent areas (Module 8: Hydrology and the 30 Acre Expansion Hydrogeologic Study). The groundwater model gives a probable impacted ZOI Pierson will be required to restore or replace affected water supply wells, if needed. The ZOI is the evaluated extent of effect the quarry will have on groundwater during mining operations. A quarry's ZOI is developed using historic monitoring and pumping data, pumping tests, computer software for hydrologic assessment, geophysical surveys and any other relevant information.</p> <p>Based on the modeling provided, DEP does not anticipate that geothermal wells will be affected by quarry activity. The geothermal wells are located in the edge of the ZOI. The effect of the ZOI lessens the farther from the quarry pit. In the event the wells are affected by mining activity, the quarry would be responsible for replacing the geothermal wells. The Commonwealth's statutes and regulations governing noncoal (industrial minerals) mining require protection of local surface and groundwater resources for approval of a surface mining permit. A geothermal well will have the same protection as a homeowner's water supply well.</p>
2	Aesthetic impacts of quarry has on community. Many other quarries are at least fenced and have a buffer of trees around the property to give a safer and more sightly appearance to the community		1 Zoning	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is <i>"The DEP does not have specific regulations regarding fencing or screening. West Donegal Township does have specific requirements in their zoning, subdivision and land development ordinances. The project must get approval from West Donegal Township through their Land Development process. Plans were submitted in April 2025 are currently under review by the Township. Those plans show required screening and fencing. The existing quarry has reportedly been in existence since the 1920's."</i></p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response.</p>
3	Concerns about noise from blasting		2 Blasting	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is <i>"There are no noise ordinances. There are no specific times for blasting in ordinances. The quarry will follow the current regulations with regards to blasting. The quarry will install screening trees and shrubs along a berm as required by the zoning ordinances. The expansion meets all required setbacks of the zoning ordinances. The expansion area is located farther from the majority of the residential uses. There are no specific MSHA processes for blasting at this site. The quarry could be conducting blasting activities Monday through Friday between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 4:00 P.M."</i></p> <p>DEP concurs with the response from Pierson and further adds – The "sound" from blasting is not always audible, so DEP does not regulate "noise" from blasting per se. Rather, DEP regulates air overpressure generated by blasting. Air overpressure is a passing wave of sound energy which is sometimes experienced inside a structure in much the same way as the rumbling from thunder. The allowable limit for air overpressure in PA is 133 dB(L) (that is, linear decibels). This limit was established following studies by the U.S. Bureau of Mines regarding the effects of blasting on structures, and is considered protective of residential structures. Homeowners near a quarry may feel the effects of blasting both as ground vibration and air overpressure, both of which make structures shake slightly and are difficult to discern from one another. These occasional brief events cannot be entirely eliminated, but they are regulated such that any shaking that does occur may not cause damage. The regulatory limits are very conservative, and although they may be perceived as startling or intense, are designed to prevent even the extension of existing cracks in materials such as gypsum wallboard. Vibrations From Blasting, David E. Siskind, ISEE, 2018 and RI 8485, Structural Response and Damage Produced by Airblast from Surface Mine Blasting, Bureau of Mines Report, U.S. Dept. of Interior, 1980. Preblast surveys are not mandatory, they are an option that can be performed. Requiring seismic monitoring actual data is obtained and can be determined if damage could have been caused by blasting.</p>
4	Concerns about dust pollution	2, 4, 5, 8,	Air Quality	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is <i>"The proposed expansion is not requesting any new air quality permits. Module 17 addresses how the expansion meets the regulations developed to protect the environment. The proposed expansion will use the existing processing equipment already permitted and operating."</i></p> <p>DEP concurs with response from Pierson. DEP adds that the Module 17: Air Quality includes the use of dedicated water spray truck for quarry site and adjacent public road, spray bar is available to wet down loaded trucks, tarping station for trucks leaving the site.</p>
5	Concern about dry wells	2, 7, 8	Hydrologic balance	<p>During the review process, DEP considered the effects the permit may have on the hydrologic balance and evaluated the probable hydrologic consequences of issuing this permit as required by 25 Pa. Code §§ 77.403 Description of hydrology and geology; 77.405 Groundwater information; 77.457 Protection of hydrologic balance; 77.521 General Requirements and Section 7 Permitting of the Noncoal Act. Pierson submitted a groundwater model to evaluate the hydrologic balance within the quarry and adjacent areas. The groundwater model gives a probable impacted ZOI Pierson will be required to restore or replace affected water supply wells. In addition to its bond amount, Pierson has posted \$88,000 for well replacement. The quarry has been in operation since the early 1920s and DEP's records for this quarry date back to before 1940. During this time Pierson has only had to replace 2 wells and did so in a timely manner. These wells were drilled deeper than the final pit floor elevation. The Rheems Quarry has currently mined to the final pit floor elevation of 126 ft mean sea level (MSL). The quarry is not requesting to mine deeper in the current pit or expansion area to the current pit. Responses submitted by property owners adjacent to the quarry show some existing water supply wells are already deeper than the quarry final pit floor elevation.</p> <p>If a property owner inside or outside the ZOI believes quarry activity has affected their water supply by contamination, interruption or diminution by quarry pumping or activity can file a complaint with the PDMO at 570-621-3118. Technical staff from DEP will investigate the water supply complaint to evaluate if quarry pumping or activities have affected the water supply. The property owner is given an investigation report. If the quarry is found responsible, Pierson will be directed to restore or replace the water supply in adequate quantity and quality for the purposed served by the supply (25 Pa. Code § 77.533).</p>

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
6	Concerns about damage to homes by blasting	2, 4, 5, 8,	Blasting	<p>Please see the Blasting section of the review memo for a description of the regulatory requirements.</p> <p>The seismograph reports in the site's blasting records indicate the air blast and ground vibration levels generated by the blasting. If the air blast levels from the blasting exceed 133 dB(L) at a building, or if ground vibration exceeds the USBM Z-Curve limits, it is a violation of the regulations, and an enforcement action will be taken. Although a homeowner may feel or hear their house respond to blasting vibrations it is highly unlikely that the house will be damaged by vibrations below DEP's regulatory limits.</p> <p>Many studies have been performed in the past, all these studies support that DEP's regulations are based on safe blasting limits intended to ensure that homes are not damaged by controlled blasting methods. The supporting literature used within the Commonwealth are in part: 1. "Vibrations From Blasting", DESA Dr-31, Special edit. for PA DEP, August 5, 1997, David E. Siskind, p.20. 2.RI 8507, Structural Response and Damage Produced by Ground Vibration From Surface Mine Blasting, Bureau of Mines Report, U. S. Dept. of Interior, 1980. 3. RI 8485, Structural Response and Damage Produced by Airblast from Surface Mine Blasting, Bureau of Mines Report, U.S. Dept. of Interior, 1980.</p> <p>DEP does not require pre-blast surveys if seismic monitoring is conducted. Seismic monitoring allows DEP to review the effects of each blast. With this information we can determine if the blast contained enough energy to have damaged a structure.</p> <p>PDMO reviewed Rheems Quarry blasting compliance history and complaints for the past ten years. During this time period there were thirteen complaints. DEP had investigated each of these complaints and did not find that the quarry's blasting was responsible for any alleged damage. Pierson Rheems Quarry was not cited for any violations related to blasting activities.</p>
7	Excessive truck traffic from quarry		2 Truck Traffic	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "The proposed project does not increase truck or any other traffic. The existing quarry access is onto S.R. 4018 W. Harrisburg Ave. No traffic counts or studies are required with the municipality or PennDOT since there are no proposed changes to traffic."</p> <p>DEP concurs with the response from Pierson.</p>
8	Damage to surrounding road infrastructure		2 Truck Traffic	<p>Please see response to comment 7 (truck traffic). Since there is no increase in traffic there is no anticipated damage to the surrounding road infrastructure.</p>
9	Sinkholes caused by mining	2, 4,	Hydrologic balance	<p>The quarry has been in operations since the early 1920s and DEP's records for this quarry date back to before 1940. During this time there have been only 2 sinkhole complaints. Pierson was found responsible for one sinkhole complaint in January 2023 and it was repaired by the quarry in June 2023 and has not reopened. The second sinkhole complaint in July 2023 was repaired by the homeowner a year before the sinkhole complaint was filed.</p> <p>The expansion area is on the opposite side of the quarry pit from the town of Rheems. The quarry is located in the Epler Formation which is light-gray limestone interbedded with gray dolomite. Limestone and dolomite create a topography call karst topography. Karst topography is formed by the dissolution of carbonate rock such as limestone and dolomite. A Karst Supplement was submitted as part of the permit revision application. The Karst Supplement is intended to supply additional information on karst features existing in the general permit area and an assessment specific to potential karst impacts from the proposed mining activities in order to allow DEP to evaluate the hydrologic impacts. DEP has determined through a review of the permit application that the Rheems Quarry expansion is not expected to cause additional disruption of the hydrologic balance in Rheems. While karst features are present in the existing Rheems quarry, no large conduits that transport large volumes of water and sediment are present.</p> <p>Please see the Groundwater section of the review memo for more information.</p>
10	Contamination to crop from mining activity	2, 8,	General Permitting	<p>The Rheems Quarry mines Dolomitic Limestone (Epler Formation). The Epler Formation does not contain any known contaminants.</p>
11	Article 1 of Pennsylvania Constitution, enables Pennsylvania citizens to clean air and pure water. "As trustee of these resources, the Commonwealth shall conserve and maintain them for the benefit of all the people."		5 Article 1, Section 27	<p>Please see the Article I Section 27, Groundwater, and Air Quality sections of the review memo for a detailed response of how DEP met its Article I Section 27 trustee responsibilities.</p>
12	Groundwater Contamination caused by mining activities	5, 8,	Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson submitted a groundwater model to evaluate the hydrologic balance within the quarry and adjacent areas. The groundwater model gives a probable impacted ZOI of the quarry. In order for an application to be approved, noncoal mining regulation 77.126(a)(3) requires that an "Applicant has demonstrated that there is no presumptive evidence of potential pollution to waters of this Commonwealth." DEP has reviewed the application and determined that the applicant has demonstrated that contamination from the quarry is unlikely. The applicant conducted background sampling to demonstrate the current status of groundwater around the acreage to be added to the permit boundary. Sampling at the NPDES outflow did not show any parameters of concern. The applicant discharges stormwater and groundwater at the NPDES discharge point.</p> <p>If a property owner inside or outside the ZOI believes quarry activity has affected their water supply by contamination, interruption or diminution by quarry pumping or activity the property owner can file a complaint with the PDMO at 570-621-3118. Technical staff from DEP will investigate the water supply complaint to evaluate if quarry pumping or activities have affected the water supply. The property owner is given an investigation report. If the quarry is found responsible, Pierson will be directed to restore or replace the water supply in adequate quantity and quality for the purposed served by the supply (25 Pa Code § 77.533).</p>
13	Concerns about damage to homes by quarry operations		6 General permitting	<p>See response to comment 6 regarding blasting, comment 9 on sinkholes, and the review memo sections on Blasting and Article I Section 27.</p>

