



Sugarhouse Casino – Letter Re Army Corps Permit

April 2, 2008

District Engineer

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District

Wanamaker Building

100 Penn Square East

Philadelphia, PA 19107-3390

Re: CENAP - OP - R - 2007 - 120 - 24

Application of HSP Gaming, L.P. for construction of Sugarhouse Casino

Dear District Engineer,

Let me begin by making two procedural requests:

- 1) an extension of the comment period and
- 2) that a public hearing be held on this permit application

to allow for additional public input on this high profile project which will have significant, precedent setting affects on the Philadelphia community and Delaware River environments.

Substantively, the Delaware Riverkeeper Network takes the position that this proposed project, individually as well as cumulatively with other existing and proposed development, inflicts a tremendous harm on the ecosystems and communities of the Delaware River and Philadelphia, and as a result the permit application should be denied.

Let me also state upfront that the Delaware Riverkeeper Network, for all of the reasons to be stated in this letter, believes that to the extent consideration of this application continues to move forward, a full Environmental Impact Statement is required pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. This project and Army Corps action brings with it individual as well as cumulative impacts that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The effects that will be caused by construction of the Sugarhouse Casino in the location and manner proposed will be both direct and indirect and will impact ecological resources, aquatic ecosystems, water quality, aesthetics of the Delaware River and adjacent communities, historic and cultural

Delaware Riverkeeper Network

300 Pond Street, Second Floor
Bristol, PA 19007

tel: (215) 369-1188

fax: (215) 369-1181

drkn@delawareriverkeeper.org

www.delawareriverkeeper.org

resources, as well as the social well-being, health and safety of the community. Allowing this project to move forward as proposed will set damaging precedent that will allow other projects to move forward in a way that mimics and magnifies the environmental and community harms that will result. A full Environmental Impact Statement is warranted and mandated by law.

HSP Gaming, L.P.'s proposed construction of a casino complex at 941-1025 North Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia, PA requires tremendous river bank and in-river work. The project requires dredging, filling and bulkheading along the river. It will result in new and renewed pollution discharges. It will harm the habitat of state endangered species and could potentially impact federally listed endangered species. It will present a river and community eyesore. It will introduce additional fill and obstructions along the water's edge, thereby displacing high flow waters potentially impacting flooding. And it will create in water obstructions that are not only ecologically damaging but could become dangerous.

In its application materials HSP Gaming attempts to make this permit application review process about the approval or disapproval of gaming - i.e. it states that it did not select the site, the State did, in providing for a gaming permit tied to this site. HSP Gaming is proposing a mixed use complex which could, or could not, include gambling operations. The gambling operations are not necessary for the project to be deemed profitable or successful. Inclusion of gambling, or not, is wholly at the discretion of HSP Gaming. It is inappropriate to make this permit decision one about gaming. This permit decision is about construction, and whether the environmental and community harms that would result are such that needed permits should be granted or denied. With this reality check in mind, the alternatives analysis provided by HSP Gaming for its proposed development is, to be blunt, ridiculous, as there is no analysis of other alternative development options or locations. HSP Gaming used the gambling issue as a rationale to truncate and limit its alternatives analysis for the project. The alternatives analysis provided by HSP Gaming is wholly inadequate, non-responsive to the alternatives analysis question, misleading, inappropriate, and fails to procedurally or substantively fulfill the obligation for an alternatives analysis to the project proposed.

The project as proposed will harm water quality in the Delaware River.

In addition to the relocated Laurel Street Combined Sewer overflow pipe, the project will result in a new 48 inch City outfall, increased sanitary sewage discharges, as well as 9 additional stormwater outfalls to collect and discharge runoff from the site. The relocated CSO outfall (according to documents part of earlier State and City reviews) will be increased by 86%.

The new pollution inputs will result in an increase in pollution loading into a reach of the Delaware River that is already overburdened by pollution.

I recently attended a Delaware River Basin Commission meeting discussing the concerns about the effects that existent and increasing nutrient pollution may have/be having on Delaware Estuary and Bay ecosystems. At this joint meeting of the DRBC's Monitoring Advisory Committee and Water Quality Advisory Committee (of which I am an appointed member), the largest concern discussed is the reality that we don't in fact know what affect high nutrient inputs into the Delaware River system is having now and/or could have in the future. It is clear that the scientists have not given this issue the focused concern or research necessary to evaluate the affects, and have not been monitoring the appropriate endpoints to know the effects. In light of this tremendous deficit of information and the potential ramifications it might hold for our present or future, it is not appropriate to be permitting projects that will result in additional pollution and sewage inputs into the Delaware River system.

