TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE LINE COMPANY LLC

NORTHEAST SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

APPENDIX M. PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE TO THE NESE PROJECT

NOVEMBER 2026

TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE LINE COMPANY LLC

NORTHEAST SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

APPENDIX M. DEP RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

NOVEMBER 2026

Public Comment Response on the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project

Permanent vs Temporary

Specific Site locations of Concern

Outdated Studies and Incomplete Assessments

Commenters assert the project fails to have sufficient details to determine the overall impacts of the Project and that minimal changes were made to this new application since the prior denial. Commenters assert that the 2025 NESE permit application is not a new project. They note that Transco admitted within its application to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for an expedited reinstatement that the Project is the same with no additional or updated environmental impact study required. (Waetzman – PH) Commenters advocate that if the application is substantially identical, the permit should be denied, again. They ask if the regulations changed, if the economic or community problems that this will cause have been addressed or alleviated, or if the only thing that has changed is the current political climate. (Juro – PH)

RESPONSE: The initial application for the Transcontinental Gas Pipeline – Northeast Supply Enhancement Project (NESE) was received by the Department on June 30, 2018 (PI #0000-01-1001.3 FWW180001, FHA180001, CSW180001, WFD180001, and WFD180002). The Department issued multiple deficiency letters and requests for additional information and revisions to the project. The applicant did not comply with the requests, and the project was denied on June 15, 2019 for failure to demonstrate compliance with multiple rules.

The applicant submitted a revised application to the Department on January 21, 2020 (PI #0000-01-1001.3 LUP200002) incorporating the revisions requested in the initial application. This application was denied on May 15, 2020, for failure to demonstrate that the proposed NESE Project would comply with the Freshwater Wetland Protection Act Rules (FWPA) at N.J.A.C 7:7A. Specifically, the applicant could not demonstrate "compelling public need" as required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.4 in the FWPA since the State of New York had not issued a permit for the pipeline. The denial of the permit under these rules eliminated the project.

While the current NESE application (PI #0000-25-0012.1 LUP2500011) is essentially the same project as was submitted in January of 2020, FERC reissued it's Order Issuing Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity on August 28, 2025, and shortly thereafter the State of New York Public Service Commission (NYSPSC) issued its Order Regarding Long-Term Natural Gas Plan and Requiring Further Actions document. NYSPSC in its conclusion, based on the February 2020, National Grid Long Term Capacity report, agrees that there is a need for more reliable source of supply that the proposed NESE project would provide, should it receive all require approvals. Further, permits for construction of the pipeline were issued by the State of New York on November 7, 2025. Therefore, the project now complies with the requirements at N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.4, demonstrating a compelling public need.

Commenters provided a report entitled "Princeton Hydro's Review of Transco's Northeast Supply Enhancement Project (NESE) NJDEP Permit Application" (2025), that raises concerns regarding lack of sufficient detail to determine the Project related impacts. Issues raised included several site-specific locations for temporary vs permanent impacts, steep slopes, and the location of the horizontal directional drilling (HDD) entry and exit bore pits within wetlands mapped pursuant to the Coastal Wetlands Rules at N.J.A.C. 7:7-2.3 and 9.27. There were also concerns regarding the description of clearing, grading, filling, and excavation pursuant to the Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act rules at N.J.A.C. 7:7A-16.7(a)4ii. During the Department's review of the application, revisions were requested to better delineate the proposed impacts to regulated areas, ensure that all impacts are included in the permit and that compliance with the applicable rules had been met.

Grading Changes

Specific Locations of Concern & Steep Slopes

Commenters assert Transco has not supplied sufficient information regarding grading to comply with NJDEP's rules. Commenters express concern that the Project's construction will sever hydrological connections to wetlands and wetlands transition areas. They express concerns that certain areas proposed for construction are steeply sloping and the slopes will be negatively impacted and create hydrologic issues. Commenters assert Transco improperly categorized changes to steep slopes as temporary impacts when they should be considered permanent. (Miller – PH)

RESPONSE: Disturbances to wetlands and wetland transition areas include both temporary and permanent impacts as described in Transco's FWW application. To the extent practical, Transco will be required via permit condition to restore the right-of-way to pre-existing contours, including steep slopes, in a manner that maintains slope stability and promotes revegetation. These areas will be restored in accordance with the soil and erosion and sediment control plan for the Project and will restore functions and values impacted during construction of the proposed Project.

Areas M.P. 8.7-8.75, M.P. 8.75-8.89 and M.P. 10.05 to 10.19, are located outside the jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone Management rules (N.J.A.C. 7:7). Therefore, the applicant is not required to provide, nor does the Department have the authority to undertake a detailed analysis of steep slopes.

Regarding concerns raised about steep slopes at M.P. 10.85, the area requires clearing of vegetation and regrading of the work space to a level condition to facilitate pipeline installation via open trenching. The proposed pipeline installation at this location will result in 0.211 acres of temporary impacts, 0.040 acres of permanent impacts, and 0.210 acres of additional temporary impacts. As a permit condition, the Department will require that areas experiencing temporary impacts be restored upon completion of work.

In addition, in regard specifically to steep slopes at M.P. 10.85, the Department acknowledges that per the Steep Slope Rule, N.J.A.C. 7:7-9.32(b), development on steep slopes is discouraged where wetlands, wetland buffers, intermittent stream corridors, threatened and

endangered species habitats, riparian zones, or water areas are located adjacent to or at the base of the slope and on steep slopes which are forested as defined at N.J.A.C. 7:7-13.5. However, the definition of "discouraged" provided at N.J.A.C. 7:7-1.5, states "A proposed use of coastal resources is likely to be rejected or denied as the Department has determined that such uses of coastal resources should be deterred. *In cases where the Department considers the proposed use to be in the public interest despites its discouraged status, the Department may permit the use provided that mitigating or compensating measures can be taken so there is a net gain in quality and quantity of the coastal resource of concern.*" (Emphasis added).

Therefore, because the Department has made a determination, based on FERC's Order issuing Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, and the approval of the project by NYSDEC, that the Project is in the public interest, the use may be permitted. In further compliance with the rule, conditions requiring the restoration of temporary impacts are included in the final approval document.

The Project proposes work waterward of wetlands identified on promulgated Coastal Wetlands Map # 588-2106. The coastal wetlands in question are also identified in Appendix D of the CZM rules at N.J.A.C. 7:7. A coastal wetlands permit has been requested to authorize the proposed work waterward of the promulgated Mapped Coastal Wetlands. Eastern Environmental Law Center's (EELC) objection letter indicates that the level of detail provided in relation to the impacts to mapped coastal wetlands are not sufficient to make a positive finding on the proposed impacts. Specifically, it outlines N.J.A.C. 7:7-9.27(c) as rationale. There are no feasible non wetland sites or areas that would not preclude some form of coastal wetland impact to reach the Raritan Bay Loop. Additionally, the lines are being co-located within existing utility right(s)-of-way in this area to further minimize impacts. All proposed work within coastal wetlands will require either vegetation or grading related impacts. All impacts to coastal wetland vegetation and topography will require restoration to preconstruction conditions following installation of the underground pipeline. Restoration of the impacted areas will be under the oversite of the DLRP's Mitigation Unit to ensure compliance with this section.

Public Comment Period & Stakeholdering

Commenters assert the public comment period and stakeholder interactions were insufficient, short, and that the one public hearing was conducted in an electronic format that was difficult for elderly people to participate in. Further, commenters assert that there was a late release of Project plans, which has limited public review. (Miller – PH)

RESPONSE: While the Department acknowledges the public's desire for additional stakeholdering and an extended public comment period with additional hearings, the Department has fulfilled all requirements for the review of the permit, pursuant to the legal and regulatory requirements, such as, but not limited to, the Administrative Procedure Act (N.J.S.A. §52:14B-1 to -31), the Coastal Areas Facility Review Act (N.J.S.A. §13:19-1 et seq.), the Wetlands Act of 1970 (N.J.S.A. §13:9A-1 et seq.), the Waterfront Development Law (N.J.S.A. §12:5-3), the Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act (N.J.S.A. §13:9B-1 et seq.), the Flood Hazard Area Control Act (N.J.S.A. §58:16A-50 et seq.), the Water Quality Planning Act (N.J.S.A. §58:11A-1 et seq.), the Coastal Zone Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:7), the Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act Rules

(N.J.A.C. 7:7A), and the Flood Hazard Area Control Act Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:13). The Department considered each and every public comment it received on this Project prior to rendering its decision.

FERC Certification/Public Need

Commenters assert the Project lacks FERC Certification and approvals. Further, Commenters assert there is no public need for the Project, that New Jersey bears a negative disproportionate risk to benefit ratio, and that the Project constitutes a prolonged commitment to utilize fossil fuels over renewable (carbon light/free) energy. (Wurst, COA – PH) (Mikatis – PH) (Cronheim – PH).

RESPONSE: FERC issued its Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity on August 28, 2025 stating that "Transco has demonstrated a need for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, that the project will not have adverse impacts on existing customers, or existing pipelines and their existing customers, and that it will have minimal impacts on the interests of landowners and surrounding communities" (https://elibrary.ferc.gov/CP17-101-007). The Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP) reviews proposed permits strictly according to the statutory and regulatory requirements over which it has authority. For the permits issued by the DLRP, the review is primarily focused on minimization of impact to the DLRP regulated environmental resources and ensuring that any authorized impact, that is allowable under these regulations, is mitigated for or restored. The Permit requires that the applicant obtain all applicable Federal, State, and local approvals prior to the commencement of the Project. In addition, permits for construction of the pipeline have been issued by the State of New York satisfying the requirement that the project is considered a "compelling public need," allowing the Department to issue this permit.

Stormwater Management Requirements

Outdated Stormwater Assessment

Commenters noted that the compressor station will not meet stormwater requirements because there was no consideration of green infrastructure requirements or compliance with the Inland Flood Protection rules since the old application was submitted in 2020 and the 2025 iteration was not updated. (TWI) Commenters assert that Transco's stormwater assessment, dated 2020, failed to account for changes to the Stormwater rules, such as the Inland Flood Protection Rule, rendering the assessment insufficient.

RESPONSE: The proposed stormwater management design was revised following the initial May 2025 submission as per the request of the DLRP reviewing Engineer to have full compliance with the applicable DLRP regulations. The applicant has incorporated green infrastructure BMPs in the form of small-scale infiltration basins in order to demonstrate compliance with the requirements for stormwater runoff quality, stormwater runoff quantity, and groundwater recharge.

Stormwater Basin

Commenters provided concerns regarding Transco's proposed stormwater basin, stating that the infiltration basin fails to meet New Jersey's Best Management Practices (BMP) Manual. Specifically, commenters note the drainage basin area is 13.5 acres, and that exceeds New Jersey's

2.5-acre max per basin. Additionally, commenters assert Transco only conducted one test pit, highlighting that the NJ BMP Manual Appendix E requires three test pits for the proposed 24,000 square foot stormwater basin and no infiltration test pits were done at location TP-4. Commenters allege that infiltration testing within the infiltration basin's footprint remains inadequate. Commenters assert that Transco severely underestimated stormwater runoff and that the stormwater management basins will not be able to contain the Water Quality Design Storm. (Cuthbert/Weinberger)

RESPONSE: The proposed stormwater management design has been revised following the May 2025 submission as per the request of the DLRP reviewing Engineer to have full compliance with the applicable DLRP regulations. All small-scale infiltration basins proposed have drainage areas of 2.5 acres or less. In addition, the applicant has provided additional soil testing so that the minimum number of test pits required by the Stormwater Management BMP Manual have been provided for each proposed BMP.

Groundwater Calculations

Commenters allege that Transco's groundwater analysis is grossly underestimated, highlighting the bedrock data as being inconsistent, and stating that faulty assumptions of groundwater flow and runoff will lead to negative downstream flooding impacts. Further, commenters advocate that Transco's berm design prevents lateral groundwater flow and is not considered in Transco's engineering mounding or infiltration analysis.

RESPONSE: The applicant has provided sufficient soil testing in order to determine the location(s) and elevation(s) of bedrock and/or seasonal high water table and design the proposed BMPs as appropriate, in accordance with the Stormwater Management BMP Manual. The applicant also conducted groundwater mounding analyses for all proposed infiltration BMPs to demonstrate that no adverse impacts are anticipated due to the construction of the proposed BMPs.

Stormwater, Soil Erosion, and Sediment Control Plans

Commenters assert the Project used incorrect Curve Numbers (CN) and inconsistent proposed ground cover in their stormwater plans and soil erosion and sediment control plans to misrepresent the runoff which will be generated from the expansive proposed staging and laydown areas. (Weinberger)

RESPONSE: The provided CN calculations have been reviewed for consistency with the Stormwater Management BMP Manual and are consistent.

Peak Control Flow Compliance

Commenters assert that Transco failed to demonstrate compliance with the Water Quantity (Peak Flow Control) requirement for both the gravel areas and staging and lay down areas. (Weinberger) (LWVM)

RESPONSE: The Department has determined that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with Stormwater Runoff Quantity for all drainage areas within the proposed project area.

Offshore Impacts

Contaminant and Turbidity Monitoring

Heavy metals
Legacy Contaminants
Raritan Bay Impacts

Commenters note that legacy contaminants such as PCBs and dioxins exist within the seabed of the proposed construction area. Further, commenters assert construction will disturb over 1 million cubic yards of sediment containing such toxins and heavy metal, re-suspending these contaminants and exposing marine life. They assert this resuspension violates NJ Water Quality Standards for total suspended solids (TSS), pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:9B-1.14(d)7, and will affect aquatic migration, clog fish gills, interfere with breeding, and contribute to harmful algal blooms. (Wurst, COA – PH)

Commenters advocate that the Project's proposed use of mixing zones for new discharges of 4,4'-DDE, mercury and PCBs is prohibited. Commenters highlight Transco's 2025 addendum relies on the presumed use of a 500-foot mixing zone and analyzes the potential maximum water column concentration of resuspended contaminants at the edge of that mixing zone. Further, commenters are concerned because the Project's area is essential fish habitat and assert that the proposed mixing zones impermissibly extend into threatened and endangered species habitat and other important biological areas. (EELC; NRDC)

Commenters assert the Project's construction violates New Jersey's Water Quality Standards for total suspended solids (TSS), pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:9B-1.14(d)7 [NRDC]

Commenters raise concerns that the Project will release toxic substances (e.g., PCBs, heavy metals, volatile organic compounds) into the surrounding waterways and wetlands, and state that exceedances of upper-level effects thresholds for heavy metals were detected at multiple locations. (Weinberger)

Commenters express concern over how the Project will negatively impact the Raritan Bay, asserting trenching the Bay to construct the pipeline will resuspend toxic materials and violate New Jersey's water quality standards. (Anbarasan – PH) (Weinberger; LWVM). Further commenters specifically highlighted the Project's use of a chemical, CORRTREAT 15316. (ALS)

Commenters assert that the Project will resuspend heavy metals into the water column and environment nearby the construction area, violating water quality standards. Commenters cite N.J.A.C. 7:9B and N.J.A.C. 7:7-9.36(a)3(b).

RESPONSE: Transco provided a report entitled "*NESE Hydrodynamic & Sediment Transport Modeling*" dated August 2017 that analyzed various methods of dredging and potential TSS turbidity and sediment plumes. An analysis was provided for an open bucket with barge overflow, jet sledding, jet trenching, and HDD. NJDEP asked Transco to provide a more detailed analysis to

compare different methods of bucket dredging and jet equipment. Additionally, NJDEP required an analysis for the methods selected for the pipe installation. Transco provided information on the feasibility of HDD method, mechanical dredging, and jet trenching and provided a modeling analysis of cumulative TSS, distance of TSS plume, production rates, and maximum distance of deposition. The model predicted maximum concentration within a 500-foot mixing zone at a rate of 7,500 cubic feet per hour (cf/hr). Concentrations of arsenic and mercury were below the acute and chronic criteria. However, PCBs were still at high concentrations. Once the model was re-run at a slower operation rate of 4,800 cf/hr and during slack tide, PCB concentrations were under the chronic criteria. Even though criteria do not exist for acute and chronic surface water quality standards for 4,4'DDE, Manganese, Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate and phenanthrene, the report shows that the overall levels of contaminants in the mixing zone decrease with best management practices such as the rate of operation, time and duration of operation, and type of dredging equipment. The modeling analysis indicates that with implementation of best management practices and monitoring, dredging impacts will be minimized.

During construction, turbidity and water quality will be continuously monitored, and if exceedances are detected, operations must be slowed and additional measures implemented to reduce sediment disturbance. Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as using closed environmental buckets, lowering buckets to the trench bottom before release, operating during slack tide, and controlling discharge rates will minimize turbidity and sediment resuspension. Clean backfill will also be used to restore areas to existing grade. Based on the modeling, monitoring, and BMPs in place, any temporary increases in turbidity or contaminant levels are expected to be minimal and will not result in long-term impacts to water quality or aquatic life.

Commenters expressed concerns regarding the use of CORRTREAT 15316.

RESPONSE: According to EPA's Safety Data Sheet, this product is an anticorrosive agent, used in pipelines for internal corrosive protection. While EPA advises that the product must not be released into water without pretreatment, it is only utilized within the pipeline, and not for external use in open waters.

Recreational Uses

Commenters note that the majority of New Jersey's shoreline abutting Raritan Bay is a designated public space. The Harbor itself also serves as a recreational area for public and private boating activities, such as rowing, kayaking, canoeing, and sailing. Recreational and sport fishing are popular activities in the Project area, as is whale watching and scuba diving. The pipeline's workspace would cross through three New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection-designated sport ocean fishing grounds: the Gong Grounds, Tin Can Grounds, and Ambrose Channel Grounds. In 2015, nearly 4.3 million saltwater recreational angler trips took place off the shores of New Jersey. Placement of a pipeline will threaten these areas. (NRDC)

RESPONSE: As is standard practice for all applications that may affect fish or wildlife, the Department coordinated its review with the Division of Fish and Wildlife which provided timing restrictions and notification requirements prior to work so that recreational and commercial

fisheries entities will have notice and can avoid work areas. The restriction and notification requirements have been added as conditions to the approved permit.