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
14	Groundwater contamination of wells with forever chemicals (PFAS, PFOA, e.g.) migrate to private water supplies as the quarry dewaterers 2-3 million gallons per day.		7 Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "PFAS are not pollutants generated by the quarry. There is no evidence of groundwater or well contamination with PFAS. The test results submitted by the commentors show no PFAS in the well tested. PFAS in surface water is ubiquitous throughout Pennsylvania. The commentators may be referring to PFAS in surface waters and speculating about the western unnamed tributary. There are no wells between the proposed expansion and that surface water, which is encased in PVC pipe. The surface water to the west is enclosed in a 10" PVC pipe which carries waters from the western surface water beyond the proposed project area. The existing quarry and the proposed expansion would not discharge into this surface water. The data supplied by the commentors indicates the quarry is not increasing or pulling additional PFAS across sub-watershed boundaries. There are no residential wells located between surface waters and the proposed expansion area. There is no reason to expect that any existing PFAS levels in this surface water would increase or migrate."</p> <p>DEP concurs with response. PDMO also consulted with the Southcentral Regional Office's ECB Program to investigate if there are any known releases of PFAS contamination within the quarry's ZOI and surrounding areas. No known releases of PFAS contamination were found.</p>
15	Impacts of mining activities to Catherine Hershey School playground (visible from quarry)		8 General Permitting	<p>Please see response to comment 3 above regarding noise associated with blasting and 6 above regarding blasting.</p> <p>Pierson's response to this comment is "We are not aware of concerns from the Catherine Hershey Schools. The location was the site of Rheems Elementary School which operated from 1955 through 2024 and is currently not operating as a school. The proposed expansion is 2200 feet away from the Catherine Hershey School property. The expansion is farther away from the Catherine Hershey School property than the existing quarry operation.</p> <p>DEP concurs with the response from Pierson and further adds that the quarry has been blasting and conducting seismic monitoring at locations much closer than the closed school. Inspections performed by DEP's blasting & explosives inspectors indicate that the blasting is being performed in a safe manner so as to ensure the safety of the surrounding public and that any adverse effects from the blasting has been beneath the structural damage threshold. See response to comment 6 regarding damage to homes and other structures from blasting activities at quarry. In addition, the quarry has not had any fly rock violations.</p>
16	Impacts of blasting on Donegal Presbyterian Church (3 miles from quarry)		8 Blasting	<p>Seismic monitoring is required at the nearest non-owned structure, as required by Chapter 77 & 211. The nearest structures to the mining/blasting activity are much closer than the Donegal Presbyterian Church property, and data indicates that seismic energy dissipates with distance. If blasting energy is in compliance at the nearest structure, it is not conceivable to cause damage at structures at much greater distances.</p>
17	Impacts on property values from quarry operations	6,8	Property Value	<p><i>Pierson's response to this comment is "See Comment 2 regarding municipal zoning, fencing and screening. The expansion is located in West Donegal Township's Mineral Extraction Zone and is an allowable use by right. It does not adjoin any residential uses. It is adjacent to industrial, railroad, warehouse and agricultural uses. We have no references regarding any reduction in surrounding property values. The Phoenix Center for Advanced Legal & Economic Public Policy Studies report, Quarry Operations and Property Values: Revisiting Old and Investigating New Empirical Evidence, was released on March 5, 2018. The Phoenix Center conducted an analysis of the price effects of quarries, estimating the effect of quarries on home prices with data from four locations across the United States. A key NIMBY (Not in My Backyard) complaint in the siting and expansion of quarries is the effect of the operations on nearby home values. Despite NIMBY opposition, they found no compelling evidence that either the anticipation of, or the ongoing operation of, rock quarries negatively impact home prices. Pennsylvania Aggregate and Concrete Association correspondence to Lancaster County Planning Commission, June 29, 2018. Quarry Operations and Property Values: Revisiting Old and Investigating New Empirical Evidence, March 2018. Found June 2018 at http://www.phoenix-center.org/pcpp/PCPP53Final.pdf."</i></p> <p>DEP concurs with this response. Furthermore as discussed in the review memo under the section, Land Use Information, The Lancaster County Planning Commission and West Donegal Township state that the quarry is an "essential industry" and the expansion area is in the "best interest of the township's public health, safety and general welfare."</p>
18	What location specific science is Pennsylvania using in determining a 1000' boundary is sufficient when all evidence points to a much wider area of impact when dewatering in Karst?		3 General Permitting	<p>The 1000 foot boundary is a requirement for mapping in 25 Pa. Code § 77.454, Maps and plans. The regulation describes minimum standards for mapping purposes. 25 Pa. Code § 77.457, Protection of hydrologic balance, is the regulation used to determine impacts to the hydrologic balance from a mining permit within the proposed permit and adjacent area. The hydrologic impact are not subject to 1000 foot boundary. The Pierson Rheems LLC Rheems Quarry 30 Acre Expansion Hydrogeologic Study (April 26, 2023) and the Groundwater Flow Model for Pierson Rheems Quarry, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (March 17, 2023) study areas extend beyond 1000 feet and explain the probable impacts to the hydrologic balance. DEP is not limited to the minimum 1,000 foot boundary requirement. Further, upon reviewing the studies submitted by Pierson DEP has determined that it took into account the entire ZOI.</p>
19	What legal, written policy does Pennsylvania have in protecting property owners from damage from permitted quarrying in Karst?		3 General Permitting	<p>The Chapter 77: Noncoal Mining Regulations do not reference karst geology. Evaluation of adverse impacts to the prevailing hydrologic balance are used for mining permits in Karst geology. The Application Supplement - Karst (5600-PM-BMP0456 Rev. 9/2021) contains information on mining in carbonate rock. A sinkhole mitigation plan was submitted for the quarry in this application.</p>
20	Surrounding property owners request additional investigation outside the 1000' boundary (esp. to the west and south) to determine impacts to residential and agricultural properties.		3 General Permitting	<p>See response to comment 1 on well replacement and comment 18 concerning impacts to properties. DEP further adds properties within the ZOI were sent a water supply survey. This survey was sent to both residential and agricultural properties. 25 Pa. Code § 77.533, Water rights and replacement, states that "The operator of a noncoal mine which affects by surface mining activities a public or private water supply by contamination, interruption or diminution shall restore or replace the affected water supply with an alternate source of water, adequate in quantity and quality for the purpose served by the supply. For the purpose of this section, the term 'water supply' includes an existing source of water or facility or system for the supply of water for human consumption, for agricultural, industrial or other uses."</p>
21	Spreadsheet indicating what homes were contacted was not submitted with application.		3 General Permitting	<p>The homeowner spreadsheet within the ZOI was submitted by Akens Engineering as part of the response to technical deficiency letter dated April 12, 2024. The applicant submitted a response dated June 6, 2024 to the deficiency letter which included the homeowner spreadsheet.</p>
22	What additional homeowners has Aken yet to contact and on what basis are these homeowners being contacted? Are there additional or difference areas of impact that are not being shared in the permit submission?		3 General Permitting/Hydrologic Balance	<p><i>Pierson's response to this comment is "We have contacted all three homeowners located south of the quarry on Bossler Road. They were done after the model was completed since they were in an area outside the 1000 perimeter guideline. In addition, we also contacted and tested 1610 Landis Rd, Mount Joy, PA 17552 at the request of the homeowner at the hearing. This information is included in the Module 8."</i></p> <p>DEP concurs with response. DEP requested the information from Pierson in the deficiency letter dated April 12, 2024. Pierson submitted a response dated June 6, 2024 to the deficiency letter which included the homeowner spreadsheet.</p>