In the 2006 Delaware River and Bay Integrated List and Water Quality Assessment, Zone 5c of the Delaware Estuary was identified as not meeting the Delaware River Basin Commission's current water quality criterion for Dissolved Oxygen. Identified sources for the problem include "Municipal Point Sources Discharges, Package Plant or Other Permitted Small Flows Discharges, Wet Weather Discharges (non-Point Source), Wet Weather Discharges (Point Source and Combination of Stormwater, SSO or CSO)". Supporting expanded pollution inputs, such as those that would result from this proposed project, that would further exacerbate this pre-

existing water quality violation and negative condition is not appropriate. In addition, several sections of Zone 6 of the Delaware Estuary and Bay were identified as being impaired for shellfishing as the result of pathogens, and in one section for Primary Contact Recreation as the result of Enterococcus, coming from "Residential District, Wet Weather Discharges (Non Point Source), Wet Weather Discharges (Point Source and Combination of Stormwater, SSO or CSO), [and] Source Unknown". Additional sewage treatment inputs, a primary source of pathogens and nutrients to our waterways, could contribute to and compound these pre-existing, harmful, and unacceptable conditions in our Bay. And so again, we should not be permitting projects that will contribute to and/or exacerbate these pre-existing pollution and water quality harms.

The project as proposed will have significant aquatic ecosystem harms.

The plan proposes development in and along the River, will require the removal of existing vegetation, requires human alterations to the banks of the Delaware River including hardening those banks with steel and concrete, will dig out portions of the riverbed, and will bury aquatic ecosystems as it fills in part of the Delaware River.

The lands that sit along the banks of the Delaware River and those that sit between the high and low watermark are essential for the health of the Delaware River, as is its open water habitat. The fact that so much of the City's riverfront is already developed and/or bulkheaded does not reduce the ecological value and importance of the lands and open water at issue here but in fact makes them more valuable. Vegetation along the banks of the River, the habitat between the high and low water mark, and the open water are important for the ecological health of the River and its aquatic ecosystems. Fish and other aquatic life rely on these areas for food and habitat, as well as important water quality protections.

Sugarhouse is proposing to use old piers 42 through 48 to support their development. They discuss the history of these piers and how over time the river between the piers was filled in. They are now looking to benefit from the damaging river fill that has taken place over time, including illegally, to support their proposed project. This is exactly the wrong approach, and should not be a policy we want to set for our River or region. It is not sound policy to perpetuate damage done in the past with new damage done in the present. Rather than look to solidify and reward the filling that has taken place in the past, including illegally, we should be looking to this site as an opportunity to remove the damaging fill and to provide an appropriate level of river restoration.

This project includes additional fill and development in and over what was once the river's natural floodplain. Concerns about floodplain development are largely dismissed by the applicant with assertions that the structures being built will be elevated above the 100 year floodplain level. But, the fill in floodplain is important, it should not be so easily dismissed, and merely placing a structure at a higher elevation does not address or mitigate all concerns associated with flooding and floodwaters and floodplain development. Structures located in or over a floodplain, in addition to additional fill, further inhibit the flow of the river and its carrying capacity during high flow events, it forces more water onto downstream and adjacent communities, and it continues to leave the built structure at risk of harm including those located inside. In addition, it deprives the river of the habitat, pollution filter, and stormwater infiltration benefits that healthy floodplains provide. A genuine consideration of the adverse impacts to the Delaware River resulting from placement of additional fill and structures in or over the floodplain, as well as the harm in permanently losing access to vegetated and healthy floodplain communities and soils, is needed.

The proposal to actually fill in, and perpetuate existing illegal fill in, parts of the Delaware River to accommodate this new, massive and largely unwanted development is inappropriate. In terms of new fill, 3500 cubic yards of new fill, along with 1700 cubic yards of illegal fill would be installed and perpetuated over 0.29 acres of open water below the high tide line between Piers 41 and 42. In addition, 10,000 cubic yards of new fill, along with 3,500 cubic yards of illegal fill would be discharged and perpetuated over .911 acres of open water below the high tide line between Piers 43 and 44. An additional 1500 cubic yards, .20 acres of fill, will result from phase II of the project in order to extend the Laurel Street CSO. As a result 1.411 acres of aquatic habitat in the Delaware River will be permanently buried, permanently lost, in order to accommodate this project. This is a tremendous level of damage to be done to the aquatic ecosystems of the Delaware River. Assertions that this

harm is somehow mitigated by the areas where illegal fill of the past will be removed is unpersuasive - the Sugarhouse Casino project was not needed to secure removal of the illegal fill and to secure restoration of the historic habitats and bottom of the Delaware River. In fact, this project is not only going to cause new fill in the Delaware River, but its construction ensures ratification, and permanence, for the illegal fill of the past - removing any and all opportunities for the lost aquatic habitats in this reach of the river to be ecologically restored.