Noise impacts

Commenters assert the Project will negatively impact marine life through offshore noise. (Weinberger)

RESPONSE: Transco has analyzed potential impacts to marine mammals and fish from noise generated during offshore construction activities as part of its NEPA process. The analysis regarding marine mammals is included in the draft Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) application previously approved by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Office of Protected Resources (OPR) in June 2019. Transco is in consultation with NOAA OPR regarding the mitigation required under the IHA authorization. These requirements include collision avoidance measures that NOAA OPR deems sufficient and effective. The analysis regarding fish is included in the "Latest Noise Modeling on Fish and Sea Turtles – June 2019 (Northeast Supply Enhancement Project)". NOAA Fisheries reissued the IHA to Transco in the Raritan Bay, New York Bay, and Atlantic Ocean on 9/19/25. Comments received by State authorities with oversight over marine fish and fisheries determine that the project as a whole would not result in long term adverse impacts to marine resources cited within the Coastal Zone Management rules.

Construction Schedule

Commenters assert the Project's shortened construction schedule will mean more vessels in the water; incursion into timing restriction periods; and will contribute to improper sedimentation controls and associated hazards. (Weinberger)

RESPONSE: According to the submitted information, Transco will conduct the offshore dredging activities in accordance with the Management and Regulation of Dredging Activities and Dredged Material in New Jersey's Tidal Waters, set forth in Appendix G of the Coastal Zone Management Rules, N.J.A.C. 7:7. The Department has reviewed Transco's Sediment Analysis and has determined that Transco will be implementing Best Management Practices (BMPs) and has demonstrated that, through use of these BMPs, contaminants introduced into the water column during construction will not have an adverse impact on water quality. The permit also includes timing restrictions to minimize impacts to protected species. Transco will be obligated to adhere to those timing restrictions. Any deviation from these requirements would have to be reviewed and approved by the Department on a case-by-case basis.

Higgins Farm Access Road

Additional Wetlands

Commenters assert the Project will negatively impact wetlands north of the Higgins Farm Access Road.

RESPONSE: During the Department's review, a site inspection was conducted on October 3, 2025 to verify and modify the limits of wetlands on the compressor station site and the Higgins Farm access road. Based on those inspections and the approved plans, there are no wetland impacts associated with the access road. The permit authorizes minor impacts to transition area to upgrade the existing road for use by construction vehicles. Stormwater management will be provided for the road. The Department does not anticipate negative impacts on the wetlands adjacent to the Higgins Farm Access Road.

Post-Approval Modification

Commenters submit that Transco's wetland delineation is incomplete and inconsistent. Specifically, commenters point to critical wetlands near the Higgins Farm site being omitted from the maps, which commenters express makes it impossible to determine the true nature and extent of wetlands/water impacts. Additionally, commenters express concerns that additional impacts may occur, specifically modifications to the proposed access road, after the Project is approved. (Miller PH)

RESPONSE: A site visit was conducted on October 3, 2025, and the wetland line on site was modified to reflect the findings of the site visit. Therefore, the wetland delineation has been confirmed, and the Department is aware of all wetland locations in the vicinity of the compressor station development. Any potential future modification to the Higgins Farm Access road would be subject to review by the Department for compliance with the applicable wetlands and flood hazard standards, including an evaluation as to whether the new impacts are warranted based on an alternative analysis for any modified individual permit application.

Farmland Preservation

Commenters assert a portion of the proposed access road is subject to a federal agricultural easement.

RESPONSE: The assertion that a portion of the proposed access road is subject to a Federal Agricultural Easement is correct. However, Transco/Williams possesses the authority to exercise eminent domain under the federal Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717 *et seq,* and condemn a portion of the property for access into the compressor station site and stated its intent to do so if required.

EPA Superfund Site

Comment: Part of the Raritan Bay Loop would go through the Raritan Bay Slag Superfund Site. (Weinberger), The access road into CS206 site is located within the Higgin's Farm Superfund Site.

Comment: The Compressor Station is located near the Higgins Farm, which is a National Priorities List Superfund site where groundwater contamination is a concern as significant construction activities in this area will exacerbate the existing groundwater contamination. (Spiller – PH)

RESPONSE: Concerns about the pipeline's proximity to EPA Superfund sites have been addressed through coordination between the agencies and adherence to regulatory requirements. The pipeline route and associated dredging activities are located outside the designated remedial

areas identified in the EPA's Record of Decision for the Superfund site. All dredged and excavated materials have been properly characterized through sampling and will be transported to approved upland disposal facilities. Clean material will be used for backfilling. The project will be overseen by a Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) in accordance with NJDEP regulations to ensure proper management of any contaminated material encountered. Access agreements between the agencies will allow continued sampling and remediation activities as needed. Based on these measures, the project complies with applicable environmental and remediation requirements and is not expected to interfere with ongoing or future cleanup efforts. The DLRP determined that the proposed access road into the CS206 site, while situated within the Higgins Farm Superfund site, will not require excavation or disturbance to the superfund site. EPA has not stated any objections to the use of the Higgins Farm access road for the compressor station.

Forest Impact

Commenters express concern surrounding the Project's impact to New Jersey's forests, advocating the Project will remove 16.6 acres of forest land (Cuthbert)

RESPONSE: Assuming that commenters are referring to the removal of forest land in proximity to the compressor station site, impacts associated with forest removal within regulated areas have been reviewed for compliance with applicable State standards. Forest areas outside of regulated areas are outside the review authority and jurisdiction of the DLRP and, therefore, are beyond the scope of this review or comment.

Horizontal Directional Drilling

Inadvertent Discharges, Leaks, and Spills

Commenters express concern about Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) failures and assert that the technology will eventually cause inadvertent, environmentally damaging discharges.

Commenters assert that the project's onshore pipeline construction will release fluids which could impair nearby wetlands. Specifically, commenters are concerned that horizontal directional drilling (HDD), which has the highest likelihood of fluid releases, would impact the Madison Loop's wetlands. Further, commenters note that one HDD entry point at Milepost 11.48 is an exceptional resource value wetland within 30 feet of a tidal stream. (Brill – PH)
RESPONSE: Transco prepared a document entitled "Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC, Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, Environmental Report, Appendix G. Onshore and Offshore HDD Contingency Plans (Formerly Appendix J)" which has been reviewed by the Department in consultation with the New Jersey Geological Service (NJGS). The Department is requiring conditions to the Permit to ensure that special care is taken during HDD activities, that all drilling fluids, additives, grouts, and stabilization materials must be certified for use in drinking water (National Sanitation Foundation Standard 60/61), and that every entrance and exit end of completed boreholes are grouted within the upper twenty-five feet of the vertical soil profile and extend the entire distance of the pipeline within this soil layer.

Toxic Sediment Deposition

Commenters assert that HDD will cause toxic sediment to be deposited onshore during high tide or storm surges (Thompson – PH).

RESPONSE: Turbidity controls in concert with BMPs to minimize turbidity and suspension of sediments will be employed during construction as per a condition of the permit. Monitoring of turbidity levels will also be required to ensure that turbidity levels are minimized. Therefore, any suspended sediment will be controlled within the vicinity of installation and should not be transported to other areas. Transco's Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) must also oversee the management of contamination encountered during the project.

Emergency Failure Plan

Commenters assert the Project fails to have an emergency HDD failure plan in place that meets the Department's standards. (Weinberger; League of Women Voters of Monmouth County (LWVM)

RESPONSE: The Department has gained extensive experience reviewing the outcomes of horizontal directional drilling and acknowledges the commenters concerns regarding the potential to negatively affect environmental resources when such techniques are used. Although horizontal directional drilling construction methods are often preferable to open trenching with respect to protecting above-ground resources due to a lesser footprint of ground disturbance, the Department has determined, based upon its experiences with these activities, that more extensive review and monitoring are necessary. As such, the Department has appended several conditions to the permit to ensure the safest outcome. Specific conditions require the permittee to use potable water when drilling, use NSF 60/61 certified drilling fluids and additives to conduct drilling operations, and submit a contingency plan that details processes for minimizing environmental degradation in case of a failure during drilling operations, including an "inadvertent return" scenario. The permittee must additionally fill all abandoned boreholes, including portions that are within 25 feet of the surface, with grouts approved by the New Jersey State Well Drillers and Pump Installers Examining and Advisory Board. Due to the proximity to wetlands and other waters, the Department is requiring the use of potable water during drilling to ensure that if an inadvertent return or other accident does occur, the drilling water will not contaminate the wetlands or waterway. Further, since very few of the drilling fluids and additives used by the drilling industry meet New Jersey safety standards for working near wetlands or waters, the use of NSF certified materials ensures that the pipeline installers are aware of, and follow, all New Jersey standards.

Air Quality

Air Pollution

Pollutants and "Blowdowns"

Greenhouse Gas

Health Effects

Commenters assert the compressor station's operation would contribute to "blowdowns," or releases of methane and methyl mercaptan. (Lisi)

Commenters assert that the Project would allow for air quality impacts including direct carbon emissions and methane leaks (COA).

Commenters express concern about air quality impacts: the concentration of air impacts (Kramer – PH, Uddin – PH); the impact of toxic plumes to the surrounding area and beyond, impacts to farms and golf courses; viability of schools and businesses within a nearby radius (Chakvaborty – PH); the Hazardous Air Pollutants emissions from each of the two Mars 100 turbines exceed reporting thresholds for formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, acrolein, benzene, ethylbenzene, naphthalene, and propylene oxide pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:27-17.9; and the Project will emit volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, and high quantities of particulate matter (PM 2.5) which can cause negative health impacts.

Commenters assert that providing emissions reduction credits is an untenable solution because they advocate it permissively allows the pollution of a local community if Transco purchases credits to offset emissions elsewhere (Spiler – PH)

Commenters assert that the Project's anticipated air impacts will increase the risk of stroke, dementia, Parkinson's disease, and developmental delays in children (Kramer – PH, Uddin - PH). Further, commenters contend that the lowest most smokestacks will emit 26 pounds of benzene each year and the toxic chemicals and particulate matter emitted will affect the lungs and cause neurological damage, especially in children, seniors, and pregnant women. (Chakvaborty – PH) Commenters raise concerns about negative potential health impacts over the lifetime of the Project.

Commenters assert that the Project will contribute to acid rain, that acid rain will increase the ratio of toxic metals in the water which can affect plants and farms, and that residents will need to rely on bottled water for drinking water. (Chakvaborty – PH) (Weinberger)

RESPONSE: Several commenters expressed concerns regarding air emissions, the potential environmental, health and safety impacts associated with those emissions, and the potential use of emission credits to offset air impacts. Compliance with air quality standards are issues to be addressed by the Bureau of Stationary Sources within the NJDEP Division of Air Quality and Radiation Protection. Additionally, the Bureau of Evaluation and Planning (within the Division of Air Quality) conducted a refined risk assessment for the compressor station to address health risks. The assessment can be found under the Program Interest #36396, Permit activity #PCP 240001. Therefore, air emissions and the use of emissions credits to offset emissions resulting from the compressor station are not review criteria for evaluation for the land use permit applications described herein. The permit will be conditioned that appropriate air permits are received prior to the start of construction

NJDEP's Legal Authority

Preemption

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Authority

Commenters assert that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) Authority under the National Gas Act (NGA) does not preempt New Jersey's Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act (FWPA) Authority and that the Department has the authority and duty to deny the Project's Water Quality Certification. (EELC)

Commenters assert that New Jersey's Flood Hazard Area Control Act (FHACA) and Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act (FWPA) based laws are appropriately incorporated into the Federal Water Quality Certification and are not preempted. (EELC)

RESPONSE: The Department has reviewed the Project and determined it complies with the provisions of the FWPA and FHACA, as well as their respective rules. The review of the project in accordance with the State rule criteria also informs the assessment of compliance with Federal Water Quality Certification requirements. Thus, if an application satisfies all State permit review standards, it also satisfies Federal Water Quality Certification requirements for New Jersey.

Public Interest and Individual Permit Requirements

Practicable Alternative Analysis

Commenters believe that the application fails to demonstrate that there is no practicable alternative with less environmental harm. (EELC/ALS) They contend that for the compressor station, the applicant failed to evaluate the possibility of obtaining several sites which could be combined to avoid wetland impacts (Watershed Institute-TWI)

Similarly, commenters contend that the applicant failed to satisfy the three-pronged rebuttable presumption for a Freshwater wetlands permit, namely that: (1) the Project's basic purpose cannot reasonably be achieved at an alternative site in the region that would avoid or reduce harm to aquatic ecosystems; (2) reducing the Project's size, scope, configuration, or density—or adopting alternative designs—would not fulfill the Project's fundamental purpose; and (3) where alternatives have been rejected due to constraints like zoning, infrastructure, or parcel size, the applicant has made reasonable efforts to address those constraints. (EELC) (Weinberger)

RESPONSE: To satisfy the regulatory requirements set forth by the New Jersey Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act Rules, Transco used a multi-tiered approach to identify the most suitable site for Compressor Station 206. The siting criteria consisted of engineering constraints, site availability, and natural resources. Transco undertook an exhaustive study to identify and evaluate potential compressor station locations. In accordance with the definitions outlined at N.J.A.C. 7:7A-1.3 and rules outlined at N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.2 and N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.3, alternatives were identified as practicable when available and capable of being carried out after taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes. Transco considered alternative sites practicable that were not owned by Transco, but which could reasonably have been or be obtained, utilized, expanded, or managed in order to fulfill the basic purpose of the proposed activity. Based on these criteria, Transco selected the most practicable alternative site with the least impacts to wetlands, pursuant to the Freshwater Wetlands Protection

Act. Upon completion of the alternatives analysis summarized above and described in detail in Transco's Alternatives Analysis for the Project, Transco acquired the selected site.

The Department requested that Transco investigate the possibility of combining adjacent sites that were rejected from consideration under the alternative analysis for not meeting the selected siting criteria. Transco applied the same temporary and permanent work space requirements for Sites 8 and 27 combined. To the extent practicable Transco attempted to site Compressor Station 206 footprint onto site 8 and 27 in such a way that would avoid open water impacts and minimize impacts to wetlands and transition areas to the extent practicable. Transco found, and the Department agreed, that no configuration of the expected permanent and temporary work space for CS206 would result is less impacts to open waters, wetlands, and transition areas when compared to the preferred alternative Site 3. This can be demonstrated by the wetland information provided for both sites showing the presence of regulated areas on significant portions of the respective sites.

As detailed in Transco's June 2025 Freshwater Wetlands Individual Permit Application, Transco also evaluated avoidance and minimization measures at individual wetland, waterbody, and transition area crossings at the compressor station site and along the Madison Loop and accordingly reduced workspaces to the maximum extent practicable to minimize and avoid wetland buffer and wetland impacts.

Mitigation

Commenters assert the Project has inadequate mitigation measures. (ALS)

RESPONSE: While in some cases, proposed mitigation is submitted with a permit application, mitigation for impacts to freshwater wetlands, coastal wetlands, and riparian zones is only required after a permit is issued. Thus, review and approval of proposed mitigation is ongoing. Mitigation must be performed using ratios specific to the type of resources disturbed and the approved mitigation method. For example, if the applicant proposes to enhance a wetland area, they will be required to enhance an area that is three times larger than the impact area—in other words enhance wetlands at a 3:1 ratio. The final approved mitigation plan(s) may be different from that submitted in the initial permit application.

Public Interest Threshold

Commenters assert the Project fails to demonstrate that it is in the public interest or in the interest of New Jersey residents. (EELC; COA; PECC)

RESPONSE: FERC reissued its Order Issuing Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity on August 28, 2025, and shortly thereafter the State of New York Public Service Commission (NYSPSC) issued its Order Regarding Long-Term Natural Gas Plan and Requiring Further Actions document on September 18, 2025. In its conclusion, based on the February 2020, National Grid Long Term Capacity report, NYSPSC agrees that there is a need for a more reliable source of supply that the proposed NESE project would provide and concluded that the project would materially improve the reliability and resilience of the gas system for all system users, should it receive all require approvals. The permits for construction of the pipeline have been

issued by the State of New York on November 7, 2025. Therefore, the project now complies with the requirements at N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.4, demonstrating a compelling public need.

Threatened and Endangered Species / Impacts on Wildlife

Barred Owl Habitat

Commenters express concerns that the new application does not address survey of nest trees to be sure they are not being removed to result in a negative impact on barred owls. (Wander)

RESPONSE: The Project will not impact any critical barred owl habitat. As an initial screening measure to identify threatened and endangered species near the Project workspaces, Transco was required to assess state and federal databases and to report its findings to the Department. Transco's June 2019 Freshwater Wetlands Individual Permit Application contained the outcome of this assessment and stated that there were no state-listed threatened or endangered species identified during this screening process.

In March 2019, a neighboring landowner reported hearing a barred owl in 2018, in the wooded area adjacent to the proposed compressor station. In May 2019, NJDEP accepted this report, prompting reclassification of the wetlands at the Compressor Station 206 site from intermediate to exceptional resource value. Subsequently, NJDEP biologists conducted an inspection of the proposed compressor station site and contiguous forested area on April 4, 2019. During their site visit, NJDEP identified a single tree that was large enough (that is, greater than 20 inches diameter at breast height) and contained a cavity which had an opening of sufficient size to support barred owls. However, this tree is located outside the limits of disturbance. Thus, it will not be cleared or impacted during construction of the Project. There were no other trees on the site which could support barred owl nesting. As a result, despite the fact that the area was classified as exceptional resource value, NJDEP concluded that construction of the compressor station would not impact any critical nesting habitat for the barred owl, but the site might provide suitable foraging habitat.