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
23	When will this ongoing information be added to the permit application?		3 General Permitting/Hydrologic Balance	When Pierson submits a response to a technical deficiency letter or other follow up questions from DEP, those responses are considered part of the pending permit application under review.
24	Why did Pottsville Mining District mark this permit as complete when there is so much outstanding information and work that hasn't been done yet?		3 General Permitting	A completeness review is done to verify all appropriate permit modules are submitted with the original submission. The application was administratively complete with all appropriate permit modules submitted. Administratively complete does not mean the application was substantively complete. The PDMO completed a substantive review to evaluate the correctness of the submitted permit modules. After the PDMO completes the substantive review, PDMO sent a deficiency letter, follow up emails, and public comments to Pierson. Pierson addressed all deficiencies and comments prior to issuance of the permit.
25	Why was an incomplete permit package made available for public review?		3 General Permitting	See comment 24 on completeness reviews. As per regulations: 25 Pa. Code § 77.122, Opportunity for submission of written comments or objections on the permit application, states "(a) Written comments or objections on the permit application or application for permit revision may be submitted to the Department within 30 days after the last publication of the newspaper advertisement placed by the applicant under § 77.121(a) (relating to public notices of filing of permit applications) by a person having an interest that is, or may be, adversely affected. (b) The Department will immediately transmit the comments or objections received under this section to the applicant." 25 Pa. Code § 77.123, Public hearing - informal conferences, states "3) The public hearing or informal conference shall be conducted by a representative of the Department who may accept oral or written statements another relevant information from a party to the public hearing or informal conference."
26	Request that the public notification process is redone, this time with the complete permit package made available for public review at the West Donegal Township Building.		3 General Permitting	See response to Comment 24 on completeness review and Comment 25 on public comment process.
27	How many Notices of Violation has DEP issued to R.E. Pierson permitted operations within the State of Pennsylvania?		3 Compliance	As of 1/14/26, R.E. Pierson is in compliance with all mining regulations and all permits within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
28	Is DEP familiar with Pierson(sp) violation history outside of mining violations?		3 Compliance	Violations outside of mining and safety are not reviewed as part of the mining permit application. 25 Pa. Code § 77.126(6) requires DEP to evaluate if the applicant has shown a lack of ability or intent to comply with the noncoal mining act or the Surface Mining Conservation and Reclamation Act (52 P.S. § 1396.1—1396.19b). Pierson's compliance history does not show an inability to comply with the act or regulations. Violations given to Pierson by other DEP programs would result in the District Mining Office not being able to dispose of the permit application until the violations were resolved. Pierson's compliance history outside of mining shows one violation from the Air Quality program for fugitive dust in 2017. This violation has been resolved.
29	Is DEP familiar with Pierson's violation history within the State of NJ?		3 Compliance	Section 8 of the Noncoal Surface Mining Conservation and Reclamation Act, Permit approval or denial, 52 P.S. § 3308 and 25 Pa Code § 77.126 states that other grounds for refusal to issue, renew or amend a permit include if the applicant failed or continues to fail to comply with provisions of this act or the surface mining act as indicated by past or continuing violations. Per response to comment 27, Pierson is compliant.
30	Why is it DEP's position that a company with such documented and frequent disregard for laws and permitting requirements should be given free reign to impact resident's health and property?		3 Compliance	Please see response to comment 29 regarding compliance.
31	Is it DEP's position that permits are granted even to permittees that have repeatedly violated the law?		3 Compliance	Please see response to comment 29 regarding compliance.
32	How many times and what kind of violations must Pierson commit before they are no longer granted permits by PADEP?		3 Compliance	Please see response to comment 29 regarding compliance.
33	After a cursory review of the permit submission, it seems as though it is primarily a regurgitation of information from previous permit submissions, primarily focused on properties to the north and east when the expansion focus was on the northern portion of the quarry.		3 General Permitting	The application addresses all areas within the permit boundary and adjacent properties. The permit revision modules will replace existing permit modules. The applicant and their consultant must "regurgitate" existing information because the old modules will be replaced by the new updated permit modules. 25 Pa. Code § 77.141(f) states "Except for an insignificant boundary correction, the addition of acreage for mineral extraction is subject to review through the same procedure as an application for a new permit but will be a revision to an existing permit, with consideration to the following: (1) Effect on the hydrologic balance, (2) Improvement to or logical extension of the existing overall operations and reclamation plan, (3) Feasibility of issuing a new individual permit for the additional area." The applicant submitted the application with old and new information to comply with DEP's review as if it was a new permit application.
34	It appears very little work was done by the consultant to determine impacts to the west and south of the quarry expansion area.		3 General Permitting/Hydrologic Balance	The Module 8: Hydrology contains the Pierson Rheems LLC Rheems Quarry 30 Acre Expansion Hydrogeologic Study (April 26,2023) and the Groundwater Flow Model for Pierson Rheems Quarry, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (March 17, 2023) study areas which contain areas to the west and south. DEP has determined the information presented satisfactorily explains the expected hydrologic consequences of the proposed mining activity.

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
35	The difference in properties to the north are within sandstone formation, so a very different hydrologic relationship to the quarry activities. There are only a handful of private water supplies in that area. Most properties to the north and east are on public water. ALL of the properties to the west and south are private residential and agricultural water supplies. The permit erroneously states there is only agriculture to the west and south.	3	Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "The report was discussing general site characteristics. Module 8 lists all known wells and uses which are also shown on the Environmental Resource 6.2 Map within the zone of influence or 1000 feet of the proposed expansion."</p> <p>DEP reviewed all of the modules and concurs with Pierson's response.</p>
36	Portions of the Sweigart property were previously permitted as the next phase of quarry expansion. Why didn't that happen?	3	misc.	Pierson's response to this comment is "The volume of overburden located on the Sweigart parcel is the foremost rationale for moving west."
37	Monitoring point BM-7 shows no discharge for the six month period the consultant decided to represent. The homeowner group sampled water and it was flowing. Possible faulty equipment or data manipulation to support the false assertion made elsewhere by the consultant that the stream is piped throughout the entire expansion area when it is not.	3	Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "BM-7 is located within the drainage area however it does not receive quarry discharge and is not proposed to receive quarry discharge. We have photographs of upstream and downstream locations showing the dry conditions. Also, it is piped as shown on the mapping and as stated in our reports. We are not aware of a rationale to falsify data or what evidence they have to suggest this."</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. DEP further adds that BM-7 is the outlet of a piped stream that runs under an adjacent farm field. No drainage from the quarry can reach this stream since the stream is enclosed within a pipe. Water in this stream would flow from a pond located on Property ID no. 160-71360-0-000.</p>
38	No background water samples were taken outside the 1000' boundary despite multiple wells being shown within the zone of influence. Any well shown within the 10' zone of influence should be sampled and have background conditions established.	3	Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "Pierson conducted background testing as required and included it as part of the Module 8. [Pierson] also offered at the hearing testing to anyone who wants testing completed. At the public hearing Pierson's consultant offer testing to concerned neighbors. No request were received at the public hearing. Pierson's consultant only had one request for additional testing from Paul Rouse who was at 1610 Landis Road. The testing was completed and included it in the Module 8"</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. DEP further adds that the quarry ZOI submitted by Pierson shows the area which the quarry can exert influence on the groundwater. The purpose of groundwater sampling around the quarry is to give background sampling to determine the chemical characteristics of groundwater in the area (25 Pa. Code § 77.405). This data is used to determine if mining activities have affected water supplies. The monitoring well closest to the quarry will detect a quarry's effect on groundwater earlier than a well located at the 10' draw down zone. Pierson had a well survey sent by certified mail to local homeowners. The list of wells surveyed is located in the certified tracking sheet in the Module 8: Hydrology.</p>
39	What will DEP do to protect the health of surrounding homeowners against a contaminant DEP regulates in public water supplies and groundwater as a dangerous toxin?	3	Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "This question presumes that there is groundwater contamination, but as noted in response to other comments, there is no evidence of groundwater contamination or any evidence that it would occur. With respect to quarries and drinking water standards, PADEP will continue to follow applicable laws and regulations, including Chapter 77."</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. Furthermore PDMO contacted Southcentral Regional Office's ECB program to investigate if there are any known releases of PFAS contamination within the quarry ZOI and surrounding areas. No known releases of PFAS contamination were found. When issuing a mining permit DEP reviews the application to ensure it complies with all applicable laws and regulations.</p>
40	Why wasn't the Pottsville District Mining Office aware of their own agency's report detailing the presence of PFAS in surface water in NW Lancaster County?	3	Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "PFAS in surface water is ubiquitous throughout Pennsylvania. PADEP has reviewed the proposed expansion in accordance with applicable regulations currently in place."</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. DEP also adds that PDMO contacted the Southcentral Regional Office's ECB program to investigate if there are any known releases of PFAS contamination within the quarry ZOI and surrounding areas. No known releases of PFAS contamination were found. After reviewing the information provided by Pierson and coordinating with other programs internally, DEP determined that potential pollution to waters of the Commonwealth is unlikely. Mining activities at the Rheems Quarry does not involve any known use of PFAS compounds in the mining process. Therefore, PFAS compounds are not expected in the quarry discharge and would not be included as an NPDES permit effluent parameter.</p>
41	And why wasn't water discharge from the quarry sampled for PFAS out of caution?	3	Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "The quarry is not the source of PFAS. There are no laws imposing NPDES discharge limits on PFAS. With no applicable standards, sampling results in surface water have no meaningful basis for comparison."</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. Please also see response to comment 40 regarding the presence of PFAS.</p>
42	Why wasn't the quarry's NPDES permit revised to include PFAS when the Pottsville District mining office was verbally made aware during the NPDES permit comment period that PFAS was present in the stream the quarry is discharging to?	3	Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "The quarry is not the source of PFAS and has no regulated discharge for PFAS."</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. Please also see response to comment 40 regarding the presence of PFAS.</p>