In addition to the burying of the river bottom, 1.08 acres of the Delaware River's open waters will be covered by a raised deck. Not only is this an eyesore, but the Delaware Riverkeeper Network is concerned about the ecological ramifications of the shading. While the applicant stated to me that this shading would actually be of ecological benefit, I do not see this information provided in the application materials and feel it requires careful scrutiny.

In addition to all of this fill and overreaching structure the applicant is seeking installation of two floating docks 350 feet long and 8 feet wide to serve a river ferry and river taxi. The environmental ramifications of this increased river traffic are worthy and in need of analysis and scrutiny.

The overhang and the dock structures both require 14 inch diameter pipe piles (450 for the overhang and an additional 10 for the docks). These pipes become additional disturbances for the river bottom, additional impediments to the river's flow, additional sources for catching the debris that comes down the river after storm events and therefore additional safety hazards. I suspect that the applicant went with the 460 pipe piles as a way to avoid additional river filling that it knew would likely "kill" their project. But the pipe piles, acting as a sieve for large debris, is a significant safety hazard.

The project includes dredging out 5,500 cubic yards of sediment from 1.49 acres in front of the new outfall, dredging to a depth of 6.5 feet below mean low water. This dredging would be to allow for drainage. The Delaware River has already been significantly altered by dredging projects, suspending sediments and associated contaminants into the water column, altering and/or removing stream bottom habitats, altering flow patterns, and generally disrupting the River ecosystem. Dredging of this nature inevitably requires future maintenance dredging, an issue which does not appear to be considered or addressed by the applicant's application materials. The dredging that is proposed in and of itself is disruptive and introduces a level of water quality and ecosystem harm that should not be permitted.

The facility proposed is not a water dependent use, it in no way needs or relies upon the presence of the Delaware River for construction or access, other than the proposed dock which is not a central or needed part of the proposed project. It is wholly inappropriate to allow dredge and fill of the river to accommodate this private enterprise or to allow any encroachment into or on the river itself. The promise of jobs and limited public access are not enough to justify such a proposal or request.

While HSP Gaming application materials try to minimize the importance of the project area as aquatic habitat, the January 2007 Normandeau study states clearly that it is used by a relatively large quantity and variety of fish (9 species with 92 fish captured in just 241 minutes on three dates). This is one reason why the area is so attractive to local residents for fishing. The report also notes the vegetation along the banks of the river, again, providing important benefits to the river but also to the fishers that would come here for relaxation and recreation. Normandeau also recognizes the value of this reach of the river as nursery habitat for American Shad. While there may be additional shad nursery habitat along the river as one travels upstream, the value of this habitat at its current location is increased as the result of present and future development - the less habitat available the more valuable each remaining piece becomes. The Normandeau study fails to discuss or document the level of nursery habitat in this reach of the river or the relative importance it may play in the Shad's migration and life cycle. But clearly there has been, and will continue to be, a tremendous level of development in this reach of the river that is impacting or depriving the Shad, thus making this stretch of habitat of increasing value. The Shad have a long and noble history with the Delaware River, it is important that their needs be recognized and provided for. It is important that we protect and restore those areas needed by the young of the

species as they attempt to migrate up and down the river. It's important we not permit a project that will fill in or further degrade this identified aquatic habitat for the shad and other fish species.

The reach of the river to be developed by Sugarhouse is also part of the river habitat used by the federally endangered Shortnose Sturgeon during their annual life cycle. Normandeau testing, which yielded no sturgeon in their sampling, took place over a very short duration, from September 26 to October 19. The testing period occurs at the outer edges of the window within which the National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) states, in its December 22, 2006 letter, that Shortnose Sturgeon may be present in the Philadelphia reach of the river. Therefore it is questionable whether their absence from sampling during this very brief 3 week window is truly significant. Shortnose Sturgeon experts need to be consulted and additional testing conducted. In fact, NMFS states in its letter that the applicant needs to work with the Army Corps to "determine whether the proposed action is likely to affect this species." Only after that additional effort will NMFS make any determinations regarding the Endangered Species Act. From the application materials it does not seem that this additional work has been undertaken. It would not be appropriate for the Army Corps to be making permit decisions pursuant to the Clean Water Act that will harm aquatic ecosystems without full information on the potential impacts to physical or biological integrity of the impacted waterway, the existence and perpetuation of an endangered species being part of the river's biological integrity.