Transco applied the methodology used by New Jersey Landscape Project to identify the area of potentially suitable habitat. In Appendix V of the New Jersey Landscape Project, Version 3.3, 20 different Land Use / Land Classification types have been identified as potentially suitable habitat for the barred owl. Additionally, the appendix notes that the patches should be contiguous as barred owls tend to reside in larger forest patches. The Landscape Project also identifies upland forest types as potentially suitable habitat. Using these methods, Transco determined that the total contiguous area of potentially suitable barred owl habitat surrounding the Compressor Station 206 site is more than 800 acres. Because the Project will impact a small percentage of this potentially suitable barred owl habitat, it should not have a negative impact on the suitability of the remaining contiguous area. The forest in which the barred owl was reported is already highly fragmented, with several existing openings in the vicinity of the site. As is visible in aerial photography of the site, the central portion of the proposed Project footprint contains a clearing from a former homestead, and there is an open field south of and adjacent to the eastern end of the access road. On April 4, 2019, NJDEP biologists indicated that these areas would not

be suitable habitat for barred owls. There are also existing clearings east and north of the site from existing pipeline rights-of-way.

Finally, Compressor Station 206 includes measures, such as directional lighting and sound-attenuating insulation, which will minimize disturbance to wildlife. Additionally, human and vehicle activity associated with the operation and maintenance of the site are not expected to have a significant impact on the barred owl since they are consistent with activities on the surrounding residential, commercial, and industrial properties.

Impacts to Marine Mammals: Humpback Whale, Minke Whale, Bottlenose Dolphin, Harbor Porpoise, and Grey Seal (COA)

Impacts to Atlantic Sturgeon;

Impacts to Sea Turtles (ALS)

Impacts to Bald Eagles and American Kestrel

Impacts to Critical Wildlife Habitat

Salt Marsh Sparrow

Commenters express concerns that the project can have adverse impacts on marine and land-based species.

RESPONSE: The Department's Endangered and Threatened Species Unit (ETSU) reviewed the project in consultation with the NJDEP Division of Fish and Wildlife and determined that, with adherence to certain conditions, including specific timing restrictions that will be included in the permit, the project will not pose an adverse impact to endangered and threatened species or critical wildlife habitat. The Department's jurisdiction on species protection is limited to those that are threatened or endangered. It should be noted that project impacts on marine mammals and Federally protected species were evaluated during the NEPA and FERC processes. The permit will be conditioned that the permittee shall adhere to the requirements of the Incidental Harassment Authorization permitted by NOAA on September 19, 2025, which outlines the required mitigation measures, monitoring requirements and reporting protocols to minimize potential impacts to marine mammals. The permit will also be conditioned on receiving any other required Federal approvals prior to construction so any Federal requirements for the protection of these species shall be required.

Vernal Pools

Commenters assert the Project will negatively impact vernal pools, at the compressor station facility site, specifically the access road and tie-in/suction and discharge pipeline. (Cuthbert/Wander)

RESPONSE: NJDEP visited the site to validate survey results provided by Transco for wetlands and waterbodies since 2016. No vernal pools have been documented on the Compressor Station

206 site during any of these surveys or site visits. Therefore, the Department affirms that no vernal pools will be impacted by construction of the compressor station. In addition, review by Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP) threatened and endangered species staff provided conditions to be appended to the permit, preventing work within ponded areas between February 15 and July 31 of each year. If work is required during the timing restriction period within a ponded area, the conditions require additional surveying by a qualified herpetologist , with the results of the survey provided to DLRP staff for review. No work is permitted until such time that survey has been reviewed and guidance provided to Transco.

Shellfish Habitat /Surf Clam

Commenters assert that turbidity has adverse effects on hard clams, a species that dwells throughout the Project area. Commenters express concern that the additional sediment in suspension due to the Project could increase hard clam larvae mortality after exposure to suspended sediment concentrations of 750 ppm. Commenters highlight the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the pipeline, specifically that pelagic species (fish that inhabit the water column, as opposed to dwelling near the bottom or the shore) are even more sensitive to turbidity, as are fish eggs and larvae. Commenters advocate that Transco's most updated hydrodynamic modeling—submitted for the first time with its 2020 Application (Appendix I in the 2025 Application) only provides restricted areas for relay and depuration, and issues permits that allow the harvest of surf clam for bait purposes in the waters crossed to the north of Sandy Hook. N.J.A.C. §7:9B-1.14(d)(7). Commenters express concern that Transco has attempted to substitute one measurement for the other, and that these two measurements are not easy to compare or convert. As Transco acknowledges, "the model used for the Project was designed to simulate and compute TSS concentrations and deposition and therefore does not predict levels of turbidity." Commenters conclude by remarking that it is impossible without more site-specific sampling to determine how Transco's modeling could be used to accurately determine compliance with New Jersey turbidity standards. (NRDC)

Commenters raise concerns that the Project will negatively impact surf clam habitat, principally by increasing mortality rates through higher turbidity/sedimentation.

RESPONSE: Pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Rules at N.J.A.C. 7:7-9.2(b), an area contaminated by toxins and on the List of Water Quality Limited Segments (the 303(d) list) is excluded from the definition of shellfish habitat. As part of its permit application, Transco was required to review the current 303(d) list to determine the shellfish status of the proposed project area and to provide the results of its review as part of the application. Upon review of the application, the Department concurs with Transco's determination that, given the designation of the areas crossed by the Raritan Bay Loop on New Jersey's 303(d) list, this area is not regulated as hard clam habitat and there will be no impact to shellfish habitat. DLRP also consulted with the Department's Marine Resources Administration (MRA) during review of the application for impacts to surf clam habitat. MRA determined that the Project's sedimentation rates are anticipated to be within surf clam tolerance, the impacts to the habitat are temporary and will return to baseline conditions within one to three years. Therefore, the project will not result in destruction, condemnation or contamination of surf clam habitat.

Horseshoe Crabs

Commenters assert the Project would negatively impact horseshoe crabs and the species food web that feed the crabs. (NRDC)

RESPONSE: In its application, Transco acknowledges the potential for Project-related impact on horseshoe crab populations. To address these concerns, Transco will be required to follow construction BMPs and will avoid disturbance of the intertidal zone and nearshore area in New Jersey waters between Mile Post (MP) 12.1 and MP 12.5 by using the horizontal direction drilling (HDD) method (FEIS 4.5.2.8). Transco was also required to, and has provided sediment modeling results that indicate construction-related total suspended solids (TSS) concentrations will not exceed 50 milligrams per liter (mg/L) above ambient more than 328 feet from the HDD pit at MP 12.5, and associated deposition will not exceed 0.3 cm (0.12 inch) more than 102 feet from the HDD pit at MP 12.5 (See Appendix F-3 to Transco's Supplement to the Waterfront Development Permit application, dated June 28, 2019. Juvenile and adult horseshoe crab are relatively mobile and would likely temporarily vacate turbid areas that cause them discomfort or stress (FEIS 4.5.2.8). The Department concurs with this assessment. Further, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has concurred with the FERC determination that the Project is not likely to adversely affect the red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*) (FEIS 4.6.3.2). Red knots, listed as a threatened species under the Federal Endangered Species Act, depend on horseshoe crab habitats as a critical food source during migration to eat the abundant horseshoe crab eggs that are on sandy beaches.

Essential Fish Habitat:

Commenters express concerns that the Project will negatively impact New York Harbor, which supports more than 200 fish species. These species include fish that migrate between fresh and salt water and marine finfish species of ecological, commercial, and recreational importance. The New York Bight also serves as spawning grounds for many economically important species and as nursery grounds for their early development stages. Of these over 200 fish species, an essential fish habitat is designated for 33 species in the Project area. Additionally, Atlantic sturgeon, shortnose sturgeon, cusk, oceanic whitetip shark—are federally and/or state-listed as threatened or endangered. An additional eight species: alewife, blueback herring, rainbow smelt, Warsaw grouper, cusk, Atlantic bluefin tuna, dusky shark, and sand tiger shark, are listed as "species of concern" by the National Marine Fisheries Service, and three of these (Atlantic bluefin tuna, dusky shark, and sand tiger shark) are amongst those that have a designated essential fish habitat within or in the Project's vicinity. (NRDC; Menhaden Defenders) (Jersey Coast Anglers Association) (JCAA; ALS)

Thermal Discharge

Commenters are concerned that construction activities will create thermal discharges. Commenters are wary because several marine species are sensitive to water temperature fluctuations, e.g., Atlantic Cod and Winter Flounder eggs. Commenters assert that the Project's construction barges large machines, such as drilling equipment, will likely raise temperatures in waters proximate to such species.

RESPONSE: In its application, Transco acknowledges the potential for Project impacts on fisheries resources, particularly River Herring, Atlantic Sturgeon, and Winter Flounder. The Division, in consultation with the Division of Fish and Wildlife and Marine Resources Administration (MRA) reviewed the application for potential impacts to fishery resources and determined that the project will not have an adverse impact provided certain conditions are implemented. Transco will be required to observe specific timing restrictions for in-water work. In addition, Transco will utilize specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction to minimize turbidity and water quality impacts. Transco is also being required to adhere to a water quality monitoring plan to further minimize the potential of impacts to aquatic species. It should also be noted that the project was reviewed and approved by NOAA and National Marine Fisheries Service during the NEPA/FERC processes for potential impacts to aquatic species.

Transco's Tidelands Instrument

Tideland's Grants/License

Commenters state that Transco does not have a grant or license to perform any NESE-related activities on Tidelands. (EELC)

RESPONSE: It is the Department's practice that if a project requires a Tidelands Instrument that has not yet been applied for by the permittee, the instrument may be applied for after the permit is issued. Construction in the Tidelands claim area cannot proceed until the instrument has been obtained. The Department will include a condition to the approved permit requiring the permittee to secure a Tidelands Instrument for the Madison and Raritan Loops.

Environmental Justice

Commenters advocate that the proposed pipeline was intended to be constructed within low-income, aging, and working-class areas only, which they assert is classist, ageist, purposeful, and a clear example of environmental racism and ageism, contrary to the State's environmental justice laws. (Peters – PH) (Anbarasan, Powell – PH; LVM)

RESPONSE: The Department's Division of Air Quality & Radiation Protection - Bureau of Stationary Sources is in the process of reviewing an application for an Air Pollution Control Preconstruction Permit (PCP) (PI #36396 PCP250001) for the construction of the natural gas compressor station, Compressor Station 206. During the review of this application, it was determined that the proposed compressor station and pipeline do not meet the definition of an "environmental justice" type facility (N.J.A.C. 7:1C-1.5) because they do not require a Class V air permit. In addition, the compressor station site itself is not within an overburdened community. The Madison Loop does traverse within areas designated as overburdened communities; however, it does not meet the definition of a "facility" and the Environmental Justice Law does not apply.

Water Quality Impact

Coastal Water Quality

Toxic Emissions

Hydrostatic Testing

Commenter's express concern surrounding the validity, concentration, and sufficiency of the Project's hydrostatic testing.

RESPONSE: Water required for hydrostatic testing will be taken from several sources. Onshore, Transco will primarily utilize fresh water obtained from municipal sources. This may require state or local withdrawal permits. Water may also be obtained via trucking to the site. The offshore portions of the project will utilize water from Raritan Bay. Transco has preliminarily identified 5 locations along the alignment within New Jersey State waters where water will be taken from. Water will not be taken from one concentrated location which will aid in minimizing impacts compared to one isolated intake area. Transco will be responsible for obtaining any required water allocation or discharge permits prior to construction.

Water Quality Management Plan

Commenters assert the Project's draft water quality management plan is insufficient (COA)

RESPONSE: The Department reviewed the project's compliance with the local Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). The only sewage-generating structure is Compressor Station 206 which is not within the sewer service area. Transco proposes a septic system at this site that will handle less than 2,000 gallons per day. Given this anticipated volume of sewage, the project does not require a Treatment Works Approval, and it has been determined that the project is consistent with the WQMP.

Historic Area Remediation Site (HARS)

Commenters expressed concerns that use of the Army Corps' Historic Area Remediation Site (HARS)for this project will take all the remaining capacity "which is needed to sustain the state's navigational and commerce demands." (COA)

RESPONSE: . Transco originally proposed to dispose of some of the dredged material to the HARS. However, NJDEP did not receive final approval or notice from the Army Corps of Engineers that the material is found acceptable to be placed at the HARS site. Based on documentation provided to DLRP, all material is proposed to be accepted by multiple locations in Pennsylvania and Ohio through coordination of Donjon and processed at the Bayshore Recycling Facility in NJ. Should Transco receive acceptance and revises this proposal to take material into HARS, a modification of the Acceptable Use Determination (AUD) must be submitted and authorized by DLRP.

Domestic Water Supply

Commenters express concern the Project will cross under both the Delaware and Raritan Canal and the Millstone River, and any failures could cause severe damage to New Jersey's domestic water supply. (KVAC)

RESPONSE: There is no proposed new crossing of the waterways referenced above. These waterways are in the vicinity of Compressor Station 206. However, the only new pipelines being placed in the vicinity of this site are to connect the compressor station to Transco's existing transmission line on the property. It's possible that existing pipes cross below the referenced waterways further downstream of the site. However, DLRP's review does not include these existing pipes and is only evaluating the impacts of new pipeline on environmental resources.

Wetlands Impacts

Onshore Construction Impacts

Sensitive Wetlands

Coastal Wetlands

Commenters assert the project will negatively impact wetlands, water filtration, and biodiversity. Further, commenters express concern that contamination from leaks and spills will interfere with ongoing monitoring and mitigation efforts. (Blair-Nelson – PH) (Yang – PH)

Commenters assert the impacts to coastal wetlands and habitats are not fully disclosed and that the coastal wetland permit would allow for the destruction of wetlands critical for protection against flooding and storm surges. Commenters further assert that the project does not meet the requirements for a coastal wetlands permit because the proposed pipeline route and new compressor station will cause permanent and temporary damage to acres of State-regulated wetlands that provide a natural buffer against rising water. (Miller, McFarland – PH)

Additionally, commenters assert that pollution emissions from the project will form a toxic layer on the surrounding wetlands and will be discharged from the wetland area during heavy storms and routine stream flows via Heathcote Brook. Commenters allege these discharges will carry toxins into the Millstone River, the major source of drinking water for a million and a half people and floodwater holding capacity. (Cherry – PH)

RESPONSE: The Department reviewed all proposed impacts to both freshwater and coastal wetlands and determined that the impacts were conditionally approvable under the respective regulations. Transco is utilizing various methods of pipeline installation including HDD to minimize impacts on wetlands. Where HDD is not practicable, open cut trench installation is proposed and the permit will be conditioned on the adherence to BMPs to reduce turbidity and any water quality impacts. Following installation, Transco will be required to restore the ground elevation to its pre-construction condition. Transco will be required to utilize marsh matting or similar BMPs to reduce ancillary impacts to wetlands during construction. Provided the conditions of the permit are followed, the Department does not anticipate any loss of wetlands or their functions following construction. The Department does not anticipate that any emissions from the compressor station will have an adverse impact on drinking water. Any emissions from the station will be required to meet all applicable Federal and State air quality standards, and the permit will include a condition to receive the required Department air permits prior to construction.

Transco's Safety Record

Commenters express concern over the veracity of Transco's safety record. Commenters cite specific examples of safety incidents such as a 2013 fire in Williams Compressor Station at Branchburg, the Williams' natural gas plant in Louisiana explosion, explosions at a Louisiana natural gas and chemical plant. (Zhang – PH) Commenters assert the Project would fail to comply with Federal and State standards, citing the State's Natural Gas Pipeline Regulations, N.J.A.C. 14:7.

Commenters express concerns that there is the potential for pipeline leaks into GW/surface waters

RESPONSE: Transco's safety record and the potential for pipeline leaks after construction are not review criteria for the required DLRP permits. FERC has oversight in ensuring that the facilities are designed according to the latest U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) – Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) safety standards and are safely constructed. Once the natural gas is flowing through the new facilities, the USDOT-PHMSA assumes oversight responsibility during the operational life of the pipeline and supporting appurtenances such as compressor stations.

Fire Prevention and Response

Commenters assert fire departments adjacent to and in the nearby areas of the Project are unequipped to handle an emergency such as an explosion. (Leckie – PH) (Plourde – PH) (Marano – PH, Uddin – PH) (COA)

Commenters assert that the Project has insufficient/incomplete emergency access plans.

RESPONSE: While the Department appreciates concerns regarding the ability of fire departments to handle an emergency at a pipeline facility, such issues are not part of the Department's permitting process or review criteria with regard to the permits issued herein. FERC has oversight in ensuring that facilities are designed according to the latest U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) - Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) safety standards and are safely constructed. Once the natural gas is flowing through the new facilities, the USDOT-PHMSA will assume oversight responsibility during the operational life of the pipeline and supporting appurtenances such as compressor stations. For additional general information on fire safety requirements, please see the New Jersey Division of Fire Safety at https://www.nj.gov/dca/dfs/.

Trap Rock Quarry Proximity

Commenters express concern that the Project is being constructed in proximity to a functioning quarry, one in which explosives are frequently used. (COA) (Leckie – PH)

Commenters express concerns that Trap Rock Quarry will be used as a surface water reservoir.

RESPONSE: While the Department appreciates concerns regarding the proximity of the pipeline facility to a functioning quarry, such issues are not part of the DLRP's permitting process or review criteria with regard to the permits issued herein. For additional information on safety requirements at quarries, please refer to the Mine Safety Act and Pits and Quarries Regulations which can be found at https://www.nj.gov/minesafetyact.shtml. Regarding concerns about using the Trap Rock Quarry as a surface water reservoir, there is nothing within the application to the Department proposing such a use.

Miscellaneous

Habitat Destruction

Harmful Algal Blooms (HABS)

Commenters assert the Project's Madison Loop work adjacent to Cheesequake Creek could increase the potential for growth of harmful algal blooms (HABS). They also contend that there are acid producing soils and pyritic clay in the Madison Loop. (Weinberger)

RESPONSE: According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, there are many factors that may contribute to HABs, although how these factors come together to create a 'bloom' of algae is not well understood. The only factor that may be relevant to the project in question relates to stormwater runoff—that is stormwater runoff may contain nutrients that may result in HABs. That said, the project has been reviewed and meets all requirements of the Department's Stormwater Management rules. Regarding acid soils and pyritic clay, there are no requirements within the applicable DLRP rules to address these issues. However, the local Soil Conservation District is responsible for ensuring that acid producing soils are properly handled.