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
43	Prior to permit approval, a study on how pervasive the PFAS contamination is in the surrounding area is necessary. The source must be determined. A plume needs to be delineated. Homeowner's wells should be sampled and analyzed for PFAS to develop a baseline.		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "The permit application is for a quarry expansion in a limited area, not an investigation into the entire surrounding area. The commenters and PADEP agree that the quarry is not the source of PFAS. Testing provided by the commenters does not indicate or suggest pervasive PFAS contamination. They compare surface water levels to drinking water standards for public drinking water suppliers. The commenters provided results indicating the stream west of the quarry at ST-1 tested at 19 ng/L PFOS, and ST-2 at 4.3 ng/L PFOS (which is at the stream where the quarry discharges). The unnamed tributary itself is not a drinking water source, and even if it were, by comparison, the Pennsylvania drinking water MCL is 18 ng/L for PFOS averaged over four quarters for public water supplies.</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. Please also see response to comment 40 regarding the presence of PFAS.</p>
44	If this quarry expansion is approved, quarterly well monitoring of household/farms within a 1 mile radius should be ongoing in order to catch PFAS contamination as quickly as possible and residents should be outfitted with replacement for remainder of the life of the quarry. The Hydrologic Study did mention that every home that participated in the hydrologic study has some form of filtration system installed for sediment but not for chemical analytes.		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is " See prior responses. The quarry is not responsible for PFAS in the surface water. There is no reason to expect that any existing PFAS levels in surface water would increase, migrate, result in PFAS above drinking water standards in private groundwater wells, or necessitate monitoring or treatment.</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. Please also see response to comment 40 regarding the presence of PFAS. There is not any known impacted groundwater within the ZOI of the quarry. The quarry has not had any violations of their permitted water discharge.</p>
45	If DEP put the responsibility of showing PFAS contamination in their well water, is it reasonable to expect a homeowner to pay almost \$500 for analysis and overnight shipping on ice for water samples multiple times per year?		3 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comment 44 concerning hydrologic balance.
46	The quarry will be discharging water contaminated with PFAS to an unnamed tributary to Donegal Creek, headwaters to Donegal Creek, which is considered a Naturally Reproducing Trout Stream to Route 23. Coordination with Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission should occur as game fish, esp. trout, accumulate 'forever chemicals' like PFAS at alarming rates.		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "The quarry discharge is within the legal limits as set forth in the NPDES permit. There are no laws imposing NPDES discharge limits on PFAS. The commenters provided results indicating the stream west of the quarry at ST-1 tested at 19 ng/L PFOS, and ST-2 at 4.3 ng/L PFOS (which is at the stream where the quarry discharges). The results provided by the commenters indicate that the PFOS levels do not increase as a result of the quarry discharge.</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. Please also see response to comment 40 regarding the presence of PFAS. DEP further adds that at this time there are no concentration limits for PFAS chemicals in surface water. The PAFBC was not notified on this application because there is not a change to the discharge amount from the NPDES outfalls.</p>
47	The person in charge of approving the NPDES permits at Pottsville Mining District was aware of potential sources of PFAS adjacent to the quarry property (fire station, via phone call 6/15/24), PADEP identified the former Elizabethtown Landfill, a capped, silt contaminated Superfund site (in a former quarry) approximately 1 mile from the Rheems Quarry as a potential source of PFAS in the 2019 USGS/PADEP report and the Pottsville Mining Office project PG was informed verbally that PFAS was found in surface water samples adjacent to the quarry during the public comment period of the Quarry's NPDES permit. There was ample evidence to suggest that wastewater generated from the quarry contained PFAS and should be analyzed for PFAS as a condition of the new NPDES permit, yet it was not done. Why not?		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "See prior responses. The results provided by the commenters indicate that the PFOS levels do not increase as a result of the quarry discharge. There is no evidence the quarry has caused or contributed to PFAS discharges.</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. Please also see response to comments 40 and 44 regarding the presence of PFAS. DEP reviewed the Fourth Five-Year Review Report for the Elizabethtown Landfill Superfund Site, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania Dated June 2023. The landfill is located on West Ridge Road, Elizabethtown, PA. The Rheem Quarry ZOI does not extend to the landfill property or within the interpreted plume.</p>
48	Five Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFOs) are located within a half-mile of the expansion area: Limestone already has poor aquifer filtering capabilities. Pathogens from the surface quickly make their way down to groundwater when drawdown is occurring. Was any consideration or modeling done to determine the impacts to groundwater from the CAFOs that are present within and just outside the '1000' boundary?		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "CAFOs are heavily regulated by PADEP and maintain their own regulated NPDES discharges. The groundwater model predicted impacts on the surrounding aquifer. Background water quality testing of the existing quarry NPDES point show no influence from the CAFO operation. Nitrogen is a primary concern as a contaminate from CAFO's. Ammonia levels can indirectly indicate potential nitrate levels, but not directly. In a healthy aquatic environment, ammonia is converted to nitrite, which is then converted to nitrate by bacteria through a process called nitrification. Therefore, high ammonia levels often suggest the presence of a nitrogen cycle imbalance, which can lead to elevated nitrite and potentially nitrate levels as well. Testing completed for the NPDES renewal indicates no detection of ammonia. Also CAFO's have their own NPDES discharges which ensures the quarry cannot be impacted by the CAFO's."</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response.</p>
49	What is the current official PADEP formalized policy or procedure for sinkhole problems related to Department authorized activities?		3 Hydrologic balance	A property owner inside or outside the ZOI experiencing sinkholes potentially resulting from quarry pumping or activity can file a complaint with PDMO at 570-621-3118. Technical staff from DEP will conduct an investigation of the subsidence to evaluate if quarry pumping or noncoal mining activities have contributed to the formation of a sinkhole. The property owner is given an investigation report. If the quarry is found responsible, they will be directed to repair the sinkhole.

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
50	In the Sinkhole Mitigation Plan, it states that the only sinkholes located within the 'zone of influence' will be considered. What is the definition of the zone of influence and how is it determined?		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>The ZOI is the evaluated extent of effect the quarry will have on groundwater during mining operations. A quarry's ZOI is developed using historic monitoring and pumping data, pumping tests, computer software for hydrologic assessment, geophysical surveys and any other relevant information. DEP uses the ZOI, the Karst Supplement, field investigations, and any other relevant information to evaluate well complaints and sinkhole complaints. Karst Supplement is intended to supply additional information on karst features existing in the general permit area and an assessment specific to potential karst impact from the proposed mining activities in order to allow the DEP to evaluate the hydrologic impacts.</p> <p>All sinkhole complaints regardless of location are investigated by DEP. If DEP determines a sinkhole has formed within the ZOI, the quarry is notified to repair the sinkhole using the Best Management Practices for sinkhole mitigation or recommendations from a karst expert. If a sinkhole is reported outside the established ZOI, DEP will investigate its occurrence and if DEP determines that the quarry is responsible, it will require Pierson to repair the sinkhole.</p>
51	If a property owner outside the 'zone of influence' experiences subsidence related to retreat of the water table, is it the properties owner's responsibility to prove connection to quarry activities or is DEP?		3 Hydrologic balance	See response to comment 50 regarding ZOI and sinkhole investigations.
52	The guidance indicates that first the quarry must be identified and then PADEP. Will the homeowners be provided written guidance and some clear path of notifying and resolving subsidence issues?		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>PDMO can be contacted first when a property owner is experiencing sinkholes potentially resulting from quarry pumping or activity. The PDMO phone number is 570-621-3118. DEP does find it helpful if the complainant knows what quarry they believe is causing the subsidence but it is not mandatory. DEP's website at www.pa.gov/agencies/dep/presidents/my-water/sinkholes/who-can-i-call-for-help.html has information on sinkholes and who to contact.</p> <p>DEP will contact the homeowner about the findings of its investigation. If the quarry is found to be responsible DEP will reach out to the quarry to have them perform the necessary sinkhole repairs.</p>
53	If a property owner outside the 'zone of influence' experiences subsidence related to retreat of the water table, is it the properties owner's responsibility to prove connection to quarry activities or is DEP?		3 Hydrologic balance	See response to comment 50 regarding ZOI and sinkhole investigations.
54	If a sinkhole related to quarry activity were to cause such damage to the property as to prevent the relation of a well or septic system, and as a result loss of the property, what path to relief would homeowners have through DEP?		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>The sinkholes constitute a nuisance as defined in the Noncoal Act. 52 P.S. § 3311(b). The sinkholes are also an unacceptable disturbance to the prevailing hydrologic balance. 25 Pa. Code § 77.521. DEP would require Pierson to repair the sinkholes at the complaint location to abate the nuisance and restore the hydrologic balance. Please see the response to comment 50 regarding sinkhole investigations.</p> <p>There are no mining regulations that would require Pierson, the operator of a noncoal mine, to repair structures damaged by sinkholes. However, the Noncoal Mining regulations at 25 Pa. Code § 77.193(c) state: "Liability on the bond shall be limited to the specific bonded area except where there are adverse hydrologic impacts. When there are adverse hydrologic impacts the Department will not release liability for a bonded area which is, in the Department's best conservative judgment, hydrologically connected to the adverse hydrologic impact." Therefore, the reclamation bond of \$3,121,547.29 may not be released until Pierson has, in DEP's conservative judgement, abated all adverse hydrologic impacts connected to the bonded (mining) area.</p>
55	Has DEP ever had to condemn a property due to damage from permitted quarry activities and how was that handled?		3 General Permitting	DEP does not have the authority to condemn properties. DEP has enforcement authority over whether the mining activities comply with the various laws and regulations.
56	Karst supplement states that no voids were detected on the Sweigarts property during a boring program in 1990 and no voids were detected during drilling of 4 monitoring wells in 2022. It neglects to mention a sinkhole opened up on Sweigarts property in the last several years that required a multiple tri-axes of fill material to stabilize and was paid for by Pierson. During drilling of Tomasetti's well (also paid for by Pierson) to the south of Bossler Road, Myers Brothers Well Drillers noted there was a very large cavern adjacent to the property that had captured the water table. Rheems Elementary had sinkholes open up and filled in countless times. Pottsville Mining Office representatives recently completed a field view in the Spring of 2023, but managed to miss a very large sinkhole currently open on the west side of Landis Road, west of the quarry. This sinkhole system extends under Landis Road to the east side (Wolgemuth Property) where a sinkhole large enough to drive a car into was haphazardly filled approximately 10 years ago. Did PADEP coordinate with West Donegal Township to determine how many sinkholes the Township had repaired on and adjacent to Township roadways in the past?		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>The Karst Supplement provided with the expansion application discusses voids when drilling the monitoring wells on the property. The township did not file any sinkhole complaints with DEP or provide any comments on the mining application. The township is aware of the expansion application. As discussed in the Land Use Information section of the review memo, the township reclassified the 30 acre expansion area and deemed it in the "best interest of the township's public health, safety and general welfare."</p> <p>Please also see response to comment 9 regarding sinkholes and hydrologic balance.</p>
57	The karst supplement states that "The quarry pumping has the potential to increase karst development. The monitoring systems in place will be adequate and protect the surrounding aquifer and its uses from mining impacts." Those same monitoring systems did not protect two homeowners from losing their water supplies, why would these monitoring systems suddenly work for karst features?		3 Hydrologic balance	<p>Pierson's response to this comment is "The monitoring plan requires monthly monitoring which is reported to the PADEP on a quarterly basis. Monitoring well data, pumping data, and a 3-dimensional groundwater model all provide data and anticipated impacts on surrounding wells. The commentators referenced two homeowners' diminution of water, but those were not identified specifically as being influenced by karst features. Studies for the proposed expansion were not complete prior to one of the wells going dry, which was addressed immediately.</p> <p>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. In addition, the monitoring system has been in place to monitor groundwater in the quarry area. The permit revision does revise the monitoring plan to add additional monitoring points for the proposed 30 acre expansion. Please also see response to comment 9 regarding sinkholes and hydrologic balance.</p>