Normandeau has stated that the ecologically important Asiatic clam (*Corbicula*) was found in the project area - while perhaps not in abundance they were found. Their importance to Shortnose Sturgeon was noted. The fact that the clam was not more abundantly found should not be interpreted as proof that this habitat has little value, it could just as easily be interpreted (given the limited information provided) as proof that this is an area conducive to this ecologically important species and one that therefore warrants additional protection and restoration efforts. This latter interpretation is more in keeping with the spirit and goals of our environmental protection laws and provides additional support for a decision to reject the permit application at issue.

In a study conducted by Andrea M. Teti, Inc., (report dated Feb. 2007) regarding red-bellied turtles, it was found that "suitable aquatic habitat was found throughout the Delaware River frontage of the site (i.e., Delaware River and pier channels)." A large number of basking structures and quiet waters where float-basking could occur were observed. The piers observed could also provide for hibernation. Red-bellied turtles were found upstream and downstream of the project area. The report found that the land portion of the site, currently, only has one relatively small area suitable for red bellied turtle habitat. This is significant, because while the soil is currently too hard to be suitable for nesting for the turtles, it seems clear that with some restoration effort, this site could become suitable for nesting. The red bellied turtle is a state threatened species and therefore entitled to a greater level of protection. Development of this site, including the on land development, as well as the open water development, including removal of piers, will have a direct and immediate harmful affect on the turtles, removing habitat and preventing creation of additional, suitable nesting habitat. In addition, the cumulative impact of this development with future proposed development will dramatically magnify this harm. Andrea M. Teti, Inc. recommends a Phase II Survey. If this permit application is to continue forward for consideration, it is critical that this Phase II Survey be conducted and provided before any final decisionmaking.

In previous application materials before state and City bodies, the applicant has asserted that river current patterns in the reach of the river to be impacted by the project "do not appear substantially material to the project." The habitat that runs along the edge of streams and rivers is important ecologically and the flow patterns associated with them are important, particularly when open water work is proposed that could/would alter the flow, shape and value of those areas. Genuine consideration of the alteration to flow and current patterns is necessary.

According to documents on the record, the proposed location is in close proximity to bald eagles nesting on and around Petty's Island and Pennsauken. The impact of the proposal on this particular nesting pair was not discussed or even referenced. It is an important element that needs to be considered - both individually and cumulatively with other developments proposed for this reach of the river.

It is interesting how Sugarhouse is so dismissive of the value of the vegetation that existed on the site prior to their clearcutting activities, and yet is so quick to tout the values of the few sparse trees it is proposing to line its artificial river access walk.

The mitigation plan being proposed is wholly inappropriate and unsatisfactory. Removal of fill and structures, legal or illegal, that are no longer in need or use is something that can and should be done as part of good practice on the river and could be undertaken and funded via a number of other means, including the use of public or grant funding programs becoming increasingly available for such efforts. Removal of a small portion of previous illegal fill as a means of mitigation to allow for new fill in the river is of particular concern - we should not allow the rectification of past illegal conduct to be used as an excuse to do additional, present day harm to our river and ecological resources. The upriver wetlands project, while perhaps desirable, should not be used as an excuse to do harm in a reach of the river that has already suffered tremendous harm and habitat loss. In addition, it is bad policy to allow mitigation to be used as a means of actually filling in our Delaware River. This reach of the river is severely impacted by multiple uses and much development, the habitat that is being harmed is needed here, at the location where it exists, undertaking mitigation elsewhere in the river where habitat is more plentiful is by no means equivalent.

The Delaware has already been severely impacted by legal and illegal fill projects, it is simply beyond reason that we would continue to allow projects that are actually filling in our river - doing ecological harm, introducing increased pollution into the vital drinking water supply, further filling and obstructing both the floodplain and natural river flows

This project as proposed will adversely impact archaeological, historical and cultural resources.

The project will not enhance Penn Treaty park as asserted by the applicant. A massive building situated in close proximity to this currently open community area will become a shadow, an overlooking giant, that overshadows and destroys the character of the park and the now gentle access it provides to the Delaware River.

In addition there are clearly prehistoric, historic and cultural history to be preserved on this site.

The Delaware Riverkeeper Network believes that the applicant, its experts and the Army Corps have been provided with a variety of historic maps that would/should allow a better and more definitive articulation of the historic edge of the Delaware River, the evolution and historic impacts that historic fill and build projects have had on the Delaware River itself as well as both up and downstream communities, and the relative location of archaeological, prehistoric and historic finds (or potential finds) in proximity to the historic water's edge.