NJ State Development and Redevelopment Plan

Commenter asserts that the Project is inconsistent with the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan because the operation of the project would increase atmospheric greenhouse gas emissions.

RESPONSE: The operable rule related to the State Plan in the review of this project is N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.2(b)12, which states that the Department may only issue a Freshwater Wetlands Individual Permit if the Department determines the project is in the public interest based on seven criteria. The first criteria, relevant to this comment, is: *i) "the public interest in preservation of natural resources and the interest of the property owners in reasonable economic development. In determining whether a proposed activity is in the public interest, the Department shall consider, as one source of guidance, the goals, strategies, policy objectives and policies of the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan..."* Based on this rule, the State Plan is non-determinative guidance to be considered in one factor of a seven-factor evaluation of public interest. The Department acknowledges that burning natural gas, while cleaner than coal or oil, causes greenhouse gas emissions. However, the State Plan has several overarching goals, such as economic development, housing, infrastructure, revitalization of developed areas, and comprehensive planning. DLRP was guided by the State Plan but it was not determinative in its evaluation. The evaluation of all seven factors regarding public interest pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7A-

10.2(b)12 is described in DLRP's Environmental Report. We also note that the delivery of natural gas from the Project to certain regions in New York is anticipated to enable transition of several communities from oil to natural gas.

Noise Pollution

Commenters express concern that the Project's continuous operation will produce excessive noise from its turbines. Commenters cite blowdown events and note they can generate very loud noise for two to three hours at a time, asserting the noise is equivalent to a jet engine. Commenters allege the compressor noise will cause sleep disturbances. (Bhandari – PH) (Uddin – PH; LWVM)

RESPONSE: The Department is requiring as a condition of the Permit that the applicant employ appropriate measures to minimize noise where necessary during construction, as specified in N.J.S.A 13:1G-1 et seq. and N.J.A.C. 7:29. While noise generation associated with standard operations—including, but not limited to, periodic blowdown events—falls outside the regulatory authority and jurisdiction of the DLRP, and therefore lies beyond the scope of its review or comment, an informal review of the technical noise information has nonetheless been conducted for informational purposes.

Noise emissions are anticipated during infrequent venting (blowdown) of natural gas, which may occur during annual emergency shutdown system testing, scheduled maintenance activities, or, in rare circumstances, during an emergency event at the compressor station. To mitigate potential impacts, Transco will install unit blowdown silencers designed to reduce sound levels to approximately 45 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptor, identified as the Meditation Center. It should be noted that blowdown events conducted as part of mandatory annual testing may not be silenced.

Transco stated that while certain blowdown events may be perceptible in the immediate vicinity of the compressor station, such occurrences will be intermittent, short in duration, and attenuate rapidly with distance from the source. Additionally, in nearly all cases, local property owners will receive advance notification prior to any scheduled blowdown activities.

Regulatory Consistency

Commenters assert the Project is inconsistent with other New Jersey regulatory efforts, such as New Jersey Protecting Against Climate Threats (NJPACT) (Donaghy)

RESPONSE: NJPACT is an extensive effort by the Department to amend and update rules to reflect and anticipate the effects of climate change in New Jersey. It is unclear how or why commenters believe that this project is inconsistent. Between 2021 and 2023 there were a series of adopted rules under the NJPACT "umbrella" that dealt with air pollution, greenhouse gases and vehicle emissions. (Go to https://dep.nj.gov/njpact/ and view "Climate Pollution Reduction.") On, July 17, 2023 the Department adopted the Inland Flood Protection rules. By way of the reviews conducted by the Department's Division of Air Quality, and the DLRP, the applicant will be required to comply with all adopted NJPACT rules that apply to the project.

Historic Sites

Commenters express concern that the Project will pass approximately 300 yards from the Rockingham State Historic Site (General George Washington's final Revolutionary War headquarters). (KVAC)

RESPONSE: The application was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). SHPO provided comments on the proposed project on July 24, 2025 and did not note any adverse impacts to the Rockingham site.

Shore Tourism and Ocean Protection (STOP) Act

Commenters assert the Project violates the STOP Act.

RESPONSE: The STOP Act prohibits offshore oil or natural gas exploration, development, and production in state waters, and the leasing of tidal or submerged lands in state waters for those purposes. In addition, the STOP Act prohibits the Department from permitting, approving, or otherwise authorizing any oil or natural gas exploration, development, or production in state waters, and from developing, adopting, or endorsing any plans for the exploration, development, or production of oil and natural gas in state waters. The STOP Act defines "development" to mean "pipeline or infrastructure that transports oil or natural gas from production facilities located in federal waters or other coastal waters in the Atlantic Ocean through New Jersey State waters, and any land-based support facilities for offshore oil or natural gas production facilities located in the Atlantic Ocean."

The STOP Act does not apply to this Project because Transco is not proposing to engage in offshore natural gas exploration, development, or production. The Project would not transport oil or natural gas from production facilities located in federal, state, or coastal state waters, nor would Transco be leasing tidal or submerged lands in state waters for the purposes of oil or natural gas exploration, development, or production. The purpose of the STOP Act is to limit offshore drilling, exploration, and production in New Jersey's waters and because this project does none of those things, it is not applicable to the project.

Climate Change

Climate Change Impact

Commenters assert this project would increase the consumption of fossil fuels, negatively impacting climate change risks. (Kramer – PH)

Fossil Fuel Reliance

Commenters express concern that the project would further increase New Jersey's reliance on fossil fuels.

Regression/Delay to Clean Energy Transition

Commenters assert this Project would delay and/or regress New Jersey's pathway to cleaner energy. Further, commenters express concern the construction of this project would encourage the continued and expanding use of fossil fuels, contrary to New Jersey's energy policy. (Potosnak – PH; Anbarasan – PH; COA; Weinberger; Donaghy)

RESPONSE: The Environmental Defense Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, Earthjustice, and Alliance for a Green Economy filed with the New York Public Service Commission on October 4, 2024 a white paper that addresses how to transition to "non-pipe" energy alternatives. The same paper was submitted as a comment to the Department. Many other commenters also expressed concerns that approving natural gas infrastructure delays the transition to renewable energy sources. While the Department appreciates the commenters' concerns regarding alternative energy and climate change, the DLRP is charged with reviewing submitted permit applications to assess compliance with already-adopted laws and regulations. Major policy decisions, such as switching to alternative energy (in this case "non-pipe alternatives"), or limiting the use of fossil fuels is beyond the scope of the DLRP review. The application was reviewed and approved in accordance with all applicable regulations.

Ramapo Fault Line

Commenters expressed concerns regarding to what extent the Ramapo Fault Line will be impacted by the Project. Specifically, commenters are wary of the Project triggering a seismic event.

RESPONSE: This subject is beyond the scope of the regulations applicable to DLRP's review of the Project. However, the subject of potential seismic events is evaluated and addressed in Transco's Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Religious Practice

Commenters assert the project and associated infrastructure would severely disturb a nearby Buddhist temple and meditation center, infringing on the right to freely practice religion. Commenters express concern the project will disturb and degrade lands used for spiritual practice, meditation and ritualistic ceremonies. Further, commenters express concerns surrounding the freedom to practice religion and would harm indigenous traditions, including those of Lenape people. (Davis – PH) (Kuehnn – PH)

RESPONSE: While the Department appreciates the commenters' concerns, the DLRP is charged with reviewing submitted permit applications to assess compliance with already-adopted laws and regulations. This comment is beyond the scope of the DLRP's review.

Quality of Life and Property Value

Commenters assert the project will result in a decrease in property values, a lower quality of life, and a detraction for local economies surrounding the project. (Uddin – PH) (Chakvaborty – PH)

RESPONSE: While the Department appreciates the commenters' concerns, DLRP is charged with reviewing submitted permit applications to assess compliance with already-adopted laws and regulations. This comment is beyond the scope of DLRP's review.

Cost Benefit Analysis

Commenters assert the Project failed to prove a positive economic cost and benefit balance. (EELC;Weinberger)

RESPONSE: While the Department appreciates the commenters' concerns, the DLRP is charged with reviewing submitted permit applications to assess compliance with already-adopted laws and regulations. This comment is beyond the scope of DLRP's review.

Economic Impact

Commenters assert that the gas industry seeks to transport increasing amounts of natural gas to the New Jersey shore for future LNG exports, with NESE being the first stage. Further, commenters are concerned the project would lead to higher gas costs for everyone, including New Jersey ratepayers. (Cronheim – PH)

RESPONSE: While the Department appreciates the commenters' concerns, the DLRP is charged with reviewing submitted permit applications to assess compliance with already-adopted laws and regulations. The potential that gas will be shipped offshore and concerns about pricing are beyond the scope of this review.

Fishing

Commenters assert the project will have a negative impact on the fishing industry. (Kolias – PH)

RESPONSE: In its review of the application, the DLRP found that the project was consistent with the applicable Coastal Zone Management rules as described in the summary environmental reporting. FERC's January 25, 2019 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) concluded that impacts to fisherman, recreational boaters, and whale-watching businesses would be temporary and minor and would resolve upon completion of construction. The Department reached the same conclusion following consultation with the NJDEP Division of Fish and Wildlife and Marine Resource Administration:

Recreational Impact

Commenters assert the project will negatively impact recreation opportunities in areas adjacent to and within any air pollution impacts of the project. Commenters are concerned the project's construction route will impede, degrade, and otherwise limit commercial and recreational fishing, beach going, recreational boating, diving, kayaking, kite surfing, scenic enjoyment, photography, and wildlife viewing. (SurfRiders)

RESPONSE: FERC's January 25, 2019 FEIS concluded that any impacts on fishermen, recreational boaters, and whale-watching businesses would be temporary and minor and would resolve upon completion of construction. To ensure that any disruption is kept to a minimum, the DLRP is requiring, via permit condition, that Transco provide notice of offshore construction activities and schedules to the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) on a daily basis. Additionally, Transco

will work with the USCG Waterways Management Coordinator to ensure area cruise ports and cruise lines are updated on scheduled construction activities and active construction locations so that routes can be planned accordingly. Transco will utilize horizontal directional drill (HDD) technology when installing the portion of the offshore pipeline route across the Ambrose Channel to further reduce the impacts on recreational and general water-based transit in that area.

TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE LINE COMPANY, LLC

NORTHEAST SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

APPENDIX M. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

NOVEMBER 2026

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC - Northeast Supply Enhancement Project
Response to Public Comments Submitted to NJDEP on Transco's May 2025 Applications by Key Issue Received through September 25, 2025

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
1	Acid-producing soils	Commenters state that Transco failed to identify acid producing soils and associated impacts along the Madison Loop in its applications.	Potential impacts associated with acid-producing soils have been planned for and will be mitigated through Transco's Soil Erosion and Sediment Control (SESC)[1] Plans as approved by the county Soil Conservation Districts. Specifically, Transco has received approved SESC Plans for both the Madison and Raritan Loops from the Freehold Soil Conservation District that address the potential for acid-producing soils and detail the management of such soils, if identified during construction. Detailed information regarding the Acid Producing Soil Control Plan is provided on SESC Sheet 01.
2	Air Quality • Acid rain	Commenter raised concerns about the contribution of emissions to acid rain.	Although the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project (Project) is not subject to the Acid Rain Program, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) noted in its Final General Conformity Determination that, through mitigation of nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions through purchase of ERCs (annual emission reductions in perpetuity) under General Conformity to net zero, followed by an emissions decrease, NOx as a precursor to the formation of nitric acid/acid rain would be similarly mitigated.
3	Air Quality • Air quality impacts associated with Compressor Station 206	Commenters expressed concern related to the ongoing emissions expected from the operation of Compressor Station 206 and the potential impacts of emissions on the Trap Rock Quarry if it is eventually used as a reservoir. One commenter suggested that Compressor Station 206 would operate continuously.	While not relevant to the pending permit applications before New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), air pollutants that could potentially impact human health or air quality from the Project are below applicable federal National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and New Jersey air quality thresholds. Meeting federal/state laws, regulations, and standards are the means to approval of a permit, no matter the type. Turbines at Compressor Station 206 will be equipped with state-of-the-art controls and will be below major source regulatory thresholds. These emissions would disperse in the atmosphere and are not anticipated to result in significant deposition of pollutants into a water or land habitat, including any future reservoir project to be carried out on the Trap Rock Quarry. Use of natural gas in place of fuel oil in New York will result in reductions in direct emissions of NO_X and particulate matter (PM), as well as fine PM precursors of sulfur dioxide (SO_2) and NO_X, leading to regional air quality improvements for ozone and PM in New York as well as northern New Jersey. Compressor Station 206 would not operate continuously.
4	Air Quality • Compliance with climate change laws (NJ)	Commenter states that the Project locks New Jersey into unnecessary infrastructure for decades and sabotages New Jersey's Clean Energy Plan and climate change goals. Commenter states that the Project violates Governor Murphy's Executive Orders 315, 316, and 317 Commenters state that the Project is inconsistent with the Global Warming Response Act.	While not relevant to the pending permit applications before the NJDEP, National Grid is a regulated entity that is obligated by the New York State Public Service Commission (NYPSC) to provide safe, reliable energy service upon request. To meet that obligation, National Grid has reported that it identified the need for incremental gas transportation capacity to serve load growth in the boroughs of Brooklyn, Queens and Staten Island in New York City, as well Nassau and Suffolk Counties on Long Island. To support this growth, National Grid entered into an agreement with Transco to construct the NESE Project in order to enhance the reliability of service to existing customers, as well as to satisfy growing demand for natural gas in our downstate New York service territory. Consumers in National Grid's territory are always able to voluntarily switch from natural gas service to an alternative energy source. Similarly, the Project does not prevent New Jersey consumers from using alternative energy sources. Furthermore, the Project is governed by the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. 717f(h) (Natural Gas Act). It is not inherently inconsistent with New Jersey's Clean Energy Plan and climate change goals and will supply natural gas to the New York City area. New Jersey's wide variety of energy and climate policies also do not prohibit natural gas. Further, in its August 28, 2025 Order Issuing Certificate (2025 Certificate Order), FERC determined that the Project is "a project providing supply diversity and mitigating constraints during peak demand is not incompatible with state statutes requiring a reduction in the average annual use of natural gas or reduction in [greenhouse gas (GHG)] emissions." 2025 Certificate Order, ¶ 39. A copy of the 2025 Certificate Order is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Similarly, New Jersey's Global Warming Response Act (GWRA), N.J.S.A. 26:2C-37 et seq., does not require NJDEP to consider greenhouse gas emissions in its review of the pending permit applications. Transco's Project complies with the requirements of the Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act, Flood Hazard Area Control Act, and Coastal Zone Management regulations. To the extent that the GWRA would be used to prohibit or delay the Project, it is preempted. In these proceedings, the NJDEP's authority to review Transco's Project derives from Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act and the Coastal Zone Management Act. While a State's environmental review under the Clean Water Act and Coastal Zone Management Act is "carved out" from the preemptive effect of the Natural Gas Act, statutes and regulations that are outside of or exceed that authority would be preempted. See Del. Riverkeeper Network v. Sec'y Pa. Dept. of Envtl. Prot., 833 F.3d at 368, citing 15 U.S.C. §717b(d). See also AES Sparrows Point LNG, LLC v. Smith, 527 F.3d 120, 127 (4th Cir. 2008) (Williams, concurring)(expressing doubt about whether a local