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
58	Was a field view conducted by DEP, to determine the presence of sinkholes not shown on that mapping? Why was a 1000' boundary used for sinkholes?		3 General Permitting/Hydrologic Balance	A field review of sinkholes was not conducted by DEP. Pierson was required to submit a map showing karst related features for the proposed permit area, and within 1,000' of the proposed (or existing + proposed) permit area or within the expected quarry's ZOI whichever is greater. The Exhibit 6.2A Zone of Influence to 126' Mean Sea Level does map karst features within the interpreted ZOI of the quarry mining which is greater than 1,000 feet of the permit boundary in different locations. DEP has determined the information presented satisfactorily explains the expected hydrologic consequences of the proposed mining activity. Please also see response to comment 9 regarding sinkholes and hydrologic balance.
59	The State of Maryland indicates sinkholes are likely within a half mile of a quarry in karst. What science is DEP using to determine that sinkholes will not occur outside of 1000'?		3 General Permitting/Hydrologic Balance	The application does not state that sinkholes do not occur outside of 1,000 feet of the permit boundary. The Exhibit 6.2A Zone of Influence to 126 Mean Sea Level does how mapped karst features outside of the 1,000 ft perimeter of the permit boundary. DEP uses the permit application to determine the possible affects a quarry has on prevailing hydrologic balance in the permit and adjacent areas. The area is not limited to 1,000 feet of the permit boundary. See response to comment 50 regarding the ZOI and sinkhole investigations.
60	If a sinkhole forms outside the 1000' boundary, is the property then responsible to pay thousands of dollars for a geotechnical firm to prove the quarry is responsible or just pay thousands of dollars on their own to fix their property?		3 General Permitting/Hydrologic Balance	Please refer to the response to comment 50 regarding sinkhole investigations and 54 regarding damage to property.
61	Property owners within a half-mile of the quarry location that have homes constructed before 1923 request structural surveys for their home. Despite DEP's claim that blasting in the quarry only results in noise, long time residents know this to be false and many have suffered structural damage to their homes as a result of excessively strong blasts performed at the quarry. Numerous recorded violations for the quarry regarding amount of explosive used, placement of blast monitoring equipment, operator error, etc. illustrates that the quarry is not honest in regards to blasting activities. How many times is DEP willing to accept the 'it was an honest mistake' excuse from Pierson and why should property owner continue to suffer damage?		3 Blasting	Please see response to comment 6 regarding blasting compliance.
62	Blasting and removing rock from this new parcel will generate far more fugitive dust than any resident has been used to because it is at the surface. In addition, it's been proposed that the enormous pile will be broken down and used for restoration of the original pit, generating large amounts of PM air pollution from the movement of material and the truck traffic. What studies have been done by DEP to determine if future quarry activities will result in a net increase of the criteria pollutant? Has any study been conducted to identify sensitive receptors in the adjacent area?		3 Blasting	Pierson is required to conduct dust mitigation controls so as to prevent fugitive dust from blasting from leaving the property. If DEP can visibly see blast dust leaving the property, Pierson will be required to conduct further mitigation efforts to contain it within the property boundaries. Fugitive dust control from blasting shall demonstrate compliance with PA Code 25 Chapter 77 Noncoal Mining 77.455 and 77.575. Fugitive dust control measures shall demonstrate compliance with Chapters 121, 123, 127 and 129. (§77.575). The Air Pollution Control Plan is found in the Module 17 and is compliant with the regulations.
63	What mitigation methods will be in place to protect residents from increased particulate matter air pollution other than the proposed berm?		3 Air Quality	The Rheems Quarry permit includes a Module 17 as required by PA Code 25 Chapter 77 Noncoal Mining 77.455 and 77.575. Fugitive dust control measures shall demonstrate compliance with Chapters 121, 123, 127 and 129. (§77.575) Further, 25 Pa Code Section 123.1(c) requires that a person responsible for sources such as unpaved roadways, stockpiles and blasting operations shall take all reasonable actions to prevent particulate matter from becoming airborne. These actions include, but not be limited to, the following: (1) Use, where possible, of water or chemicals for control of dust in the demolition of buildings or structures, construction operations, the grading of roads or the clearing of land.; (2) Application of asphalt, oil, water or suitable chemicals on dirt roads, material stockpiles and other surfaces which may give rise to airborne dusts.; (3) Paving and maintenance of roadways.; (4) Prompt removal of earth or other material from paved streets onto which earth or other material has been transported by trucking or earth moving equipment, erosion by water, or other means. DEP inspects the facility and enforces this regulation.
64	We request that an air quality study be prepared for the quarry activities (sp). Criteria pollutant emission calculations and air quality modeling should be performed for the existing baseline and future planned actions.		3 Air Quality	The Rheems Quarry is authorized by a minor source air quality permit. As such, it is not expected to have a meaningful effect on ambient air concentrations of criteria pollutants such as PM10 and PM2.5. Furthermore, the facility is required to implement fugitive dust control measures for coarse particulate emissions (such as from roadways and stockpiles) per 25 Pa. Code Section 123.1(c), and is not permitted to have any fugitive emissions visibly crossing off its property per 25 Pa. Code Section 123.2. Given these factors, air quality modeling is not deemed required or necessary in this case.
65	Has the dust generated from blasting ever been tested for asbestos? We request asbestos testing from several points if it has not been previously analyzed.		3 Air Quality	The Rheems Quarry mines Dolomitic Limestone (Epler Formation). The chemical formula for Limestone is CaCO3 and Dolomite is CaMg(CO3)2. DEP is unaware of Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) occurring in these formations. In Pennsylvania, NOA typically forms in serpentinite and diabase rocks.

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
66	Ground vibration induced by quarry blasting causes damage to nearby utilities and structures. How will blasting and quarrying of the expansion area affect the level of ground borne vibration and ground borne noise that residents currently experience from quarry activities? If the answer is an increase in vibration and noise, we request a vibration study for any resident within a half mile radius that requests it.		3 Blasting	Please refer to responses 3 and 6 regarding Blasting. Blasting in the expansion area will not increase the vibration and noise from the current areas blasted at the quarry.
67	Why were the wells for the two residential properties to the south of Bossler Road (identified by Pierson's consultants as impacted properties) allowed to go dry with nothing being done ahead of time? Why was there no coordination?		3 Hydrologic balance	The two wells possibly affected by mining were replaced by Pierson in coordination with the homeowner. The Rheems Quarry has been at the current pit floor elevation since approximately 2016. It is likely that quarry activity and drought conditions had an affect on water quantity in the two residential wells. PA Code Title 25 Chapter 77.533 Water Rights and Replacement requires wells affected by mining activity to restore or replace the affected water supply.
68	Who at Pierson is monitoring these real time data loggers and who is responsible for making the determination that preventative measures be taken to prevent loss of water supply to surrounding residents?		3 Hydrologic balance	<i>Pierson's response to this comment is "During background data collection, Akens Engineering installed and monitored continuously collecting data loggers for wells and discharge used as supporting information for the application. Pierson Rheems LLC as Pierson is responsible for collecting and reporting monitoring data to PADEP. Continuous monitoring data loggers collect surface water elevation data at a manually specified time (typically every 6 hours) and the data is then downloaded (typically on a quarterly basis) and then can be graphed with rainfall data to provide meaningful analysis of impacts the quarry may be having on the surrounding aquifer."</i> DEP concurs with Pierson's response.
69	What explains the lack of action on Pierson's part when hydrology supposedly being monitored did not detect two residential wells going dry, the data loggers don't work? Pierson isn't monitoring anything? Pierson couldn't care less about impacts to surrounding property owners?		3 Hydrologic balance	Pierson acted in compliance with the regulations once they were notified of the well losses. As discussed in Comment 67, drought conditions likely compounded effects from quarry dewatering. Section 77.533 of the noncoal regulations requires Pierson to restore or replace the affected water supply with an alternative source of water, adequate in quality and quantity for the purposes served by the supply. The affected wells were replaced/deepened by Pierson.
70	What data exists on the anticipated impact to the 10 residential water supplies to the immediate southwest of the expansion area? Is it just MW22-4?		3 Hydrologic balance	<i>Pierson's response to this comment is "The Hydrology Module of the application and the Hydro Report discuss potential impacts to groundwater. MW-22-4 serves as a key monitoring point along with the metered NPDES discharge, MW-22-3, and MW-D. "</i> <i>DEP concurs with Pierson's response.</i>
71	If the data presented in the report suggested that homes outside of the 1000' boundary were within the cone of influence, why wasn't the boundary expanded?		3 General Permitting/Hydrologic Balance	The 1,000' boundary describes the minimum mapping requirements per chapter 77 of the noncoal regulations. The ZOI submitted by Pierson and reviewed by DEP extends beyond the 1,000' boundary. Since DEP has determined that hydrologic impacts extend beyond 1000 feet from the permit boundary, Pierson is required to describe the resources in their ZOI.
72	What is DEP policy/chain of command/timeline for restoration of a residential water supply?		3 Hydrologic balance	DEP does not have a policy on water restoration. Water restoration is completed according to the regulations. 25 Pa. Code § 77.533 describes water rights and replacement. This regulation states "Water rights and replacement. The operator of a noncoal mine which affects by surface mining activities a public or private water supply by contamination, interruption or diminution shall restore or replace the affected water supply with an alternate source of water, adequate in quantity and quality for the purpose served by the supply. For the purpose of this section, the term 'water supply' includes an existing source of water or facility or system for the supply of water for human consumption, for agricultural, industrial or other uses." The regulation does not contain a timeframe for restoration of a residential well. The homeowner can file a complaint with DEP for the loss of their water supply. Complainants are usually contacted within 2 business days of when the complaint was filed. The Module 8: Hydrology contains a list of wells that are predicted to be affected by mining activity. If the homeowner files a complaint and they are in the ZOI, DEP will direct Pierson to replace the water supply. DEP may request Pierson to provide temporary water to be supplied until water is restored to the homeowner if the well is dry. Pierson will work with the homeowner to set up a date for the well replacement. If the complainant is not within the ZOI, DEP will conduct an investigation of the well loss.
73	What is DEP policy/timeline for restoration of water supplies to the multiple CAFOs located just outside the 1000' boundary?		3 Hydrologic balance	See response to comment 72 for water supply replacement. Impacts to and from CAFOs are not treated differently than residential water supplies.
74	Will residents and agricultural operators be reimbursed for providing their own emergency water supplies while waiting for DEP and/or Pierson to determine cause/responsibility/and drill a new well? Who will reimburse residents and where is the written policy for that process?		3 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comment 72 and 73 concerning water supply. DEP does not have authority over reimbursement payments.