We believe that a very defined and successful articulation of the historic water's edge and floodplain is of archaeological, prehistoric, historic and ecological value and believe that there should be a more defined identification and discussion of the historic rivers edge and associated floodplain, and the implications of prehistoric and historic fill and build activities on the river itself, its flows, its ecological integrity and changes, and the community around.

Particularly, we think it is critical that the process closely identify the historic, natural edge of the Delaware River and conduct an assessment of the river and community ramifications of the repeated fill activities that have taken place over time.

The level of fill that has already been documented as part of this process argues strongly against approving the project as proposed and all of the river filling, dredging and bulkheading it requires - too much of the river has already been filled at this site, there should be no more.

The project as proposed will harm recreational, aesthetic, social and quality of life benefits now provided by the Delaware River.

When I travel the Philadelphia reach of the Delaware River, monitoring the health of the river and potential threats to its quality and restoration, I see individuals of all ages reaching out to the river, finding those last remaining areas of natural green and spending their time there fishing, swimming and enjoying the beauty and nature of the river. The old piers that nature has been reclaiming are also being reclaimed by the community for purposes of this river connection. This project will further distance the community from the river, removing recreational opportunities the community has self-created, and setting a precedent of community eviction from the banks of the river for recreational uses such as fishing, swimming and relaxing by the waterside.

A big deal is being made of the "public access" this project would be providing - 2100 linear feet, 25 to 50 feet wide, that will be built on sheetpiling. Putting people on cement that borders the River and sites above the river is not creating quality public access. Members of the Philadelphia community do not need more cement and do not need more hardened riverfront, they need land that contributes health and habitat to the Delaware River - they need quality access that allows them to relax, fish and access the Delaware directly, to actually touch the water, in a natural, cooling and healing setting. The access that HSP Gaming is proposing is not quality access, it is simply a hardened river view perhaps with a few trees and grass around; it is access that is actually doing harm to the River as opposed to providing healing to the community.

The hardened bank of steel and concrete along with the massive structural overhang being proposed introduces a new eyesore to those that recreate along the river and respect and appreciate the importance and beauty of a naturalized water line. Even the degrading piers present today are aesthetically more pleasing than what is being proposed.

The artificial waterfront access to address the access the casino would otherwise be preventing, securing LEEDS certification which may reduce but will not prevent the environmental (particularly the river) harms created by a massive facility being built on the banks of a river and seeking to actually construct within the river itself, creation of a service program to address the harms the casino's presence will inflict on neighboring communities, security and emergency services for problems originating in its own complex, a role in relocating a combined sewer overflow, i.e. moving a significant pollution problem and source from one location to another, installing a wetlands mitigation program 8 miles from the proposed development, introducing some aquatic vegetation, and removing some illegal fill in order to justify new and more river filling do not mitigate the significant harms this project poses to the river, aquatic communities, or Philadelphia residents.

The proposed project is going to be adjacent to the river's main navigation channel. What consideration has been placed on the impacts of increasing structures on the safe operations of shipping traffic or altered flow patterns that may contribute to additional sedimentation in the channel?

The project as proposed will set precedent which will allow other projects that mimic and magnify ecological harm to the river, aquatic ecosystems and populations.

Allowing dredge and fill projects, including hardened river banks, and installation of fill and structures in what should be the river's natural floodplain, to accommodate structures associated with new development (whether they be new structures or relocation of old structures) sets and solidifies precedent for all new riverfront development, much of which is already anticipated for this reach of the River. The harms that would be introduced by HSP Gaming's proposed activities should not be considered in a vacuum, they must be considered in the context of existing and future development proposed for this same reach of river.

This project includes filling in and burying over 1.4 acres of the Delaware River and aquatic ecosystems. It sets a precedent of embracing and grandfathering in the illegal river filling of the past, denying the opportunity for future restoration. It sets a precedent which allows the removal of illegal fill as a means of justifying new and expanded fill and hardened bank projects.

While the applicant has yet to document the original edge of the River, it has demonstrated that the original river's edge was set back hundreds of feet from where it exists today. We cannot, and should not, perpetuate

the tremendous mistakes of the past by allowing continued perpetuation of these damaging fill projects and exacerbating their harm by allowing for new fill. The filling in of the Delaware River, in the past and present, has resulted in altered flows, changed flood patterns and flood buffering capabilities of the river, lost aquatic habitats and ecosystems, and a loss of the benefits that a natural, vegetated and healthy floodplain would otherwise provide - it has resulted in a level of damage that has never been recorded or assessed. It would be wrong to allow HSP Gaming to use the illegal behaviors and bad practices of the past to justify its destruction of important ecosystems in the present.