[1] A List of Acronyms can be found at the end of this document.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			law that bans liquified natural gas terminal siting "can ever be a 'right of States under' the Coastal Zone Management Act", even if incorporated into the State's federal program). Because the GWRA is not part of New Jersey's delegated authority under the Clean Water Act and Coastal Zone Management Act, to the extent it would prohibit the construction of the Project or conflict with FERC's authority under the Natural Gas Act, the GWRA would be preempted.
5	Air Quality • Compliance with climate change laws (NY)	Commenters state that the Project is inconsistent with New York Local Law 97	While not relevant to the pending permit applications before NJDEP, the Project is not inconsistent with Local Law 97, and as detailed in National Grid's Long-Term Plan Addendum and FERC's 2025 Certificate Order as the Project helps meet a downstate gas need. Local Law 97 aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from covered buildings in New York City. It does this by requiring covered buildings to meet emissions intensity limits (tons of carbon dioxide (CO_2) per square foot). These emissions intensity limits took effect in 2024. The goal is to reduce the emissions produced by the City's largest buildings by 40% by 2030 and to net zero by 2050. Local Law 97 does not prohibit natural gas in New York City, does not cover all buildings in New York City, and does not apply to buildings outside of New York City. Local Law 97 will affect New York City energy markets which National Grid contemplated in both its March 2025 Final Gas System Long-Term Plan and July 2025 Final Gas Systems Long-Term Plan Addendum (Long-Term Plan Addendum) filed with the New York State Public Service Commission (Case 24-G-0248, National Grid, Final Gas System Long-Term Plan: n. 33 (Mar. 7, 2025.) Both plans evaluated downstate gas need for the region, considering state and local legislation, projected demand, and various other system constraints and predictions. The March 2025 Final Gas System Long-Term Plan projects that National Grid will face a shortfall in supply to meet its reference Design Day standard by 2028 in downstate New York, and states that "the company continues to seek new supply and demand options." On September 18, 2025, the NYPSC approved National Grid's Long-Term Plan, finding that the Project is "needed to ensure the continued provisions of safe, adequate and reliable gas service to customers in New York City and on Long Island." See Order Regarding Long-term Natural Gas Plan and Requiring Further Actions (NYPSC Order), attached hereto as Exhibit B.
6	Air Quality • Compliance with NJDEP's air quality regulations	Commenter states that Transco is relying on grandfathered air standards. Another commenter stated that Compressor Station 206 does not comply with Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) guidelines	While not relevant to the pending permit applications before NJDEP, Transco applied to NJDEP for a preconstruction air permit and certificate to operate for Compressor Station 206. The compressor station will comply with applicable NJDEP HAP regulations, including health risk assessment guidelines and acceptance criteria.
7	Air Quality • Emission Controls	Commenter asked how Transco will ensure emissions of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, oxygenates and oxides of nitrogen will comply with emissions standards. Commenter also asked what technology is being used to achieve these results. Commenter further asked about the frequency that measurements will be taken and what happens if Transco fails to comply with certain requirements.	While not relevant to the pending permit applications before NJDEP, the turbines at Compressor Station 206 will be equipped with SoLoNOx combustion technology, along with oxidation catalyst and selective catalytic reduction (SCR) controls. These controls ensure that NOx and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions satisfy performance levels required by NJDEP state-of-the-art (SOTA) requirements. The pre-construction air permit authorization currently under review by NJDEP will contain specific testing, monitoring, and recordkeeping requirements to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations. Failure to comply with these requirements could subject Transco to potential civil, administrative, and criminal penalties, depending on the nature and severity of the violation.
8	Air Quality • Emissions from blowdowns	Commenters expressed concerns about pollutants emitted during blowdowns.	While not relevant to the pending permit applications before NJDEP, Transco operates under a Control Measures Plan in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:27-16.21 to control potential volatile organic compounds (VOC) emissions associated with natural gas venting events for its pipeline operations in the state of New Jersey.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
9	Air Quality • Emission reduction credits (ERCs)	Commenters state that Transco's proposal to purchase ERCs will not improve air quality.	While not relevant to the pending permit applications before NJDEP, Transco has purchased, and is proposing to purchase, NOx and VOC emission reductions credits (ERCs) to ensure that its activities conform with State Implementation plans approved under the Clean Air Act. As explained by FERC in its Final General Conformity Determination Reevaluation, "[a]n ERC, [Creditable Emissions Reduction] (CER) and a [Continuous Emission Reduction Credit] (CERC) represents a permanent, quantifiable, federally enforceable surplus reduction of emissions that has or will have resulted from a physical or operational change of an emission source subject to [New Source Review (NSR)] (or a non NSR facility subject to approval)." "ERCs...are emissions that have been retired by existing facilities and are available for purchase to offset future projects." Transco proposes to demonstrate conformance with New York and New Jersey state implementation plans through the purchase of ERCs, CERs, and CERCs. New sources are exempt from General Conformity as they are presumed to be in conformance with a state's implementation plan if they obtain the appropriate permit or approval from the relevant state agency. Here, Transco is seeking a preconstruction permit and certificate to operate from NJDEP in connection with the operation of Compressor Station 206. Thus, emissions from operation of Compressor Station 206 are exempt from General Conformity. Instead, ERCs are being used to offset temporary emissions from construction of Transco's Project. Accordingly, Transco's purchase of ERCs, which are permanent annual NOx and VOC emission reductions in perpetuity, to offset temporary emissions during construction would have a net benefit to air quality within the NJ-NY-CT nonattainment airshed.
10	Air Quality • Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions	Commenters state that the Project will result in increased GHG emissions.	While not relevant to the pending permit applications before NJDEP, as a result of the additional natural gas capacity, the Project will result in health-based air quality benefits in the NJ-NY-CT Ozone Nonattainment Area as systems are converted from fuel oil to natural gas. GHG emissions associated with the construction and operation of the Project within the region, including methane leakage, are identified and quantified in the Air Quality Technical Report (and documented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Transco has also addressed the Project's direct and downstream GHG emissions in separate, supplemental FERC filings.
11	Air Quality • Health and environmental impacts	Commenters state that Transco did not account for the cumulative impacts of emissions from the Trap Rock quarry and Compressor Station 206. Commenters also state that a health impact assessment was not completed for Compressor Station 206.	While not relevant to the pending permit applications before NJDEP, air quality associated with operation of Compressor Station 206 and cumulative air quality impacts have been addressed in the context of Transco's application to FERC for a certificate of public convenience and necessity and will be addressed in Transco's pre-construction air permit authorization to operate Compressor Station 206, to be issued by the NJDEP. Compressor Station 206 is a minor source of air emissions, and air dispersion modeling results demonstrate that the station is not predicted to cause or contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS, which address human health and public welfare. In addition, for HAPs, the preconstruction air permit under review by the NJDEP satisfies current NJDEP health risk assessment requirements and proposed emissions are within acceptance criteria.
12	Alternatives Analysis • Alternative energy sources	Commenters state that the Project will delay the region's transition to alternative, renewable energy sources. One commenter advocated for reducing demand for natural gas as an alternative to the Project.	Transco evaluated the potential for other energy sources to meet the purpose and need of the Project. Energy sources were separated into two broad categories: renewable energy sources (biofuel/biomass, hydroelectric, solar, tidal, and wind) and traditional energy sources (coal, nuclear, and oil). Following a review of energy source alternatives to meet the purpose and need of the Project, no other energy source would satisfy the increased demand for natural gas in the service territory. Electrical energy produced by traditional energy sources, such as coal-fired plants or nuclear plants, is not a viable alternative. Primarily because of environmental concerns, the capacity of these energy sources is not increasing, and the timeline to permit new facilities is not expected to be sufficient to meet the projected energy demand in the service territory within the timeframe proposed. Current regulations are phasing out fuel oil No. 4 and No. 6, due to emission rates of NO_X and SO_2. Therefore, increasing the use of fuel oil to meet the projected energy demand in the service territory would not be viable. Sufficient renewable energy sources are not currently available and cannot be made available on a timely basis for large-scale application to the point where they would be viable energy alternatives to the Project. In addition, in-home natural gas energy systems would require conversion for the delivery and use of the electricity generated by the alternative energy sources discussed above. For these reasons, and because no other energy source would directly satisfy the increased demand for natural gas in the service territory, other traditional and renewable energy sources are not considered viable alternatives to satisfying the Project's purpose and need. Transco recognizes the importance of energy efficiency and conservation measures in building a comprehensive energy portfolio and did not evaluate energy efficiency or energy conservation programs, as the stated purpose and need for the Project is to transport natural gas to meet National Grid's needs and therefore such conservation efforts would not meet the Project purpose and need.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			Ultimately, FERC concluded in Section 3.0 of the FEIS that although energy conservation and efficiency programs help to reduce energy demand, and renewable energy is playing an increasing role in meeting the region's energy needs, because the purpose of the Project is to transport natural gas to meet National Grid's needs, and renewable energy sources or reductions in demand are not transportation alternatives, they were not considered further as viable alternatives to the Project.
13	Alternatives Analysis • Compressor Station 206 site selection	Commenters state that Transco has not fully demonstrated that there is no practicable alternative to the Compressor Station 206 site. Commenters state that alternatives analysis does not satisfy Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) guidelines.	To satisfy the regulatory requirements set forth by FERC and the New Jersey Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act (FWPA) Rules, Transco used a multi-tiered approach to identify the most suitable site for Compressor Station 206. The siting criteria consisted of engineering constraints, site availability, and natural resources. Transco undertook an exhaustive study to identify and evaluate potential compressor station locations. In accordance with the definitions outlined at N.J.A.C. 7:7A-1.3 and rules outlined at N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.2 and N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.3, alternatives were identified as practicable when available and capable of being carried out after taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes. Transco considered alternative sites practicable that were not owned by Transco, but that could reasonably be or have been obtained, utilized, expanded, or managed to fulfill the basic purpose of the proposed activity. Based on these criteria, Transco selected the most practicable alternative site with the fewest impacts to wetlands, pursuant to the FWPA. Upon completion of the alternatives analysis summarized above and described in detail in Transco's Alternatives Analysis for the Project, Transco acquired the selected site. Transco's alternatives analysis is consistent with Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) guidelines.
14	Alternatives Analysis • Electric Motor Drive at Compressor Station 206	Commenter asked why Transco is not using electric motor driven compression at Compressor Station 206.	Transco evaluated the feasibility and related environmental impacts of using electric motor-driven compression at Compressor Station 206 as an alternative to gas-driven compression at Compressor Station 206. Electric utility providers undergo a regulatory process similar to the process that natural gas pipelines go through when they propose to expand their system. Transco engaged with the local electric utility provider to discuss the feasibility of bringing in electric power capable of running electric compressor units at the compressor site. The results of these discussions showed that in order to supply utility power capable of supporting electric-powered compression the electric utility would have to overcome numerous regulatory hurdles, including running additional lines through a historic borough, crossing the Delaware and Raritan Canal, and impacts to landowners as a result of running several miles of additional lines. Regardless of the availability of electric power capable of running electric compressors, this additional electrical infrastructure would significantly increase the environmental impacts associated with Compressor Station 206. Therefore, the electric motor-driven compression alternative would not be a practicable alternative that would have lesser environmental impacts on freshwater wetlands when compared to Transco's proposed use of natural gas turbine-driven compression at Compressor Station 206. See N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.2(b)1.
15	Alternatives Analysis • Looping alternative to Compressor Station 206	Commenter states that Transco's alternatives analysis related to the looping alternative to Compressor Station 206 is insufficient as it assumes the pipeline loop would be co-located with Transco's existing right-of-way (ROW).	Both FERC and NJDEP encourage co-location of natural gas pipelines, to the extent practicable, as co-location allows the pipeline company to use its existing right-of-way, thereby minimizing impacts. Transco noted in its Alternatives Analysis that the looping-intensive alternative would require the construction of 15.31 miles of 42-inch diameter pipeline from Compressor Station 205 in Lawrenceville, New Jersey to milepost (MP)1788.20 in Middlesex County, New Jersey. Transco's analysis assumed, consistent with FERC and NJDEP policy, that it would co-locate the new pipeline with its existing permanent maintained ROW, thereby only requiring 25 feet of additional permanent ROW. Even so, this alternative would have resulted in 8.78 acres of permanent impacts to forest wetlands, whereas the construction and operation of Compressor Station 206 would only result in impacts to 0.54 acres of forested wetlands. Commenters state that Transco's analysis is deficient because it did not consider a looping-intensive alternative that was not co-located with Transco's existing permanent ROW. However, Transco was not required to do so, as such an alternative would be contrary to FERC and NJDEP policy, and would have required a new permanent 50-foot-wide ROW (instead of 25 feet), which would have resulted in even greater impacts when compared to co-location. This would not have been a reasonable alternative and was not required to be analyzed by Transco as part of its FWPA permit application.
16	Alternatives Analysis • No-build Alternative	Commenters state that Transco failed to analyze the "no-build" or "no-action" alternative.	FERC and Transco analyzed the No Action alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, the Project, as described in Transco's applications would not be constructed or operated. The potential environmental impacts of construction and operation of the Project would not occur. However, this alternative would not meet the purpose and need for the Project. The No Action Alternative would prevent Transco from providing 400,000 Dth/d of incremental firm transportation capacity to National Grid to the Rockaway Transfer Point to supply its existing service territory, for which there is a public need (see discussion below on Public Need).