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
75	In 1946, a blast in a hanging wall of a quarry outside of Hershey, PA (also the Epler Formation) exposed a 6" wide solution channel at about 275' bgs. Water flowed out at 8-10,000 gpm and caused wells within a 1 ½ mile radius to go dry (Foose, R.M. 1953, Groundwater behavior in the Hershey Valley, Pennsylvania Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 64, pp 623-646). What resources does DEP have available to restore water to a population that large? Is there a legal limit to how long a homeowner can go without a water supply before they are able to take legal action against the State?		3 Blasting	25 Pa Code § 77.533 requires Pierson to restore or replace the affected water supply. DEP interprets this to include temporary water supply until a permanent water supply is completed. Based on information submitted in support of the Module 8: Hydrology, DEP does not expect a large population not to have a water supply. There are no municipal water supply locations found within the ZOI of the Rheems Quarry. Please also refer to the response for comment 5 on the ZOI and comment 72 for more information on well investigations. PDMO contacted the Southcentral Regional Office's Safe Drinking Water Program to verify there were not any municipal water supplies. Safe Drinking Water verified there were not any municipal water supplies within the ZOI of the quarry. DEP also required Pierson to post water loss bond for each water supply located within the ZOI. Pierson posted \$88,000 of water lost bond at \$11,000 per well.
76	Why should any surrounding property owner have any degree of confidence that impacts to their property and health will be quickly and fairly by DEP and R. E. Pierson, esp. when the consultant for the quarry blatantly lies about what homeowners have been contacted?		3 General Permitting/Hydrologic balance/blasting	A homeowner can submit a complaint to DEP if they believe their property has been impacted by mining activities. The surface mine conservation inspector conduct site inspections quarterly, without the need for a complaint to be filed. Blasting & Explosives inspectors will conduct routine inspections, and they review blasting records for every blast complaint that DEP receives. DEP has not identified any false information in the permit application submitted by Pierson. The regulation require information in the permit application to be sealed by a professional engineer and geologist. In addition, DEP's professional and licensed geologists and engineers reviewed the application.
77	Statement made in Geology Section: 'It is evident from published literature and numerous field views that Rheems Quarry is so intensely folded and faulted that a single strike and dip reading could not adequately describe the attitude of the rock units exposed here.' So how are you determining there will be no deleterious effect to the residential properties to the west, southwest, and south when the geology is unknowable? One well in the Wolgemuth's front yard isn't capturing what's happening to the water table under all the homes on Bossler and Landis to the SW of the expansion area.		3 Geology	The Module 7: Geology contains information on the geology of the permit and surrounding area. The geology of the area is exposed in the quarry highwall showing extensive folding and faulting as described in the geology module. Pierson has 7 monitoring wells surrounding the quarry to evaluate the quarry affected on the hydrologic balance. Pierson also conducted soil boring for additional information on the geology of the area. Information submitted for the entire permit application is used to determine the affect mining will have on the permit and adjacent area. Pierson submitted an updated Module 8: Hydrology, hydrogeologic study with a groundwater model to predicted groundwater drawdown. Other information from the application and current monitoring is also taken into review such as discharge volumes, rainfall amounts, and groundwater monitoring well data to determine the affects mining activity has on the hydrologic balance. Although the geology is complex in this area, the geology is analyzed in coordination with hydrology, monitoring well, precipitation data to allow a high degree of scientific certainty.
78	According to Lancaster County Conservation District, the stream to the west of the quarry was enclosed illegally. This perennial waterway qualifies as jurisdictional Waters of the United States and the enclosure was never permitted by DEP. The illegally enclosed stream on the Wolgemuth property is daylighted on the south side of Hetsay Quarry Road for about 50' before it is enclosed just outside the creatively drawn 1000' boundary (MP-3). The stream enclosure ends 25' north of its crossing with Bossler Road, MP-7 (well within the 1000' boundary) and is daylighted the remainder of its length. The statement is made that this will not enter the quarry dewatering system. On what basis is the determination made that extracting almost 3 million gallons of water a day will not cause the capture of this surface water stream from the sections where it is daylighted?		3 Hydrologic balance	The daylighted portion of the enclosed stream is beyond the 10' drawdown contour line at maximum built out of the quarry. The stream is predicted to be outside of the ZOI of the quarry.
79	This stream was enclosed in a 10" PVC pipe in the early 2000s. Did Aiken engineering perform a survey on the integrity of this pipe for the entire length? How is the determination being made that this stream will not be captured by quarry dewatering activities?		3 Hydrologic balance	The stream enclosed on the adjacent property is not the preview of the mining permit application. The commenter noted in a comment 78 above that water flows from the enclosed stream where the stream daylights by Bossler Road. The daylighted portion of the enclosed stream is beyond the 10' drawdown contour line at maximum built out of the quarry. The stream is predicted to be outside of the ZOI of the quarry.
80	Owners of private well understand that existing contaminants can be present in their groundwater and that testing and filtering systems are needed. Can the state in the form of DEP issue permits for activities that will contaminate an aquifer and destroy private water supplies in the surrounding area?		3 Hydrologic balance	The applicant must affirmatively demonstrate in a permit application that noncoal mining activities will have no presumptive evidence of potential pollution to waters of the Commonwealth (77.126(a)(3)). Mining activity at the Rheems Quarry do not include any processes that could add contaminants to a water supply well. In addition, if a water supply would become affected, 25 Pa. Code § 77.533 requires Pierson to restore or replace the affected water supply with an alternative source of water, adequate in quality and quantity for the purposed served by the supply.
81	The expansion will consume 30 acres of Prime Farmland soils in an area of rapidly disappearing agricultural resources due to warehouse development. What mitigation measures will be required to compensate for this loss of agriculturally significant soils		3 General Permitting	Pierson's response to this comment is "The permit addresses the prime farmlands which is also consistent with Lancaster County's Comprehensive Plan 'Places2040'. The commentor should consider Minerals in same light as prime ag farmland as both are critically important natural resources." DEP concurs with Pierson's response. Please also see the Land Use Information section of the review memo. The 30-acre tract of land was reclassified as Mining and Natural Extraction District by West Donegal Township.