A tremendous level of development is proposed for the Philadelphia riverfront, adjacent to, upstream and downstream from the proposed Sugarhouse Casino at issue here. The Army Corps needs to consider the cumulative impacts of all of that development when it considers whether or not to allow the Sugarhouse Casino project to move forward. HSP Gaming is proposing a project which requires removal of vegetation, earth disturbance, filling in sections of the Delaware River, grandfathering existing and illegal fill, construction in and over the open waters of the River, further destruction of the land/water interface and replacing it with additional bulkheading, dredging out sediment from the river (not pre-existing illegal fill, but the actual river bottom itself) and destruction of identified aquatic and potential riverside habitat. If HSP Gaming is allowed to undertake this tremendous level of destruction and damage, it sets the precedent that all other developers are entitled to inflict this level of harm as well. The Army Corps needs to undertake a comprehensive review of all development proposed along the Delaware River in Philadelphia and assess the cumulative impacts as part of its review.

This project also would set and solidify a precedent that would allow overhangs over the open water of the river, creating shading but also being held up by multiple pilings that act as river obstructions for debris. It sets a precedent that an alternatives analysis can be truncated if other approvals have been provided for specific aspects of the proposal unrelated to its actual development or environmental impact. It perpetuates bad precedent that allows ecological destruction in one reach of the river if mitigated, largely, by habitat development miles away.

There are numerous residential development projects planned for the Delaware River including more than 20 new towers containing 5,000 condo units. In addition, there are several industrial and port development proposals moving forward. By reviewing just a few public sources we were able to immediately identify the following development proposals under consideration at various stages for Philadelphia's Riverfront (please note, information marked with * obtained, much of it verbatim, from article by Blanchard, Matt. "Low Down on High Rise Hopes". *Plan Philly*. September 2007):

Front & Richmond (a.k.a. Front & Wildey)*

A 21-story tower tucked between I-95 and the Frankford El on the north side of Richmond Street (1045 N. Front). Project includes 14 townhouses on north side of site, making an L-shape to enclose a street-level courtyard. Includes 138 housing units, 167 parking spaces in garage.

PIER 53 - Penn Treaty Tower*

A 35-story condo tower at southern border of Penn Treaty Park on Pier 53, the former site of Maui Club. Includes 168 condominiums.

Penn's Point*

A narrow condominium tower on the west side of Delaware Avenue at Shackamaxon Street. Includes 67 condos and 94 parking spots in surface lot.

PIER 49 & 50 (a.k.a 1101 North Delaware Ave.)*

Two sizeable high-rise towers on Piers 49 & 50 immediately north of Sugarhouse casino at Shackamaxon Street. Includes 535 housing units and 720 parking spaces with ground-floor retail and marina.

AJAX Metal / JATCO Site*

A 20-story mixed-use tower on Frankford Avenue where it meets Delaware Avenue, between Laurel and Richmond. Initial phase is 200 condominiums with retail at the ground floor.

PIER 40 - River's Edge*

Latest plans call for a 35-story tower at the very end of Pier 40, connected to a small park on the mainland by a bridge. Project is immediately north of Waterfront Square. Includes 266 housing units, 459 parking spots in automated garage at base of tower.

Waterfront Square*

Five towers built around central green space to form a gated condominium community on Piers 36 thru 39, two blocks north of the foot of Spring Garden Street. An eventual total of 936 condominiums.

Trump Tower - Pier 35 ½ *

A 45-story luxury condominium tower perched atop a multi-level parking garage, on the river near the foot of Fairmount Ave. Includes 263 condo units, priced from \$700,000 to 3.6 million, as well as 350 parking spots in garage at base of tower.

Bridgeman's View Tower*

A 66-story condominium tower at Delaware Avenue and Poplar Street complete with a high-end retail "galleria," parking garage, and boutique hotel. Includes 352 condo units starting around \$700,000. Around 94,000 square feet of retail space and 97,000 square feet of office space. Also includes a 177-room hotel and 1,200-car garage.

700 North Delaware (Hoboken Brownstone)*

Four curvilinear residential towers of 40 plus stories on Delaware Avenue one block north of Spring Garden. Back of site slated for 5-story townhouses along Front Street, and 5-story parking garage.

Developer: Hoboken Brownstone Co. (developers Danny Gans and George Vallone). Includes 1,050 condominiums in four towers and about 50 low-rise units built around a parking garage.

World Trade Center, Philadelphia*

A vast office, retail and residential complex on the northwest corner of Delaware Avenue and Callowhill Street. Phase I would include an apartment house with 265 units. Later phases add 3 million square feet of office and retail space, and a 500-room hotel. Total parking: 2,149 spaces.

101 Sky Condos*

A 21-story luxury condominium tower proposed for the north side of Spring Garden Street at Front Street. Includes between 48 and 57 units with spa with a private plaza in rear.