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			In addition, the benefits of the Project, as described in the permit application, would not be realized. These benefits include: expanded infrastructure to meet the needs of National Grid's residential, commercial, and industrial customers; • increased reliability of the natural gas transportation system serving New York City and the region; • the reduction of harmful air emissions; and • the provision of a flexible and affordable energy source that will serve as a bridge fuel as renewable energy sources are developed. National Grid is currently the major local distribution company in Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, and portions of Long Island. National Grid projects that NESE would increase firm gas supply to Downstate New York by approximately 13 percent. This will reduce National Grid's risk of supply shortfalls during periods of peak demand, particularly in the winter heating season, and ultimately allow National Grid to scale back its compressed natural gas, which, on high demand days, can require up to 240 compressed natural gas truck deliveries navigating congested road networks under snow, ice, and wind conditions. (National Grid's Long Term Plan Addendum filed with the NYPSC). Selecting the No Action Alternative would lead to a lack of available natural gas to satisfy National Grid's projected demand. To address these shortages, consumers would be required to reduce their energy consumption through conservation measures or through the utilization of alternative energy sources. Further, the development and implementation of additional conservation measures may have some effect on energy demand; however, the magnitude of energy conservation necessary to equal the capacity proposed for this Project will not be attained in the near-term via current proven methods. Long-term increases in natural gas peak demand from market growth and from residents converting from oil to gas, would more than offset the implementation of energy conservation programs. The No Action Alternative would force National Grid to seek other natural gas transportation services and depend on other, future development projects with unpredictable schedules and undetermined environmental impacts. FERC staff, in Section 3.1 of the FEIS, considered the No Action Alternative and determined that other existing interstate natural gas transmission systems in the region could not meet the purpose of the Project without expansion and/or construction of new, greenfield facilities. FERC found that these facilities would be of similar or greater scope than the facilities proposed by Transco, resulting in similar or greater environmental impact and, therefore, would not be preferable to the Project. Also, FERC did not consider the use of renewable sources of energy or energy conservation and efficiency programs to be viable Project alternatives. For these reasons, FERC did not recommend the No Action Alternative. The FEIS can be found at eLibrary | File List.
17	Compliance with the Shore Tourism and Ocean Protection (STOP) Act	Commenters alleged that the Project is prohibited under the STOP Act	The STOP Act does not apply to Transco's Project. The STOP Act prohibits offshore oil or natural gas exploration, development, and production in state waters, and the leasing of tidal or submerged lands in state waters for those purposes. In addition, the STOP Act prohibits the Department from permitting, approving, or otherwise authorizing any oil or natural gas exploration, development, or production in state waters, and from developing, adopting, or endorsing any plans for the exploration, development, or production of oil and natural gas in state waters. The STOP Act defines "development" to mean "pipeline or infrastructure that transports oil or natural gas from production facilities located in federal waters or other coastal waters in the Atlantic Ocean through New Jersey State waters, and any land-based support facilities for offshore oil or natural gas production facilities located in the Atlantic Ocean." N.J.S.A. 13:19-49c. The STOP Act does not apply to the Project, as Transco is not proposing to engage in offshore natural gas exploration, development, or production. The Project would not transport oil or natural gas from production facilities located in federal, state, or coastal state waters, nor would Transco be leasing tidal or submerged lands in state waters for the purposes of oil or natural gas exploration, development, or production. The purpose of the STOP Act is to limit offshore drilling, exploration, and production in federal waters and New Jersey's waters in the Atlantic Ocean. Clearly, this is inapplicable to the Project.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
18	Compressor Station 206 • Impacts on Carter's Brook and Heathcote Brook	Commenters raised concerns about the impacts of construction of Compressor Station 206 on Carter's Brook and Heathcote Brook and claim that Transco cannot demonstrate that the Project will not "cause or contribute" to a violation of any applicable State water quality standards.	Both Carter's Brook and its tributary are located outside of the project's Limit of Disturbance (LOD). The proposed access road does not cross any tributaries, nor does construction or operation involve direct disturbance to Carter's Brook or its tributary. The proposed stormwater management system has been designed in full compliance with the New Jersey's Stormwater Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:8) and the New Jersey Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Manual. The revised design now includes eight (8) small-scale infiltration basins, which collectively provide 80% Total Suspended Solids (TSS) removal for runoff generated from all proposed motor vehicle surfaces as per the runoff quality standards. Additionally, discharges from the infiltration basins are further attenuated and buffered by adjacent wetlands, providing secondary sediment capture before stormwater enters any downstream surface water. No direct discharges from construction or maintenance are proposed to Carter's Brook or its tributary. During construction, soil erosion and sedimentation will be controlled under the SESC Plan certified by Somerset-Union Soil Conservation District. The SESC Plan includes perimeter silt fencing, sediment basins, and temporary stabilization measures to minimize any potential increase in suspended solids or turbidity to off-site areas. These measures ensure compliance with N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.2(b)(5) by preventing degradation of State waters during and after construction. Finally, once construction is complete, the operational phase of Compressor Station 206 will generate minimal vehicle traffic, limited primarily to routine maintenance. The proposed access road is unpaved (gravel) and designed with roadside infiltration basins to capture and treat stormwater from its contributing drainage area, further minimizing any potential for TSS generation or off-site discharge. Based on these measures, the project will not cause or contribute to any violation of applicable State water quality standards, and no adverse hydrologic or water quality impacts to Carter's Brook and its tributary or Heathcote Brook are anticipated.
19	Compressor Station 206 • Impacts on water supply wells	Commenters raised concerns related to impacts on nearby water supply wells from disturbing the Higgins Farm Superfund Site.	Compressor Station 206 site was previously identified as having potential groundwater contamination on a small portion of the site as a result of the adjacent Higgins Farm Superfund site. Transco notes that the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment conducted at the site indicated that the groundwater contamination is more than 50 feet below ground surface and that the existing onsite groundwater extraction and treatment system limits further migration of contaminated groundwater, while actively reducing contaminant levels. The Higgins Farm Superfund Site is not likely to pose a concern for the development of the compressor station facility and suction and discharge piping, given that the extent of groundwater contamination is known, being actively monitored, collected, and treated; monitoring by the U.S. Environnmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is ongoing; the depth of contamination is deeper than would be required by proposed facilities; and the location that the pipeline and compressor station would tie into is at the southern tip of the property, which is outside the contaminated groundwater plume. Construction and operational workspaces are also outside the contaminated groundwater plume. Nonetheless, Transco provided detailed and appropriate mitigation measures designed to protect the public health and safety as part of its FWPA and Flood Hazard Area Control Act (FHACA) individual permit applications. Specifically, in the event of an unanticipated discovery of contamination in soil, groundwater, or sediment when excavating during construction and/or maintenance activities, Transco will adhere to its Unanticipated Discovery of Contamination Plan to appropriately manage and dispose of sediment. Transco also identified general procedures and site-specific requirements for addressing and minimizing worker exposure and handling of encountered excavation materials and backfill during planned construction activities, in accordance with its Materials Management Plans for the Madison and Raritan Bay Loop, which were part of Transco's May 2025 applications.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			Transco will implement BMPs and proper measures for installation of the proposed Project to prevent any impacts to water supply wells. Transco will also work with the USEPA and the NCH Corporation as to the recommended measures to ensure the integrity of the ongoing remedial action at the Site.
20	Compressor Station 206 • Light Pollution	Commenter states that Compressor Station 206 will result in increased light pollution.	FERC Staff in the FEIS addressed lighting and acknowledged that lighting would be present at the main gates, yards, and all building entry and exit doors, and would have directional control or be positioned in a downward position to minimize their visibility from local residences while maintaining Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards for lighting. Therefore, FERC staff concluded that the aboveground facilities would not result in significant impacts on nearby visual receptors. (FEIS 5.1.7.1).
21	Compressor Station 206 • Minimization of impacts	Commenter alleges that Transco failed to demonstrate that it could not reconfigure Compressor Station 206 to avoid or reduce impacts on wetlands. Commenter states that Transco could move the suction and discharge piping further south to avoid wetlands. Commenter also states that, unlike the pipeline company in Matter of Proposed Const. of Compressor Station (CS327), 258 N.J. 312 (2024), Transco did not site its facilities on a previously disturbed property.	As part of its alternatives analysis submitted with its permit applications, Transco analyzed alternate configurations for Compressor Station 206, including alternate locations for the access road and tie-in facilities. See Appendix C to Environmental Report. Moving the tie-in facilities further south would not avoid impacts to freshwater wetlands and would actually increase impacts to forested areas due to the increase in the length of the suction and discharge piping. Lastly, the New Jersey Supreme Court's decision in Matter of Proposed Const. of Compressor Station (CS327) has no relevance here. That decision addressed whether a new compressor station within the Highlands Preservation Area qualified for Exemption #11 under the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Act. Transco's Project is not located within the Highlands Preservation Area.
22	Compressor Station 206 • Noise impacts	Commenters state that Compressor Station 206 will result in operational noise impacts. Commenters raise concerns regarding the impact of noise from Compressor Station 206 on wildlife. Commenters also raise concerns regarding the impact of noise on the Buddhist Vihara Meditation Center and allege an infringement on the right to freely practice religion.	FERC requires that the noise attributable to a new natural gas compressor station with all equipment operating not exceed a day-night average A-weighted (A-wt.) sound level (i.e., Ldn) of 55 A-weighted decibels (dBA) (decibels on the A-weighted scale) at any noise sensitive area (NSA)/residence, noting that an Ldn of 55 dBA is equivalent to an A-wt. sound level (Leq) of 49 dBA. Additionally, the New Jersey Noise Control Act and implementing regulations at N.J.A.C. 7:29-1.1 et seq. state that the continuous airborne sound at nearby NSAs shall not exceed an A-weighted sound level of 65 dBA during the daytime (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and 50 dBA during the nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.). For proposed Compressor Station 206, it is anticipated that the maximum A-wt. sound level contribution of the compressor station during full load operation will be equal to or lower than 50 dBA at nearby NSAs. Thus, proposed Compressor Station 206 will be designed to generate sound levels that are lower than the FERC sound level requirement and state noise regulations (e.g., State of New Jersey noise level limits). Noise analyses for Compressor Station 206 were performed in accordance with FERC requirements and state/local noise regulations, which establish criteria for human receptors (e.g., residences, schools, hospitals). No federal or state regulatory thresholds currently exist for evaluating noise impacts on terrestrial wildlife. Modeled operational noise levels at nearby residences remain at or below 55 dBA Ldn, consistent with typical suburban ambient sound environments, and construction noise will be temporary and restricted to daytime hours. Blowdown events are infrequent, brief, and attenuated by silencers. Because common terrestrial species in the area are already exposed to similar community noise levels and given the robust noise control measures incorporated into station design, significant adverse effects to onshore wildlife from noise are not anticipated. Finally, FERC analyzed the impacts of Compressor Station 206 on the Buddhist Vihara Meditation Center and concluded that construction and operation of Compressor Station 206 would not have a significant impact. (FEIS 4.7.4). FERC noted that, based on noise modeling, the increase in noise at the meditation center due to the compressor station would be 0.4 dBA, which is below the threshold of perception for the human ear. Id. FERC also noted that Compressor Station 206 would comply with applicable air quality standards that are protective of public welfare. Id. Further, the compressor station is proposed to be constructed on property owned by Transco. For these reasons, the operation of Compressor Station 206 will not infringe on anyone's right to freely practice religion.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
23	Dewatering	Commenters allege that dewatering will make soil compaction from construction vehicles worse.	Construction dewatering for the pipeline, whether within the pipeline ditch line or horizontal directional drill (HDD) entry points, were assessed within the submitted NJDEP BWA-002 Temporary Dewatering Permit application that detailed the hydrological setting of the project and expected temporary dewatering amounts. This application and NJDEP's review included the assessment of secondary impacts such as the potential for dewatering of wetlands and this will be considered during the review of the Project.
24	Eminent Domain	Commenters argue that the extension of the Higgins Farm access road violates the farmland Deed of Easement on the property. Commenters raised concerns about the use of eminent domain on farmland and open spaces.	The property on which Transco is seeking to construct an extended access road to Compressor Station 206 is subject to a Deed of Easement held by the Township of Franklin ("Township"). The Deed of Easement conveyed the non-agricultural development rights in a portion of the property to the Township and expressly prohibits any development for non-agricultural purposes. Since the Deed of Easement does not provide a mechanism by which the Township can convey the necessary rights to Transco, Transco must file a condemnation action pursuant to its authority under the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. 717f(h), to acquire and perfect the permanent and temporary rights in the property that are needed for the Project.
25	Environmental Justice	Commenters allege that the Project violates New Jersey's Environmental Justice Law. Commenters also state that the Madison Loop would cross impact low-income and marginalized communities.	New Jersey's Environmental Justice Law does not apply to the Project components within New Jersey. The Environmental Justice Law applies to an applicant for a permit to construct a new or expanded facility within an overburdened community. N.J.S.A. 13:1D-160(a). Compressor Station 206 is not within an overburdened community and does not meet the definition of a "facility" as the compressor station is not a major source of air pollution. See N.J.S.A. 13:1D-158. Further, while the Madison Loop is located within areas designated as overburdened communities, it also does not fall within the definition of a "facility." Accordingly, the Environmental Justice Law does not apply. FERC also analyzed the impacts of the Project on environmental justice communities, noting that "two census tracts near Compressor Station 206, and two census tracts near the Madison Loop and onshore segment of the Raritan Bay Loop are considered environmental justice communities." (FEIS 4.8.10). However, FERC found that "[p]otentially adverse environmental effects associated with the Project on surrounding communities, including environmental justice communities, would be minimized and/or mitigated, as applicable, and would not be high and adverse." Id. FERC ultimately concluded that the Project "would not result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low-income populations." Id.
26	Grading/Steep Slopes	Commenters raise concerns about the impact of the Project on steep slopes. Commenters state that Transco has not provided a description of how temporary workspace within steep slopes will be graded.	To the extent practical, Transco will restore the ROW to existing contours, including steep slopes, in a manner that maintains slope stability and promotes revegetation. These areas will be restored in accordance with the SESC Plans for the Project and will restore functions and values impacted during construction of the Project. Transco has received approval of its SESC Plan for the Madison Loop from the Freehold Soil Conservation District that addresses both the temporary stabilization and permanent restoration of the pipeline right-of-way to ensure proper handling of all areas of topography present along the route, where not avoided by HDD. Temporary impact areas will be restored to pre-existing conditions and will not modify groundwater flow paths and wetland hydrology. In addition to providing a safe and stable working area, the use of timber mats minimizes compaction by dispersing equipment weight over a larger surface area. Timber mats also avoid excessive disruption of wetland soils and the native seed and rootstock within the wetland. Temporarily impacted wetlands will be restored in accordance with the approved SESC Plan and monitored in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:7A-11.12.
27	Habitat Fragmentation	Commenter raise concerns about habitat destruction and fragmentation	During the development of the Project, Transco implemented several measures related to Project routing, workspace design, and construction methods to avoid and minimize impacts to regulated features, as well as forested areas. Transco minimized impacts by co-locating the pipeline facilities with Transco's existing ROWs to the maximum extent practicable. The Madison Loop, in its entirety, will be co-located where the Madison Loop is adjacent and partially overlapping the existing Transco ROW; however, the existing ROW will be widened where necessary. In general, Transco maintains a 25-foot offset between co-located pipelines. This offset allows for safe construction adjacent to the existing pipeline and allows for rights-of-way to overlap, reducing the overall impact. Additionally, several segments of the pipeline will be installed via HDD. Doing so will also avoid and minimize impacts to forested areas. Impacts to forested areas have been minimized to the greatest extent practicable.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			Alteration to habitat functions provided by palustrine forested (PFO) and palustrine scrub-shrub (PSS) wetlands will occur due to disturbances of these wetland communities. Such alterations will result in changes such as vegetation composition and structure, increased exposure to wind, light, and temperature fluctuations. In locations where the Project is not co-located with other, existing utility or roadway corridors, these changes will also result in new habitat fragmentation. Transco has sought to minimize impacts to wetlands and transition areas by avoiding and/or reducing disturbance areas to the greatest extent practicable. While the disturbance of wetlands during construction of the Project may have negative impacts on wetland functions and other secondary impacts, Transco has demonstrated that it designed the Project to avoid and minimize these impacts to the greatest extent practicable. Transco will implement BMPs such as soil erosion and sediment control measures and the timely restoration of vegetated areas following construction activities, which are anticipated to reduce the potential for significant short or long-term adverse impacts resulting from the Project. In PFO/PSS wetlands located in temporary workspaces outside of the permanent maintenance corridor, vegetation clearing will consist of cutting vegetation flush to the ground, and no grubbing of stumps is proposed. This clearing method will serve to preserve vegetation composition and effectuate regeneration of said vegetation. Additionally, these temporary workspaces will be restored in-place, in accordance with an NJDEP approved restoration plan. Over time, these temporary workspaces will recapture functions and values lost during construction of the Project.
28	HDD • Drilling fluid release/ inadvertent returns	Commenters state that HDD fluids will be released into wetlands and Raritan Bay further impacting water quality and marine life. Commenters allege that HDD has the highest likelihood of drilling fluid releases and would impact the wetlands and critical wildlife habitats along the Madison Loop.	The HDD process is designed to minimize any impacts to wetlands and water quality and must be completed in accordance with all water quality and wetland permits. In addition, Transco has submitted an "Onshore Horizontal Directional Drilling Contingency Plan" and an "Offshore Horizontal Directional Drilling Contingency Plan" to FERC and NJDEP. These plans are designed to anticipate and mitigate a non-compliant release. The construction contractor will be required to have all necessary means and methods available to minimize the impact of any release and to follow these plans. The Project's compliance with the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Rules regarding Water Quality (N.J.A.C. 7:7-16.3) is outlined in Part III, Section 3 of the Compliance Statement. Copies of the Contingency Plans are included as Appendix G of the Environmental Report. As described in the FEIS, drilling fluids and cuttings will be deposited within the HDD entry and exit pits for the offshore HDDs as drilling progresses. Transco has sized the offshore HDD pits to accommodate the entire volume of drilling fluids and cuttings and a 25% overage to reduce the potential that the fluid and cuttings will leave the pits. Further, and because the density of the drilling fluids is greater than seawater, the drilling fluid and cuttings are expected to settle to the bottom of the pits and not escape into the water column. Transco will use water-based drilling fluids and will not use petroleum-based drilling fluid additives. Transco will provide information on all HDD fluid additives to NJDEP for approval prior to use. Upon selecting the HDD contractor, Transco will file on the FERC docket the safety data sheets for all drilling fluid additives for review and approval prior to construction. Transco also notes that its Onshore and Offshore HDD Contingency Plans, submitted with its NJDEP Division of Land Resource Protection permit applications, describe the methods that Transco's HDD contractor will employ to reduce the risk of an inadvertent return of drilling fluids, as well as the contingency plan for containment, restoration, and mitigation in the event of an inadvertent return of drilling fluids. Prior to construction, a specific scope of work will be developed for each HDD crossing that will outline any site-specific conditions and specifications necessary to ensure successful restoration and mitigation in the event of an inadvertent return. As required by the NJDEP, all inadvertent returns within regulated area will be immediately reported to the NJDEP. Potential impacts on freshwater aquatic resources associated with HDD crossings could result from erosion or sedimentation associated with the onshore operation of the HDD equipment and inadvertent releases of drilling fluids. However, HDD entry and exit points are typically located away from the waterbodies crossed to minimize potential impacts, and drilling fluid would consist of non-toxic materials. To prevent and control inadvertent releases of drilling fluids, Transco would implement its Onshore Horizontal Direction Drill Contingency Plan, which includes measures

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			to monitor the drilling operation and drill path to identify inadvertent returns, minimize the duration of any releases that occur, and contain and clean up any spills. (FEIS 4.5.1.3).
29	Hydrostatic Testing • Hydrostatic testing	Commenters state that underwater pipelines are susceptible to leaks and ruptures which will release contaminants into surrounding water. Commenters state that Transco will release toxic hydrostatic test discharge water into Raritan Bay, further impacting water quality, marine life, and human health. Commenters specifically raise concerns about Transco's use of CORRTREAT 15316.	Transco will hydrostatically test the pipeline segments in accordance with USDOT regulations, 49 CFR Part 192. The pipeline will be filled with water and maintained at pressure, in compliance with Transco's engineering standards and applicable federal regulations. The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) of the DOT is responsible for ensuring the safe operation of interstate natural gas pipelines through its regulations under Part 192 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Transco must comply with these regulations and further, as required by 157.14(a)(10)(vi) of the Commission's regulations, Transco has certified that it would design, install, inspect, test, construct, operate, replace, and maintain the project facilities in accordance with modern engineering practices that meet or exceed the DOT's Minimum Federal Safety Standards. (2025 Certificate Order, ¶ 104). Hydrostatic testing of the Raritan Bay Loop will involve flooding the pipeline with filtered seawater. A non-toxic fluorescent dye (Hydro Tag Clear) will be added to allow easier detection of any underwater pipe leaks during the test(s). If water is to remain in the pipeline for an extended period of time, Transco may control internal corrosion by chemical treatment using CORRTREAT 15316 based on the results of an analysis of three corrosion inhibitor options. The results of the analysis indicated CORRTREAT 15316 to be both biodegradable and a better corrosion inhibitor than the other alternatives evaluated. Furthermore, FERC concluded in its FEIS that, given CORRTREAT's relatively rapid degradation in seawater, the proposed critical dilution for the discharge, and the results of Transco's bioassays, the use of CORRTREAT 15316 in the hydrostatic test water would not be expected to bioaccumulate in aquatic food webs or result in adverse impacts on aquatic organisms. (FEIS at 4-134). The selected additives will be used at concentrations that do not cause adverse effects on the receiving waterbody at the time of test water discharge. Treatment and discharge of the hydrostatic test water will meet applicable NJDEP regulatory requirements. Transco will submit an application to the NJDEP for a New Jersey Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit in advance of the commencement of offshore construction activities. No other additives are planned to be used during hydrostatic testing of the Raritan Bay Loop. During final pre-commissioning, Transco would use other additives; however, those materials would be captured and not discharged.
30	Impacts on Birds • American Kestrel and Bald Eagle.	Commenters raise concerns related to impacts of the Project on American Kestrel and Bald Eagle.	A request for information regarding the threatened and endangered species within the vicinity of the project was submitted to the New Jersey National Heritage Program (NHP) on May 6, 2025. Bald eagle foraging and nest habitat was identified within the vicinity of the Madison Loop and Raritan Bay Loop while American Kestrel habitat was identified within 1 mile of the Madison Loop and Raritan Bay Loop. Previous NHP database letters for the Madison Loop, dated July 8, 2019 and May 19, 2017 indicate the presence of suitable habitat for the bald eagle (foraging and nesting habitat) within areas located to the east of Route 9 and generally in association with Cheesequake Creek and its adjacent wetlands. In January 2025, the bald eagle and osprey were removed from the state's list of endangered species. The bald eagle is reclassified as a species of concern; while the osprey is stable. Although the species are no longer listed as endangered and threatened, nests are still protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and/or the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. There was a documented bald eagle nest located along Cheesequake Creek; however, in an e-mail dated May 18, 2017, Mr. Kelly Davis, New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife, Office of Environmental Review, indicated that the project area does not extend into the 660 ft regulated nest buffer of the documented nest. A review of the New Jersey Bald Eagle Project, 2024 (NJDEP Fish & Wildlife) does not identify a bald eagle nest within the vicinity of Cheesequake Creek. Three active nests (nest #594, 603, 740) and one territorial nest (724) north of the Madison Loop and Raritan Bay Loop near the Raritan River. In addition, one territorial nest (595) is located south of the project near Matawan Creek. Impacts to wetlands and threatened and endangered species habitat will be avoided through the use of an HDD from MP11.49 to MP11.84. Construction activities along the remaining portions of the Madison Loop not crossed by HDD will impact areas of wetland that are identified as suitable foraging habitat for bald eagle, but it is anticipated that these impacts will be minor and/or temporary in nature and will not result in any significant, long-term, adverse impact to bald eagle or its foraging habitat.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
31	Impacts on Birds • Barred Owl	Commenters state that Transco did not adequately assess and avoid potential suitable barred owl habitat. Comments claim that 17 acres of forest loss would fragment an 800-acre block and, therefore, could potentially compromise the viability of the larger contiguous block.	Transco assessed state and federal databases as an initial screening measure to identify threatened and endangered species near the Project workspaces. Due to the potential presence of suitable barred owl habitat within the vicinity of Compressor Station 206, a barred owl presence/absence survey was conducted for Block 5.02, Lot 25. Direct surveys to determine the presence or absence of barred owl from the site or vicinity during the breeding season were conducted on April 14, April 17, April 23, April 30, and May 13, 2025. The methodology used for the presence/absence survey was the technique/survey methodology outlined in the Protocols for the Establishment of Exceptional Resource Value Wetlands Pursuant to the Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act (N.J.S.A. 13:9B-1 et seq.) based on Documentation of State or Federal Endangered or Threatened Species, last updated January 2013, as prepared by the NJDEP Land Use Regulation Program, Office of Natural Lands Management, Division of Parks & Forestry and The Division of Fish, Game & Wildlife Endangered and Nongame Species Program. The survey methodology also followed the methodologies outlined within the Woodland Raptor Survey Protocol developed by the NJDEP Division of Fish and Wildlife and the Conserve Wildlife Foundation of New Jersey. Call Playback Vocalization Survey Results: There were neither return calls nor visual observations of barred owl during any of the call playback surveys on the site. Marginal levels of anthropogenic noise audible from surrounding areas including distant cars and dogs from nearby residences barking in response to call playbacks were noted during the surveys. Although this noise had no bearing on the ability to hear nocturnal animal calls emanating from the site or vicinity, it provides further evidence of habitat degradation of the site for this forest-interior sensitive species. Natural responses were dominated by coyotes and amphibians, although a great horned owl was heard off-site to the west during the April 17 survey. Although the site is primarily associated with undeveloped forest, anthropogenic features dominate the immediate vicinity, including an active quarry. It is likely that these features and existing operations have diminished habitat suitability for the barred owl. Despite the call playback vocalization surveys being conducted during the appropriate season and under optimal weather conditions, no barred owls were heard or observed on the site during our survey. The negative survey results suggest that the site and vicinity are absent of habitat critical to the survival of a local population of barred owl. Nesting Survey Results: The survey for potential nest trees resulted in the observation of several trees of sufficient size (i.e., +/- 20" diameter at breast height (dbh)) for barred owl; however, most of these features do not contain suitable interior cavities or platform stick nests to support potential nesting by barred owl. Additionally, there was no observation of scat, cough pellets, prey remains or feathers at the bases of these trees or any other trees within the site. Several small dbh snags were observed on-site that fall well under the typical dimension of a barred owl host tree, and these were also absent of potential nesting cavities. Portions of the site which have been historically associated with the utility easement are primarily comprised of emergent vegetation and early successional sweet gum stands. No evidence of nesting activities were observed on site. The results of the nesting survey conclude that the site is absent of barred owl nest trees. The negative survey results suggest that the site is absent of habitat critical to the survival of a local population of barred owl. A full presence/absence survey resulted in the absence of barred owl from the site and immediate vicinity. Based on the surveys and investigations performed, the following findings are made in support of the conclusion that critical habitat for a local population of barred owl is absent from the site: • A full presence/absence call playback survey (five visits) during the latter portion of the breeding season resulted in the absence of barred owl from the site and vicinity; • Four full site nesting investigations resulted in the absence of potentially critical nest trees from the site; • A portion of the site was historically developed/disturbed and currently occupied by a utility easement which is routinely maintained