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
82	The wells installed in 2022 in preparation for this permit expansion are not at enough number or distance to determine and/or forecast impacts from dewatering. By the time these wells register any kind of significant drop, residential and agricultural wells outside that area are in trouble as we have just seen with the Haas well. Additional investigation is needed.		3 Hydrologic balance	Pierson's response to this comment is "The data analyzed as part of the permit application as previously stated are 7 monitoring wells, 32 acres of open quarry which occurred over 83 years, years of published data and 27 soils borings. The data supports the studies and reports for the permit application." DEP concurs with Pierson's response. Please also refer to comments 67-75 concerning well replacement. DEP adds that 25 Pa. Code § 77.533 requires Pierson to restore or replace the affected water supply with an alternative source of water, adequate in quality and quantity for the purposes served by the supply.
83	What is DEP's defense against this action constituting a violation of the Takings Clause of the 5th Amendment to the Constitution: the taking of private property (or the enjoyment of that private property) for a public use? Residents and farmers are in constant fear of their water supply being contaminated with PFAS and/or disappearing and having to wait weeks or longer for restoration at the hands of R.E. Pierson, a company that exists entirely on-public tax dollars through Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission roadway construction contracts (and similar in the state of New Jersey)? The enjoyment of our properties (and the monetary value of the		3 Property Rights	Pierson Rheems Quarry is permitted to mine on property subject to the mining permit. Pierson has valid rights to mine the properties. Pierson either owns the property or has a lease to mine the property. As stated in the Land Use Information section of the review memo, Pierson does have the zoning approval to mine the properties. Pierson does not have eminent domain authority. For water replacement please see comment numbers 5 and for PFAS concerns please see comments 40 through 47.
84	Pierson caused commenter's well to go dry and other wells to. RE Pierson failed to replace my drinking water with an alternative source fit for human consumption as required.		9 Hydrologic balance	DEP investigated the well complaint and found that while mining activity may have impacted water quantity, the mining activity did not impair the water quality. This comment refers to a specific well complaint that has been resolved. The DEP has not received any additional well complaints from residents contributed to the Rheems Quarry.
85	There are two homes within a quarter mile of the quarry that have geothermal systems which utilize wells. It's making sure that those wells would be treated same as drinking water wells if they were impacted. People can't go for months without heating or air conditioning.		10 Hydrologic balance	Please see comment 1 concerning geothermal systems and comment 5 about wells.
86	Why was restored or replaced water supply operation and maintenance cost that exceed the cost associated with the original supply, the mining company is responsible to provide permanent payment of the increased cost not the case for Carl? Will this be the case for future homeowners as well?		10 Hydrologic balance	<i>Pierson's response to this comment is "Mr. Haas and the quarry amicably resolved their differences. To the extent there are questions about replacement of water supplies, it is addressed in 25 Pa. Code § 77.533.</i> DEP concurs with Pierson's response. DEP further adds an evaluation of operational and maintenance (O&M) costs of a replaced private water supply are part of the Module 8 Hydrology. The costs would cover the additional cost of the electricity for pumping the water from the former well pump depth to the new well pump depth. The average cost being approximately \$18 a year. Pierson may opt to pay the owner a lump sum instead of yearly payment.
87	Article one, Section 27 of the PA Constitution states that the people have the right to clean air, pure water, and to the preservation of the natural, scenic, historic and aesthetic values of the environment. Trustees of article one, which includes the state as well as the municipality, have a mandatory obligation to refrain from permitting the degradation, domination or depletion of public natural resources. Groundwater instruments are public natural resources, even if they're being accessed 1 from a private property.		10 Article 1, Section 27	Please see the review memo section for Article I Section 27, Air Quality, and Groundwater.
88	Granting permits taking into account the potential for PFAS contamination in wells and releases of surface water through deep watering activities, and mitigation for all those impacts violates article one, section 27 of the PA Constitution, and also the PA statute Chapter 28, section 3208, the noncoal mining, Conversion and Reclamation Act, Which requires quarry operations not to cause any water contamination.		10 Article 1, Section 27	Please see the review memo section for Article I Section 27, Air Quality, and Groundwater. Please also see comment 41 for information on PFAS.
89	What concerns me most about this proposed mine is sink holes. As you saw in that picture it's in the limestone cuts, my property. And I heard from one of the residents who've been here for a long time. The old house on our farm, which is 234 years old, built in 1790, was one of the original king's land grabs. I'm not sure if that's true, but that's what they say. Certainly, 29 years after Michael Gross built the old house, he built the new house, which was in 1819, and that has a dry laid foundation on stone. As I said, it's on the excess shale limestone, and I'm worried that the dewatering proposed by the mine will cause the cost to get holes in it, and we could have sinkholes. Now, that worries me, because these are two of the oldest buildings in the area, and they're pretty historic.		11 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comment 9 regarding sinkhole concerns. Please also see the Cultural and Historic Resources and Groundwater sections of the review memo.

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
90	If there were to be a sinkhole that would damage the building, it would be quite an embarrassment to find that it was caused by an avert act by a department with protection in its name. I tried to tell you, think on insurance. I thought that would be an easy thing. You can't get sinkhole insurance. There's no such thing. Apparently, what is sold as sinkhole insurance is fix the building after you fix the hole insurance. So the hole has to be plugged and stabilized at the homeowners or the property owners expense. And that could be incredibly expensive, 100 foot deep hole. Could be. I don't know how many triaxle loads of fill it would be. Plus, you got to stabilize it.		11 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comment 9 regarding sinkhole concerns and the Groundwater section of the review memo.
91	So what I ask you is, if you decide that, notwithstanding these good people, local objection to the mine, if you decide to give the permit anyway, please, could you put a condition in there that shifts the onus on proving whose fault, the dewatering or the sinkhole, the mine, the welfare and dryers, from us. Because there's no ways we could ever prove that we know that. To the mine, to prove that it wasn't them. It would be a lot easier for those of us who can't afford to spend hundreds of tens of thousands of dollars trying to go against these people with deep pockets. We'd really appreciate that if you could do that.		11 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comment 9 regarding sinkhole concerns. The investigation completed by DEP is free of charge to the homeowner. Further PA Code 25, Chapter 77.243(b)(2)(c) states DEP will not release a bond amount deposited, or reduce the payment in lieu of bond if the release would reduce the total remaining amount of bond to an amount which would be insufficient for DEP to complete reclamation and to take measures that may be necessary to prevent adverse effects upon the environment or public health, safety or welfare under the environmental acts, the act, this chapter, the terms and conditions of the permits and orders of DEP. The total reclamation bond liability will be \$3,121,547.29.
92	From our constitution as trustees of these resources, the Commonwealth shall conserve and maintain for the benefit of all people. Our state has an opportunity to reduce effects on both issues and commit to making residents welfare and well-being a priority in denying expansion of this quarry. Physical threats are obvious, as we've heard this evening. Groundwater contamination, structural damage to tax paying resident's homes, dust, pollutant, emissions. The town of Rheems' needs Government to respect their property rights, not award them with mitigation repair systems after damage has denied them fair market price on their investments.	5a	Article 1, Section 27	Please see the review memo section for Article I Section 27, Air Quality, Blasting and Groundwater. Also please see response to comment 3 and 6 concerning blasting. Please see comment 4, 63, and 64 concerning dust and air quality issues. As of April 13, 2026, Pierson Rheems Quarry has not been cited for any violations related to blasting activities. A compliance check performed April 13, 2026 indicates there have been no mining violations since 2015 to present and only one violation from the air quality program for fugitive dust in 2017 that has since been resolved.
93	For my house itself, I have cracks in my foundation. I have cracks in my walls. I have called about when the blasts occur and they knock pictures off of my wall. I don't think that it is pitting, spanning the quarry is going to help us into any of those areas.		12 Blasting	Please refer to response to comment 3 and 6 concerning blasting and comment 92 regarding the specific compliance concern at commenter's home. No alleged damage from blasting that has been investigated had been founded by DEP to have been caused by the quarry blasting. All investigations and inspection have found seismic results from the blasts to be well within compliance with our structural damage criteria. At this time no damage viewed was characteristic of blasting damage.
94	Let alone the water supply, which we are all very worried about.		12 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comments 5 and 75 concerning the water supply.
95	And we are struggling as a small community to survive here where we love. We came here because we love the area. Rheem school is no longer however, our Milton Hershey has now bought that school and is going to be putting little children there. We need to make sure they have safe water to drink.		12 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comments 5 and 75 concerning the water supply. Please see comment 15 concerning the Catherine Hershey School.
96	We need to make sure the school is okay and is not affected by the blast thing. We can't afford to have more expansion and more blasts. So please help us. Please support us. And I am asking with all heart intent, but we are also violating codes that we do not accept these applications.		12 Blasting	Please see response to comment 15 regarding the Catherine Hershey School, as well as comments 3 and 6 concerning blasting. By way of further response, 25 Pa. Code § 77.564(g)(3) states when blasting is within 1,000' of a school it shall be done only during times approved by DEP. Pierson is required to notify the school 24 hours prior to blasting. Module 16 is where the blast plan is found and DEP's blasting & explosives inspector will review this information prior to any approval. In a case where a school may be built after an approval, Pierson would have to submit a new plan for review. As of now, no blasting has been conducted within 1000' of the school. With the expansion, the blasting will be further away from the school.
97	The mission statement of DEP Mission is to protect Pennsylvania's air, land and water from pollution and to provide for the health and safety of its citizens through a cleaner environment. We will work as partners with individuals, organizations, governments and businesses to prevent pollution and restore our natural resources. In my opinion, further expansion of the quarry does not meet any of the elements within the mission statement. You've heard concerns about water quality, wells, foundations. I don't have a well, fortunately. I have foundation issues. We have cracks in our foundations that we did not have prior 1 to Pierson coming into the community.		13 Article 1, Section 27	Please see the review memo section for Article I Section 27, Air Quality, Blasting and Groundwater. Please also see response to comment 92 regarding various environmental concerns. DEP received two complaints from this commenter and neither complaint pertained to damage. DEP investigated both complaints and did not find any violations.