412 Front Street*

A 33-story condominium tower tucked between I-95 and Front Street between Spring Garden and Callowhill streets. Retail planned for first floor. Site has zoning approval for 236 condominium units, as well as 4,000 square feet of retail.

Marina View Tower*

A 30-story condominium tower just north of the Ben Franklin Bridge. Includes 197 condominium units

Liberty Landing (Sheet Metal Worker's Site)*

Four 30+ story towers rising above a semi-circle of townhouses, enclosing a marina, on the Sheet Metal Workers' Union site at 1301 South Columbus Blvd., 26 acres between Washington Avenue and Reed Street. Includes 1,112 apartments in four towers, 168 duplex townhomes and 104 loft apartments, 3,000 parking spaces; 77,800 square feet of retail space; a five-story office building; a 340-room hotel; a marina and paddle-boat area; and two in-ground community swimming pools.

Northern Shipping Site

Now being redeveloped as Independence Point, with 1700 housing units, a hotel, a boat marina, a fitness and wellness center, and retail. \$1.5 million will be spent on bulkhead improvements.

Tacony Army Warehouse

Tacony Army Warehouse site is being redeveloped by Kaplan Communities as Tacony Pointe, with 552 two homes, duplexes, and condos.

Dodge Street Steel

The Dodge Street Steel site has been rezoned for residential use, with 600 condos expected to be developed by First Philadelphia Holding Company.

Tacony Palmyra Bridge- North

Development north of the Tacony Palmyra Bridge is likely to be residential.

Navy Yard property- Expansion

Port expansion project including railroad expansion.

Norfolk Southern Railroad

Planning to add a new intermodal yard to complement the existing railroad yard

Southport Development Project

A proposal by the Philadelphia Regional Port Authority. Includes filling in the Delaware River between Piers 122 and 124 and on a parcel at the east end of the former Philadelphia Navy Yard that is owned by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The proposed fill would involve the placing of up to 2.5 million cubic yards of dredged material in the river between the piers and on the parcel owned by the Commonwealth. The project is intended to accommodate new and expanded construction of port facilities.

Navy Yard Property- Food Distribution Center

Proposed food distribution center at the site may require a new interchange off I-95

DRPA- Headquarters

Proposing to expand a cruise terminal at Pier 1 by building a larger pier and headquarters building.

Philadelphia International Airport

Subject of the Capacity Enhancement Project Environmental Impact Statement. The EIS will study expanding capacity at the airport through alternatives such as lengthening existing runways including into the Delaware River, building a new runway near to the Delaware River, and totally reconfiguring the airport.

Camden Iron and Metal

Intend to relocate manufacturing facility to Bridesburg from Camden.

(Delaware Riverkeeper Network can provide additional details and source materials upon request. Attached is a bit of additional detail on a number of the projects described above.)

The level of proposed development for this reach of the River is intense with each project bringing with it their own dredge, fill, bulkheading and/or discharge requests. The decisions made on the Sugarhouse Casino project need to take into account all of this newly proposed development - both from the perspective of the precedent the decisions made will set, but also in order to consider cumulative environmental and community impacts so we are not piece by piece filling in, dredging out, polluting and destroying our River and damaging the quality of life in our community.

Respectfully submitted,
Maya K. van Rossum
the Delaware Riverkeeper

Attachment

Information below quoted from:

Blanchard, Matt. "Low Down on High Rise Hopes". Plan Philly. September 2007.

FRONT & RICHMOND (a.k.a. Front & Wildey)

Description: A 21-story tower tucked between I-95 and the Frankford El on the north side of Richmond Street (1045 N. Front). Project includes 14 townhouses on north side of site, making an L-shape to enclose a street-level courtyard.

Developers: Larry Cohen & Barry Gutin, the team behind Egypt and Shampoo nightclubs and the Cuba Libre restaurant, with Gianni Pignetti.

Architect: Cecil Baker Assoc.

Stats: 138 housing units, 167 parking spaces in garage.

PIER 53 - PENN TREATY TOWER

Description: A 35-story condo tower at southern border of Penn Treaty Park on Pier 53, the former site of Maui Club.

Developer: CNO Inc. (NCCB Associates) of Philadelphia. Chief operating officer is Steve Labov.

Architect: Bower Lewis Thrower (Jack Thrower)

Stats: 168 condominiums

PENN'S POINT

Description: A narrow condominium tower on the west side of Delaware Avenue at Shackamaxon Street.

Developer: Unknown

Architect: Agoos Lovera

Stats: 67 condos and 94 parking spots in surface lot.