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			• Trafficked roadways, dogs, coyotes and other residential disturbances produce noise levels that are unfavorable for this forest-interior dwelling species; The negative vocalization survey results provide strong evidence that the subject site and vicinity do not provide critical habitat for barred owl. In total, the construction and operation of Compressor Station 206 will result in the removal of 0.538 acres of NJDEP identified suitable barred owl foraging habitat. Transco does not have access to the private properties surrounding the compressor station site and was therefore unable to conduct surveys for the purpose of identifying the full extent of potentially suitable habitat for the barred owl. In lieu of field surveys, Transco applied the methodology outlined in Appendix V of the New Jersey Landscape Project, Version 3.3, to calculate the total area of potentially suitable habitat surrounding the Compressor Station 206 site. When the barred owl sighting is added to the Landscape Project, Transco expects NJDEP will apply the same methodology to identify suitable foraging habitat in this area. In Appendix V of the New Jersey Landscape Project, Version 3.3, 20 different Land Use / Land Classification types have been identified as potentially suitable habitat for barred owl. Additionally, the appendix notes that the patches should be contiguous as barred owls tend to reside in larger forest patches. The Landscape Project also identifies upland forest types as potentially suitable habitat. Using these methods, Transco determined that the total contiguous area of potentially suitable barred owl habitat surrounding the Compressor Station 206 site is more than 800 acres, with 381 acres being forested wetlands. The project will only impact a small percentage of this potentially suitable barred owl habitat. Given the placement of the compressor station site on the western edge of this potential habitat block, the removal of 0.538 acres of forested wetland habitat is unlikely to jeopardize or adversely modify the foraging opportunities available for the barred owl as the conversion will occur along the very edge of the contiguous forest block. Additionally, the removal of the 0.538 acres of foraging habitat will not jeopardize the continued existence of the local population of the barred owl, as more than 800 acres of contiguous forested habitat will remain available to foraging owls. As described throughout the NJDEP applications, Transco has implemented a detailed engineering design process to minimize impacts on existing forest, PFO wetlands, and potential barred owl habitat to the maximum extent practicable. Finally, operation and maintenance of Compressor Station 206 will not jeopardize the continued use of the site by the barred owl. The design of Compressor Station 206 includes measures such as directional lighting and sound-attenuating insulation, which will minimize disturbance to wildlife. Additionally, human and vehicle activity associated with the operation and maintenance of the site are not expected to have a significant impact on the barred owl and are consistent with activities on the surrounding residential, commercial, and industrial properties. To minimize potential construction-related impacts to state-listed plant and wildlife species, Transco would adhere to permit conditions imposing seasonal work restrictions based on sensitive life stages. Construction activities likely to cause adverse effects will not be performed during certain restricted time periods. Proposed mitigation and BMPs will ensure the continued existence of a local population of threatened or endangered species will not be jeopardized by the Project.
32	Impacts on Birds • Saltmarsh sparrow	Commenter raises concerns about impacts to saltmarsh sparrow.	The New Jersey Landscape Project Mapping (v3.4) identifies saltmarsh sparrow breeding habitat within the Madison Loop Project area from MP11.45, MP11.55 to MP11.90, MP12, and at MP12.15. The Project will impact areas of wetland that are identified as breeding habitat for saltmarsh sparrow, however, it is anticipated that impacts to suitable habitat will be minor and temporary in nature and will not represent any significant, long-term, adverse impact to saltmarsh sparrow or its habitat.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
33	Impacts on contaminated sites	Commenter raises concerns about construction of the Madison Loop through or near contaminated sites and stated that construction may exacerbate contamination. Commenter also raises concerns about PFAS near the E.I. DuPont Denemours site. Commenter also raised concerns about grading and the spreading of excess fill in the area of these sites.	Transco obtained federal and state search reports from Environmental Data Resources, Inc., (EDR) to determine the presence and location of potential groundwater contamination near all onshore pipeline facilities and new aboveground facilities in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The search area for the EDR reports was based on a 2-mile radius extending from the centerline of the pipeline routes and from the compressor station property boundaries. Additional records were identified using the New Jersey Open Public Records Act database. Three active sites (E.I. Dupont Denemours & Company and Global Sanitary Landfill) were identified with confirmed contamination within 0.25-mile of the Madison Loop and appear to cross wetlands, and one active site (Higgins Farm Superfund Site) was identified within 0.25 of Compressor Station 206. Project facilities near MP9.20 to MP10.31 of the Madison Loop (closest to E.I. Dupont Denemours & Company Site) will be installed using conventional trenching and HDD to depths up to 75 feet bgs. The Unanticipated Discovery of Contamination Plan outlines practices Transco will employ in the event of an unanticipated discovery of contamination in soil, groundwater, or sediment when excavating during construction and/or maintenance activities, as well as debris or waste materials deposited on the pipeline ROW. In addition, Transco developed a Materials Management Plan to address areas of known contamination. The Global Sanitary Landfill is located along Ernston Road in Old Bridge Township, New Jersey, and is less than 0.1 mile south of MP10.13 to MP10.38 of the Madison Loop. No HDD is planned in this area, only trenching to approximately 8 feet bgs. If contamination is unearthed, Transco will adhere to its Unanticipated Discovery of Contamination Plan, Materials Management Plan, and the General Groundwater Remediation Clean-up permit (BGR). Construction of the Madison Loop across or proximate to areas of known contamination will follow the requirements of the NJDEP Contaminated Site Remediation & Redevelopment (CSRR) Program which requires that the *Linear Construction Technical Guidance* (January 2012) be followed, where required remediation action is conducted under the oversight of a Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) in accordance with the guidance. Under this program and technical guidance, Transco acting as the linear construction entity has CSRR's "approval" to proceed with remediation in accordance with the guidance. Transco will hire a LSRP to complete a Linear Construction Plan (LCP) Notification Form, complete a Materials Management Plan, and will submit a Final LCP Report to the NJDEP in line with the guidance requirements. Within the vicinity of the Higgins Farm Superfund Site, the Higgins Farm access road will be used along the existing portion of the road and extended where it diverges from the existing access road toward the compressor station facility. The existing Higgins Farm access road will be repaired, as necessary, to support the continued use of the road. The extension will be constructed using conventional road construction techniques. The Unanticipated Discovery of Contamination Plan outlines practices Transco will employ in the event of an unanticipated discovery of contamination in soil, groundwater, or sediment when excavating during construction and/or maintenance activities. In the event that contaminated soils are uncovered, Transco will coordinate with NJDEP and USEPA regarding site remediation and soil disposal activities. As to grading activities, Transco has received an approved SESC Plan for the Madison Loop from the Freehold Soil Conservation District that addresses both the temporary stabilization and permanent restoration of the pipeline right-of-way to ensure proper handling of all areas of topography present along the route, where not avoided by HDD.
34	Madison Loop • Impacts to waterbody crossings	Commenters raise concerns about long-term impacts from turbidity and point to observations made during pipeline construction across a creek in British Colombia.	The Madison Loop would cross waterways using either a dry-ditch (open-cut) crossing method or horizontal directional drilling. The use of dry-ditch construction methods would reduce potential erosion and sedimentation within the stream channel by confining impacts to the construction work areas and minimizing impacts on downstream reaches. While several factors can influence the effectiveness of dry-ditch methods across waterbodies, if the crossings are properly installed and maintained during construction and restoration, the levels of sediment and turbidity produced are typically minor (FEIS 4.5.1.3). Based on a literature assessment of magnitude and timing of suspended sediment produced from open-cut dry-ditch methods (Reid and Anderson, 1999), the duration of increased sedimentation associated with construction across the waterbody would be mostly temporary (i.e., less than 1 to 4 days) and remain near the crossing location (i.e., an approximate downstream distance of a few hundred feet). Transco would also implement the erosion and sedimentation control measures described in its Plan and Procedures to minimize impacts on aquatic resources due to changes in water quality. Upland (shore-to-shore) HDD would avoid direct impacts on waterways and waterbodies. Potential impacts on freshwater aquatic resources associated with HDD crossings could result from erosion or sedimentation associated with the

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			onshore operation of the HDD equipment and inadvertent releases of drilling fluids. However, HDD entry and exit points are typically located away from the waterbodies crossed to minimize potential impacts and drilling fluid would consist of non-toxic materials. To prevent and control inadvertent releases of drilling fluids, Transco would implement its Onshore Horizontal Direction Drill Contingency Plan, which includes measures to monitor the drilling operation and drill path to identify inadvertent returns, minimize the duration of any releases that occur, and contain and clean up any spills. (FEIS 4.5.1.3).
35	Permitting Process • DLRP Permits	Many commenters ask that NJDEP hold additional in-person public hearings within the municipalities and counties impacted by the Project. Commenters also ask that NJDEP extend the public comment period. One commenter raises concerns about meetings held between NJDEP and Transco during the permitting process.	NJDEP has provided an extensive public process on Transco's applications which were submitted on July 26, 2017, June 20, 2018, June 12, 2019, October 28, 2019, and January 21, 2020. As detailed in Transco's Environmental Report filed with the 2025 Permit Applications, NJDEP's review included, among other things, the consideration of more than 5,000 public comments submitted during the various extended public comment periods and the public hearings held on November 5, 2018 and March 18, 2019. On September 10, 2025, NJDEP held a public hearing on Transco's May 2025 permit applications. Over 1,700 written comments were submitted during the public comment period associated with that hearing. As to the comment related to Transco's communications and meetings with NJDEP, there is nothing in NJDEP's regulations that prohibit an applicant from obtaining guidance from NJDEP. In fact, the FWPA, FFHACA, and CZM regulations recommend pre-application conferences between an applicant and NJDEP for large and/or complicated projects, as well as dredging and dredged material management projects. N.J.A.C. 7:7A-15.1(c); N.J.A.C. 7:13-17.1(c); N.J.A.C. 7:7-22.1(c).
36	Permitting Process • Air Permits	Commenter asks if there would be a hearing in connection with the minor source air permit for Compressor Station 206.	A virtual hearing has been scheduled for NJDEP's draft minor source air permit for Compressor Station 206 on November 13, 2025.
37	Permitting Process • Legal authority to apply for permits.	Commenters argue that Transco does not have the legal authority under the CZM Rules to apply for a Waterfront Development Permit since Transco has not yet obtained a Tidelands Utility License from the Tidelands Resource Council	Transco has the Legal Authority required by the CZM Rules to submit an application for a Waterfront Development Permit. Similar to the FWPA and FHACA rules, the CZM Rules allow for a person to submit an application for a permit if that person "has the legal authority to perform the activities proposed in the application on the site and to carry out all requirements of this chapter." N.J.A.C. 7:7-23.2(c)4. Commenters contend that Transco does not have the legal authority required under the CZM Rules to apply for a Waterfront Development Permit because Transco has not yet obtained a Tidelands Utility License from the State of New Jersey. However, the CZM Rules provide that, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, an application shall not be declared complete for review unless the applicant has obtained all tidelands instruments required for occupation of State-owned tidelands or has submitted a complete application for a tidelands instrument…". N.J.A.C. 7:7-26.1(f)(emphasis added). In other words, the CZM Rules allow for and contemplate that an applicant would apply for a permit before a Tidelands instrument, such as a Tidelands Utility License, is granted. As long as an application for a Tidelands instrument has been submitted to the NJDEP, an application for a waterfront development permit will not be deemed incomplete for lack of a Tidelands instrument. This is consistent with the NJDEP's "Instructions for Tidelands License Applications", which requires that an applicant for a Tidelands license first have a waterfront development permit before a license can be granted.
38	Permitting Plans	Commenters allege that Transco has not made any changes to its permitting plans since 2020. Commenter alleges that there was a late release of project plans.	Transco has reviewed the reasons for the denials of previously requested permits and has submitted revised permit applications which address the denial criteria. Some of these revisions include the use of different equipment types (e.g., an environmental bucket), different rates of dredging, different types of dredging, and the exclusion of side casting. Furthermore, permit plans were submitted on May 30, 2025 as part of the initial permit application. Revised permit plans were submitted on July 1, 2025 to reflect minor changes to the wetland delineation boundary.
39	Project Benefits	Commenters state that the Project will not provide any benefits to New Jersey.	As set forth in Transco's applications pending before NJDEP, in addition to meeting needs of downstate New York, the Project will provide an important benefit to natural gas shippers and consumers in New Jersey: • The New Jersey facilities will provide enhanced system flexibility during planned and unplanned maintenance activities on Transco's natural gas infrastructure within the State.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			○ The Project is designed to provide 400,000 Dth/d under peak conditions, however, shippers (especially local distribution company type shippers) do not typically require their full contractual volume except during an abbreviated time period during extreme weather conditions. Under normal conditions, the facilities constructed as part of the Project will enable Transco to manage maintenance outages and repairs; thus, minimizing impacts or interruption to all shippers on the system, especially those in New Jersey. • In the event that the permits for the Project are denied and the Project is not constructed, the anticipated increase in the average system utilization off of the Transco system could result in material degradation of delivery pressures at existing delivery points and increased challenges associated with delivering existing firm shipper entitlements in New Jersey. ○ Without the Project, utility providers would continue signing up customers to their service territory because they are obligated by the New York State Public Service Commission to provide safe, reliable energy service upon request. ○ This could, in turn, result in an increase in the normal load from the interstate pipeline transmission grid, resulting in an overall increase in average deliveries off the Transco pipeline system in New Jersey. ○ An increase in the average system utilization would lead to increased operational challenges related to the scheduling of maintenance activities and a greater chance of impacts to all shippers in the northeast region, including those in New Jersey. ○ As noted in Transco's Alternatives Analysis for the Project (see Appendix C of the Environmental Report), the purpose of the new Compressor Station 206 is to offset the pressure drop associated with transporting the additional volume of natural gas flowing through the pipeline.
40	Property Values	Commenters state that their property values will be adversely affected by the construction of Compressor Station 206.	FERC staff reviewed studies that evaluate the impact of energy infrastructure facilities on surrounding property values. The FEIS ultimately determined that there was no conclusive evidence indicating that compressor stations have a significant negative impact on property values. (FEIS 4.8.8). Accordingly, FERC concluded, as it has in other cases, that the project is not likely to significantly impact property values in the project area. *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co*., 167 FERC ¶ 61,110, at P 37 (2019) ("2019 Certificate Order").
41	Public Interest	Commenters argue that the Project is not in the public interest and point to policy statements set forth in the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan, executive orders, and the GWRA. Commenters also argue that Transco failed to show the economic value of the Project to the general area.	Under the FWPA rules, the NJDEP "shall issue an individual freshwater wetlands or open water fill permit only if the regulated activity: . . . [i]s in the public interest, as determined by the Department". N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.2(b)(12). In determining whether a regulated activity is in the public interest, the NJDEP considers several factors. Commenters take issue with how Transco's Project could satisfy two of these factors: (1) The public interest in preservation of natural resources and the interest of the property owners in reasonable economic development; and (2) "[t]he economic value, both public and private, of the proposed regulated activity to the general area." N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.2(b)(12)i and vi. In analyzing the first factor the FWPA Rules provide that "[i]n determining whether a proposed activity is in the public interest, the Department shall consider, as one source of guidance, the goals, strategies, policy objectives and policies of the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan [(SDRP)], adopted and/or readopted by the State Planning Commission pursuant to the New Jersey State Planning Act, N.J.S.A. 52:18A-196 et seq., and the State Planning Act rules, N.J.A.C. 5:85." N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.2(b)(12)i. Notably, commenters do not address the first factor, but only the fact that the Rule references the SDRP. Commenters then rely on the one reference in the SDRP to global warming to claim that the NJDEP "must take the GHG emissions from NESE into consideration as part of the public interest review" under the FWPA Rules. But this is not what the SDRP actually says. Commenters cite to SDRP Policy 6 Transportation and Air Quality, which states, in its entirety: Promote and encourage development and expanded use of environmentally sensitive, renewable energy resources and energy conversion processes that reduce the demand for fossil fuel consumption and the byproducts created during the combustion of fossil fuels. SDRP at 141. The policy statement cited by commenters relates to transportation, not energy resources, and has no bearing on the Department's analysis of Transco FWPA permit application.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			Commenters also cite Governor Murphy's Executive Order 100 ("EO100") and NJDEP Commissioner Catherine R. McCabe's Administrative Order 2020-01 ("AO1"). However, these orders also have no bearing on Transco's pending FWPA application as they merely require, among other things, that the Department amend its regulations to incorporate climate change considerations into its various permitting processes. See. e.g., EO100 (requiring NJDEP within two years of the date of the Order to adopt Protecting Against Climate Threats ("PACT") regulations). Consistent with EO100 and AO1, NJDEP has adopted the 2021 Green Infrastructure requirements and the 2023 Inland Flood Protection Rule. NJDEP has proposed its Resilient Environments and Landscapes ("REAL") Rules, which are comprehensive amendments to the Coastal Zone Management Rules, Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act Rules, Flood Hazard Area Control Act Rules, and Stormwater Management Rules. However, the REAL Rules have not yet been adopted. Transco's applications comply with all applicable NJDEP regulations. Further, and as noted above, New Jersey's GWRA does not require NJDEP to consider greenhouse gas emissions in its review of the pending permit applications. These arguments represent another attempt by commenters to bootstrap general policy statements into the permitting process, which was recently rejected by the New Jersey Superior Court Appellate Division in In re Proposed Constr. of Compressor Station CS327, No. A-3616-20, 2025 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 1189, at *18 (App. Div. June 27, 2025)(rejecting EELC's arguments that the NJDEP was required to consider the project's contribution to climate change as part of its water quality management plan consistency determination.) The factor related to the "economic value, both public and private, of the proposed regulated activity to the general area" has also been satisfied. See discussion above in "Project Benefits" and below in "Purpose and Need."
42	Purpose and Need	Commenters state that the Project is not needed. Commenters state that New York does not need the gas transported by the Project and cite reports and comments prepared by other entities that were submitted to the NYPSC.	FERC is the agency charged with evaluating the need for the Project under the Natural Gas Act. In this role, FERC evaluated the purpose and need for the Project (referred to as the "public convenience and necessity" under Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act). On May 23, 2019, FERC issued a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity authorizing the Project in which it determined that "Transco has sufficiently demonstrated that there is market demand for the project." *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co*., 167 FERC ¶ 61,110, at P 16 (2019), order denying reh'g and stay, 171 FERC ¶ 61,031 (2020), *amended*, 172 FERC ¶ 61,036 (2020) *vacated*, 187 FERC ¶ 61,145 (2024). FERC also found that "[b]ased on the benefits the project will provide and the minimal adverse impacts on existing shippers, other pipelines and their captive customers, and landowners and surrounding communities, we find, consistent with the Certificate Policy Statement and Natural Gas Act section 7(c), that the public convenience and necessity requires approval of the project, subject to the environmental and other conditions in this order." 2019 Certificate Order, ¶ 18. On May 29, 2025, Transco submitted a petition to FERC requesting reissuance of the Order Issuing Certificate for the Project. On August 28, 2025, FERC issued the 2025 Certificate Order for the Project. FERC found that "…although the precedent agreements analyzed in the Certificate Order were terminated once the certificate for the project was vacated, Transco has executed new binding precedent agreements with unaffiliated project shippers for 100% of the firm transportation service to be created by the project…Accordingly, based on Transco's precedent agreements for 100% of the project's capacity and also noting that there are credible market studies that show that the project may help alleviate reliability issues for project shippers and end-users, provide reliability and system resilience benefits to the wider New York region, and reduce energy prices for consumers, we find there is a demonstrated need for the project." *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC*, 192 FERC ¶ 61,184, at P 42 (2025). National Grid is a regulated entity that is obligated by the New York State Public Service Commission to provide safe, reliable energy service upon request. In order to meet that obligation, National Grid has reported that it identified the need for incremental gas transportation capacity to serve load growth in the boroughs of Brooklyn, Queens and Staten Island in New York City, as well Nassau and Suffolk Counties on Long Island. To support this growth, National Grid entered into an agreement with Transco to construct the NESE Project in order to enhance the reliability of service to existing customers, as well as to satisfy growing demand for natural gas in our downstate New York service territory. The stated purpose and need for the project, therefore, is "to provide 400,000 dekatherms per day (Dth/d) of incremental firm natural gas transportation services to