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
98	We have a huge sinkhole on High Street. It's not included in your map. It's actually a little bit further down. I'm told, well, there's not much of an impact because it's further away from Rheems, but it's not further away from us. It's not further away from Bossler Road.		13 Hydrologic balance	<i>Pierson's response to this comment is "Pierson was not notified of a sinkhole in the High Street area. It is difficult to make any opinion based on that information in the comment alone. It is statistically low that the quarry would have influenced the development of a sinkhole on High Street based on several years' worth of pumping data and well levels and responses to pumping within the monitoring well network. This information was used in preparing the groundwater model. The data all suggests that the greatest influence from quarry pumping would be to the south. High Street is located to the east, within a portion of a separate geologic unit than what is being mined. Also, there is an anticline that would create an additional boundary condition. Portions of High Street would be located in the 10' drawdown predicted ZOI with expansion completed to final depths and horizontal extents. The existing ZOI does not reach any portion of High Street. "</i> <i>DEP concurs with Pierson's response. DEP further adds that we did not receive a complaint associated with sinkhole on High Street.</i>
99	I just have extreme concerns about the neighborhood that the quarry has. I understand from 11 the 05:00 to 06:00 session that once it's approved through the zoning, rezoning process that it's kind of like out of everybody else's hands. But I don't think it is based upon your mission statement. And I would ask you to please reconsider the expansion based upon what your mission statement is and the concerns of our community.		13 General Permitting	Please see the Land Use Information section of the review memo for zoning information. Please also see the response to comment 92 regarding various environmental concerns.
100	Water is arguably one of the most undervalued, invaluable resources we have. When it is screwed up, it is screwed up for a long, long time. It can happen due to any number of circumstances. My parents moved their dream home. They have installed not one, not two, but three wells. And they still have dry runs and are out of water, just by natural circumstances alone. My sister moved to the country. They are fighting with a drilling company for oil. Her water has contaminated. She cannot use it, cannot drink it. When they wash their clothes, their clothes are staining with oil. This is a scenario that you hear time and time again. It isn't a matter of if, it is a matter of when. The risks do not outweigh the rewards. If this is allowed to happen, we will be the fools. I moved here. I did not buy a home with a well. I'm not unaffected by this. If it gets into the aquifer and damages the water, we're all screwed.		14 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comment 5 concerning hydrologic balance and the Groundwater section of the review memo.
101	Concerns were raised about having money in escrow for potential future damages from quarry including well replacement.		15 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comment 5 concerning hydrologic balance; 9 concerning sink hole investigation; and 91 concerning bonding. Please also see the Bonding section of the review memo.
102	Raised concerns about prior blasting and has contacted DEP about it. DEP told them that blast was within the legal ramifications. Concerns about cracks in drywall and foundation.		16 Blasting	Please see response to comment 3 and 6 above regarding blasting. This commenter's complaint was received in October 2020. DEP The investigated the complaint found the damage was not characteristic of damage caused by blasting.
103	So I wanted to concur with some of the things that Mr. Ricedorf was saying. Said if we cannot, if the vote continues to go through there needs to be some type of financial bucket of money that is set aside where, when there are situations like mine or others here with wells and water issues, as well as other damages that can occur. That there is some place that we can go to say, this is what happened, we need to have something corrected, and there needs to be a financial compensation for that.		16 Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comment 5 concerning hydrologic balance; 9 concerning sink hole investigation; and 91 concerning bonding. Please also see the Bonding section of the review memo.
104	Just like she had said, I had the same problem. Over time, my wife did the same thing. It's a loud boom house rattles and same thing. We had cracks in our walls, and there were apparently bad. Same thing, DEP came out and said those measurements were within the legal.	4a	Blasting	Please see response to comment 3 and 6 above regarding blasting. The DEP blasting inspector conducted onsite investigations into the commenters concerns in July 2023. Seismographs were set up at the commenters home on two different days. The seismographs did not trigger either day at the commenters home. No violations were cited to Pierson.

#	Comment	Commenter #	Category	Response
105	But anyway, that's one thing. The other thing is I had a sinkhole open up two years ago close to my house. I had no clue that the party is responsible, that's why I found out afterwards when this meeting came up. But I got to repair myself and got the engineer to qualify to make sure that it was done right. So there were \$2,000 that came out of my pocket. Afterwards, we started with this here. I found out that they were responsible for any of the sinkholes in the zone. So that came out of my pocket. And I had contact with DEP and they got in contact with them. But I'm not getting any endorses as far as I know. Cause they said once I've done it, I can care for it myself. So that's the only thing. Want more sinkholes? If open up yet, so it'll be at my cost.	4a	Hydrologic balance	Please see response to comment 9 concerning sink hole investigation. The commenter filed a sinkhole complaint on July 7, 2023. The complaint is still under investigation. The sinkhole was occurred and was repaired by the homeowner in 2022. A field visit was done on July 26, 2023. The sinkhole was repaired and therefore was not found in the field to evaluate.
106	We've just heard, but we have heard at our board of supervisor meetings in the township about the MS four project. And I think I'll do some research. And you may know this, I know you can't answer it now. But there's been a lot of work done by charity in this township regarding the MS four project. And I'm just wondering, with all these pollutants that we've heard about tonight, if that will negatively impact the money that's being spent on MS four projects in our area and surrounding communities.	13	MS4 Project	<i>Pierson's response to this comment is "The quarry does not discharge into an MS4 and has no impact on MS4 costs or projects. DEP concurs with Pierson's response.</i>
107	But a lot of us showed up at the zoning board meeting before this was even approved. And not one of us voted yes with us. It was the zoning board. They were the ones responsible for this and moved everything forward.	17	Zoning	Please see the Land Use Information section of the review memo for zoning information.
108	I don't know what the solution is. I would say DEP -. I think because a lot of these problems, most of them are unprovable. Now, the foundation cracks, the sinkholes, the contamination, it's theoretical. Did my contamination come from farmland? Did it come from the well head? Did it come from a fall in the rock structure? Which the fellow from Penn State said it is a possibility. So given the fact that a lot of things 17 are theoretical, I would ask DEP to have some kind of influence, to take that out of the equation to -. When there's an issue of license, you might say if you're in a zone of influence and you have a crack in your foundation within a certain period of time after plastic (blasting) or if water is contaminated, if the person has no record of contamination on their site, it's automatically falls back on the quarry. (blasting in bold is inferred by DEP)	9	Hydrologic balance	Please see responses to comment 5 concerning hydrologic balance; 9 concerning sink hole investigation; 3 and 6 above regarding blasting and 86 for well complaint specific to this commenter.
109	And secondly, well, like Bob said, an escrow count would be a second thing. And thirdly, I would like DEP to have some kind of a time limit somehow enforceable so that a condition mine doesn't go on for eight months to a year with no resolution. It should be done in a reasonable amount of time.	9	Hydrologic balance	Please see response 91 concerning bonding and also the review memo section on Bonding. Pierson must follow their permit and mining laws and regulations. DEP conducts inspections and does issue violations ordering Pierson to correct issues. Enforcement can include suspending and revoking the permit if Pierson does not follow DEP's orders.
110	Bad air days in Lancaster County have moved from occasional to daily. Our northwest corridor has absorbed a multitude of industrial pollutants from Brunner's Island over 60 years, compounded by incinerator (500 tons NOCs/yr.) and Perdue's soy bean crushing plant, (100 tons of neurotoxin hexane) Our bad air has lead Delaware and Connecticut to petition the EPA to require effective air controls at power plants and reduce emissions affecting their states. DEP has permitted air quality credits from a defunct NY plant to be applied to the soybean plant, substituting air pollution from one area to another, a profitable industry practice. Political decisions serve to worsen air quality from a population already at risk. The American Lung Association's warnings of grade F for particle pollution serves as a warning for regulatory state agencies to address these serious threats to the public's health.	5	Air Quality	Please see the Air Quality section in the review memo.

List of Commenters

Commenter #	First Name	Last Name	Middle Initial	Organization	Address	Written or Oral	Date on Letter	Date Received by DEP
1	Don and Marilyn	Miller		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/7/2023	7/10/2023
2	Stephen	Cobaugh	M	resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/7/2023	7/10/2023
3		Neighbors Against the Rheems Quarry Expansion		residents	various	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
4	Roger	Greenwalt		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/12/2023	7/12/2023
5	Patricia	Longenecker	J	resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written		7/14/2023
6	Derek and Katie	Moore		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	2/21/2024	2/21/2024
7	Evelyn	Lisi		resident	Lancaster, PA	written	3/5/2024	3/5/2024
8	Aimee	Achorn Fasnacht		resident	Palymra, Pennsylvania	written	3/7/2024	3/7/2024
9	Carl	Haas		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	oral		2/21/2024
10	Meredith	Glazier		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	oral		2/21/2024
11	Paul	Rouse		resident	Mount Joy, PA	oral		2/21/2024
5a	Patricia	Longenecker		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	oral		2/21/2024
12	Christie	Hamilton		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	oral		2/21/2024
13	Monika	Noll		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	oral		2/21/2024
14	Tyler	Case		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	oral		2/21/2024
15	Robert	Ricedorf		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	oral		2/21/2024
16	Beth	Malloy		resident	Rheems, PA	oral		2/21/2024
4a	Roger	Greenwalt		resident	Rheems, PA	oral		2/21/2024
17	Dawn	Frizzell		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	oral		2/21/2024

NARQE Comment Letter

Commenter #	First Name	Last Name	Middle Initial	Organization	Address	Written or Oral	Date on Letter	Date Received
3	Meredith	Glazier		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Paul	Rouse		resident	Mount Joy, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Margaretta	Lisi		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Julian	Richter		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Carl	Haas		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Nikki	Mason		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Mike	Mason		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Robert	Ricedorf	A	resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Audrey	Stauffer		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	William	Wentling		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Donnal	Barton		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Elaine	Wentling	M	resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Betsy	Hockenberry	A	resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Ron	Hockenberry		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	John	Brown		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Charlotte	Brown		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	William	Yoder(III)		resident	Mount Joy, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Ben	Yoder		resident	Mount Joy, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Barbara	Read		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Jim	Read		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Ben	Kaser		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Montserrat	Greenawalt		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Roger	Greenawalt		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Krista	Beach		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Bill	Beach		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Carolyn	Ricedorf		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Monika	Noel		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Nancy	Haas		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Steve	Hawthorne		resident	Mount Joy, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Pat***	****		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Patricia	****		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	John	****		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Dawn	Frizzell		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Jeff	Frizzell		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Rodney	Snyder		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Maria	Snyder		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Brenda	Hickernell		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Rena **	Kersten		resident	Mount Joy, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Douglas	Kersten		resident	Mount Joy, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Nevin	Musser		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023

NARQE Comment Letter

Commenter #	First Name	Last Name	Middle Initial	Organization	Address	Written or Oral	Date on Letter	Date Received
3	***	***		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Deborah	Hummer		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Sean	Burke		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Danielle	Burke		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Candace	Abel		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	John	****		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Joshua	Frizzell		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Travis	Erb		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Katie	Erb		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Chad	Crowe		resident	Rheems, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Dawn	Gipe		resident	Rheems, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	***	***		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Andrew	Greenawalt		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	David	Greenawalt		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Paula	Leicht		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Kathy	Sardof		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	John	Sardof		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	John and Julia	Walsh		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Chris	Mautner		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Sheri	Wolgemuth		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Doug	Wolgemuth		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Tina	Jackson**		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Barry	Jackson**		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Betty	**		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Kathy	Risser		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Pat	Risser		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023
3	Jeremy	Snyder		resident	Elizabethtown, PA	written	7/6/2023	7/10/2023