PIER 49 & 50 (a.k.a 1101 North Delaware Ave.)

Description: Two sizeable high-rise towers on Piers 49 & 50 immediately north of Sugarhouse casino at Shackamaxon Street.

Developer: Pescara Property Development.

Architect: Bower Lewis Thrower

Stats: 535 housing units and 720 parking spaces with ground-floor retail and marina.

AJAX METAL / JATCO SITE

Description: A 20-story mixed-use tower on Frankford Avenue where it meets Delaware Avenue, between Laurel and Richmond.

Developer: Unknown

Architect: Tsirantonakis & Associates

Stats: Initial phase is 200 condominiums with retail at the ground floor.

PIER 40 - RIVER'S EDGE

Description: Latest plans call for a 35-story tower at the very end of Pier 40, connected to a small park on the mainland by a bridge. Project is immediately north of Waterfront Square.

Developer: Louis Cicalese / Delaware River Development Corp.

Architect: Bower Lewis Thrower

Stats: 266 housing units, 459 parking spots in automated garage at base of tower.

WATERFRONT SQUARE

Description: Five towers built around central green space to form a gated condominium community on Piers 36 thru 39, two blocks north of the foot of Spring Garden Street.

Developer: Isle of Capri (Artsi Wine)

Architect: Wallace, Roberts & Todd

Stats: An eventual total of 936 condominiums.

TRUMP TOWER - Pier 35 ½

Description: A 45-story luxury condominium tower perched atop a multi-level parking garage, on the river near the foot of Fairmount Ave.

Developer: Multi-Capital Group

Architect: Alesker & Dundon

Stats: 263 condo units, priced from \$700,000 to 3.6 million, as well as 350 parking spots in garage at base of tower.

BRIDGEMAN'S VIEW TOWER

Description: A 66-story condominium tower at Delaware Avenue and Poplar Street complete with a high-end retail "galleria," parking garage, and boutique hotel.

Developer: 2945 LLC (Marc F. Stein & Ryan Roberts)

Architect: Agoos Lovera

Stats: 352 condo units starting around \$700,000. Around 94,000 square feet of retail space and 97,000 square feet of office space. Also includes a 177-room hotel and 1,200-car garage.

700 NORTH DELAWARE (HOBOKEN BROWNSTONE)

Description: Four curvilinear residential towers of 40 plus stories on Delaware Avenue one block north of Spring Garden. Back of site slated for 5-story townhouses along Front Street, and 5-story parking garage.

Developer: Hoboken Brownstone Co. (developers Danny Gans and George Vallone)

Architect: Bower Lewis Thrower

Stats: 1,050 condominiums in four towers and about 50 low-rise units built around a parking garage.

WORLD TRADE CENTER, PHILADELPHIA

Description: A vast office, retail and residential complex on the northwest corner of Delaware Avenue and Callowhill Street.

Developer: Carl Marks Real Estate

Architect: Alesker & Dundon

Stats: Phase I would include an apartment house with 265 units. Later phases add 3 million square feet of office and retail space, and a 500-room hotel. Total parking: 2,149 spaces.

101 SKY CONDOS

Description: A 21-story luxury condominium tower proposed for the north side of Spring Garden Street at Front Street.

Developer: WT Construction & Development

Architect: Zimmer Associates

Stats: Between 48 and 57 units with spa. Private plaza in rear.

412 FRONT STREET

Description: A 33-story condominium tower tucked between I-95 and Front Street between Spring Garden and Callowhill streets. Retail planned for first floor.

Developer: Originally CNO Properties, but site up for auction.

Architect: Undetermined

Stats: Site has zoning approval for 236 condominium units, as well as 4,000 square feet of retail.

MARINA VIEW TOWER

Description: A 30-story condominium tower just north of the Ben Franklin Bridge.

Developer: Delaware River Development Corp. (Louis A. Cicalese)

Architect: not known

Stats: 197 condominium units

LIBERTY LANDING

(Sheet Metal Worker's Site)

Description: Four 30+ story towers rising above a semi-circle of townhouses, enclosing a marina, on the Sheet Metal Workers' Union site at 1301 South Columbus Blvd., 26 acres between Washington Avenue and Reed Street.

Developer: Local 19 of the Sheet Metal Workers International Association in partnership with Allentown developer Mark Mendelson (Hampton Real Estate).

Architect: Burt Hill Kosar Rittelmann Associates

Stats: 1,112 apartments in four towers, 168 duplex townhomes and 104 loft apartments, 3,000 parking spaces; 77,800 square feet of retail space; a five-story office building; a 340-room hotel; a marina and paddle-boat area; and two in-ground community swimming pools.