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			Brooklyn Union Gas Company and KeySpan Gas East Corporation (collectively referred to as National Grid) in order to serve National Grid's residential and commercial customers in the New York City area." (FEIS, pp. 1-3). Therefore, on May 3, 2019, the Commission issued an order finding that the "public convenience and necessity requires approval of the [P]roject." In making this determination, the Commission found that there was strong market demand for the Project based on long-term binding precedent agreements for the entire capacity created by the Project. In 2025, National Grid entered into 15-year contracts for 100% of the capacity that will be created by the Project. Transco 8/5/25 Letter to the FERC (FERC accession #20250805-5222). Transco petitioned FERC for reissuance of the 2019 Certificate Order and FERC issued the 2025 Certificate Order, finding that it had the authority to do so because "[i]n considering Transco's request for reissuance, below we apply the Certificate Policy Statement to assess whether there is a need for the project and whether the project will serve the public interest, as we would for a new [Natural Gas Act] Section 7 application. Thus, our authority under section 7 of the [Natural Gas Act] to reissue a certificate of public convenience and necessity is no different than our authority to issue a certificate in the first instance." 2025 Certificate Order, ¶ 21. The FERC found that "Transco's precedent agreements for 100% of the project's firm transportation service to be significant evidence of market need for the project." (2025 Certificate Order, ¶ 26). In addition, on September 18, 2025, the NYPSC approved National Grid's long-term gas plan, finding that the Project is "needed to ensure the continued provisions of safe, adequate and reliable gas service to customers in New York City and on Long Island." Exhibit B at p. 58. Specifically, NYPSC found that the Project would address natural gas system supply constraints and reliability concerns facing the downstate natural gas system and would, among other things, provide National Gird with additional flexibility, and more time to stabilize the gas system before curtailment; increase reliability by delivering a diverse supply source, which would limit the impact of a disruption to a single supply source; decrease reliance on compressed natural gas supply in downstate New York; and increase firm gas supply by 13% to the downstate New York system. NYPSC also noted that the Project would have significant beneficial cost impacts to New York, and beneficial emission and climate impacts. Specifically, the Project would avoid power sector emissions ranging from approximately 23,200 to 88,800 short tons of CO2e and could lead to GHG emissions reductions of approximately 13,000 tons from 2025 to 2042. NYPSC also noted that oil and gas conversions and reduced trucking will help reduce air pollution including emissions of particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides and mercury. The reports and comments submitted to NJDEP, including the Comments of the City of New York, the Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. report, and the report from the Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis were all submitted to the NYPSC. However, NYPSC ultimately found that "NESE is needed and that a decision by National Grid to proceed with it would be appropriate." Exhibit B at p. 74. Given the 2019 Certificate Order, the 2025 Certificate Order, and September 18 NYPSC Order, Transco has established that the Project is needed and in the public interest.
43	Purpose and Need • Compelling public need	Commenters state that Transco has failed to demonstrate a compelling public need for the Project.	As required by the FWPA Rules, an applicant that proposes a non-water-dependent activity within exceptional resource value wetlands must establish that there is <u>either</u>: (1) a compelling public need for the proposed activity greater than the need to protect the freshwater wetland or trout production water, and that the need cannot be met by essentially similar projects in the region which are under construction or expansion, or which have received the necessary governmental permits and approvals; <u>or</u> (2) [t]hat denial of the permit would impose an extraordinary hardship on the applicant brought about by circumstances peculiar to the subject property. (emphasis added) (N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.4(a).)

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			Importantly, the Rules require only that an applicant establish either a compelling public need or extraordinary hardship. As detailed in Transco's May 2025 FWW individual permit application, in response to N.J.A.C. 7:7A-10.4(a), Transco establishes both.
44	Raritan Bay Loop • Anchorage areas and burial depth	Commenter raises concerns about an upcoming anchor penetration/ embedment study performed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in the Sandy Hook-Stapleton Anchorage areas and how a safe burial depth can be required if the study has not yet been completed.	Transco will meet or exceed all design safety standards required by the U.S. Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (FEIS 4.11.1) and the USACE's New York District (FEIS 3.6), including minimum burial depth requirements, to minimize risk of vessel anchor or gear impact that might compromise the pipeline. Transco will adhere to USACE requirements for burial depth along the route, including a minimum depth of 7 feet in anchorage areas, 15 feet in federally designated navigation channels, and 4 feet elsewhere along the route. At cable crossings and Rockaway Transfer Point where minimum burial depth cannot be achieved, Transco will install concrete mattresses over the top of the pipeline to provide the equivalent protection of 4 feet of sediment (FEIS 2.3.3.7 and 2.3.3.8). Additionally, the pipeline will be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with the U.S. Department of Transportation's (USDOT) Minimum Federal Safety Standards in 49 CFR 192. The pipeline would also be externally coated with concrete for additional protection and buoyancy control. (FEIS 4.11.1 and 4.11.2). In the unlikely event that a portion of the concrete coating is breached, and the external coating of corrosion inhibitor is compromised, the pipeline will be further protected from corrosion by connection to a cathodic protection system. A cathodic protection system uses an induced current and/or a sacrificial anode that corrodes preferentially to steel pipe. The route alignment, proposed minimum burial depths, and additional controls for minimizing risk of vessel or gear impact account for input from representatives of the maritime community, including the U.S. Coast Guard and the New York/New Jersey Harbor Safety, Navigation and Operations Committee (e.g., see Transco's October 2018 Supplemental Information on FERC Docket CP17-101-000; Accession No. 20181012-5123). Mariners will be notified of the installation of the pipeline via the U.S. Coast Guard Local Notice to Mariners. Following installation, Transco will notify the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration of the project completion and specifications so they may initiate the appropriate chart and Coast Pilot corrections. This will minimize risk of anchor interactions. Transco will conduct an annual post-construction monitoring survey for at least five years following the completion of offshore construction to ensure that adequate burial depth is maintained along the pipeline route. Additionally, Transco will monitor the pressure of the pipeline system from the Transco Gas Control center 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, using sophisticated computer and telecommunications equipment. (FEIS 4.11.1). Transco will be able detect a shift in the pipeline system through a drop in pressure and stop the flow of gas by closing valves in the event the pipeline became damaged until repairs are made. (FEIS 4.11.1).
45	Raritan Bay Loop • Construction Safety	Commenter states that construction in the Raritan Bay will endanger workers due to high-risk work under water.	Transco will implement strict safety measures, in accordance with all applicable regulations, to ensure worker safety during construction of the Raritan Bay Loop. A thorough plan outlining the work, necessary tools, and emergency procedures will be implemented to ensure the safety of the workers during construction. Continuous communication will be maintained during construction, and the construction team will go through safety training before any work begins. Tides, currents, and weather conditions will be closely monitored.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
46	Raritan Bay Loop • Construction schedule/timeline	Commenters state that the proposed shortened construction timeline would necessarily increase work intensity and magnify overall impacts of the Project in Raritan Bay. Commenters state that the plan to compress the construction schedule is a significant change that is not credibly designed to ensure that the Project meets water quality standards. Commenters also question whether the compressed scheduled changes Transco's plans related to pile driving.	Since Transco's initial application to the NJDEP in June 2017, Transco has undertaken multiple engineering design revisions to reduce the size, scope and configuration of the Project to the maximum extent practicable while still meeting the needs of the Project. Transco has provided sufficient assurances to the NJDEP that its construction schedule for the Raritan Bay Loop is feasible and that a contingency has been built into the schedule to accommodate operational issues and mechanical issues. The NJDEP has reviewed Transco's sediment and contaminant modeling based on various rates of dredging. Transco initially modeled substantially faster dredging rates to assess potential "worst-case" sediment and contaminant deposition scenarios. However, when accounting for realistic dredging rates and use of an environmental bucket, the model results suggest that the Project can comply with New Jersey State water quality standards for contaminants within 500 feet of the dredge. If the schedule is delayed due to factors such as mechanical issues or adverse weather, the NJDEP will require Transco to comply with all species-related Time of Year Restrictions (TOYRs) and water quality criteria identified in the NJDEP's water quality certification, accounting for NJDEP-approved TOYR allowances. NJDEP retains the authority to suspend or revoke Transco's water quality certification in the event it fails to comply with those conditions. As to proposed pile driving, these activities have not changed since the 2019 issuance of the previous Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA). Only the dates have shifted to accommodate delay in construction from receiving other permits.
47	Raritan Bay Loop • Disposal of contaminated sediment	Commenters alleged that the Project would dispose of toxic chemicals into the Raritan Bay.	Transco is not proposing to dispose of contaminated sediment or toxic chemicals into the Raritan Bay. Up to approximately 800,000 cubic yards of the sediments with lower contaminant concentrations were determined to be suitable for in-water disposal at an offshore site (outside of New Jersey waters) based on USACE and USEPA testing guidelines. In areas with elevated sediment contamination that is not suitable for offshore disposal, Transco will dredge the material using an environmental bucket and place the material in sealed barges; this sediment will then be disposed at an approved onshore facility.
48	Raritan Bay Loop • Impact on Atlantic striped bass, finfish, and shellfish	Commenters raised concern regarding the impact of construction on the Atlantic striped bass population and other fin fish, and shellfish.	Impacts to Atlantic striped bass (M. saxatilis), fin fish and shellfish will be minimized by complying with fish-related Time of Year Restrictions (TOYRs) to the extent possible. The nature of the work will be short-term and as such any impacts would be minimal. See Response #109 for details on impacts to shellfish habitat. As stated in FEIS 4.5.2.8, mobile finfish will likely vacate the immediate area of construction temporarily during in-water activities for other surrounding similar habitat not impacted by construction activities to avoid the disturbance. It is expected that mobile finfish will return to the area once construction has ceased in the immediate area, particularly considering the frequent disturbance in the Project area. Project construction will adhere to TOYRs for several species in New Jersey, such as anadromous fish (including alewife and blueback herring), Atlantic sturgeon, and winter flounder, with exceptions for low-impact activities approved by the NJDEP and National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries (FEIS 4.6.3.5). As described in the Project record, the TOYRs (with NJDEP-approved exceptions) allow offshore construction activities to occur during Transco's scheduled execution window beginning May 1, 2026, through December 31, 2026. Transco will conduct laboratory-analyzed and field monitoring of turbidity to comply with state water quality standards such that impacts from the Project remain localized.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
49	Raritan Bay Loop • Impacts on fishing industry and recreation opportunities	Commenters state that the Project will negatively impact commercial fishing operations and other businesses, as well as impacts on recreational activities.	FERC's January 25, 2019, FEIS concluded that the Project's impacts to fisherman, recreational boaters, and whale-watching businesses would be temporary and minor and would resolve upon completion of construction. Further, New Jersey state waters crossed by the proposed Raritan Bay Loop are currently classified as prohibited for shellfish harvest; in the waters crossed to the north of Sandy Hook, the Department issues permits that allow the harvest of surf clam for bait purposes only (FEIS 4.5.2.4). Nonetheless, the construction will temporarily impact offshore activities in waters within the Project area, including recreational and sport fishing, boating, whale watching, scuba diving, and cruise ship operations. These impacts will primarily be associated with the temporary restriction of access during construction and increased travel time caused by necessary rerouting to avoid the active construction zone. To ensure that any disruption is kept to a minimum, Transco will provide notice of offshore construction activities and schedules to the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) on a routine basis. Additionally, Transco will work with the USCG Waterways Management Coordinator to ensure area cruise ports and cruise lines are updated on scheduled construction activities and active construction locations so that routes can be planned accordingly. Transco will utilize HDD technology when installing the portion of offshore pipeline route in the Ambrose Channel to further reduce the impacts on recreational and general water-based transit in that area. Since the impacts on recreation are only expected to be temporary, minor, and limited to the active construction areas, residents and visitors to the Raritan Bay area will be able to continue to engage in water-based recreation in areas outside the immediate construction zone. In addition, because water-based recreation will continue at current levels, no impacts on local establishments that cater to these recreational users are anticipated and no impacts on the larger tourism industry are expected to occur.
50	Raritan Bay Loop • Impacts on Gateway National Recreation Area	Commenters allege that the Project will impact the Gateway National Recreation Area	It is anticipated that the project will have little to no impact on Gateway National Recreation Area due to meeting the projects water quality standards, implementing best management practices, and use of NOAA fisheries-approved observers for monitoring of protected marine wildlife. Transco will implement best management practices and corrective measures, including changing the rate of advancement of dredging activities, modifying hydraulic jetting pressures (for hand jetting and/or jet trenching); or implementing other reasonable operational controls that may reduce suspension of in-situ sediments as practicable. Transco will be required to monitor water quality during construction to ensure that the measures are properly implemented to control turbidity and associated contaminants.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
51	Raritan Bay Loop • Impacts on harvesting	A commenter raised concerns about depressions left by anchor strikes causing difficulty for harvesting equipment to operate in these areas.	As indicated in the FEIS (5.1.7.2), construction of the Raritan Bay Loop would occur within an approximate 14,166-acre workspace generally encompassing a 2,500- to 5,000-foot-wide corridor centered on the proposed pipeline. The majority of the workspace is needed to accommodate the anchor spread around construction barges and would not actually be impacted by construction. Of the designated workspace, an estimated 88 acres of seafloor would be directly impacted by construction (excavations, pipelay, anchoring systems, and backfilling) (i.e., less than 1% of the total workspace). Following construction, Transco would retain about 86 acres as permanent easement in offshore areas of New Jersey and New York and the remainder of the temporary construction workspace would be allowed to revert to previous uses. Additionally, Transco plans to backfill dredged areas with clean material; this is expected to decrease the extent of depressions created during cable installation and the use of clean material is expected to benefit benthic communities and water quality in the long term. Further, the referenced decision in Islander East vs. Gina McCarthy was based on the impacts to areas that are open to and certified for shellfishing. That decision also discusses the Cross Sound Cable, indicating that similar concerns were not pertinent to that project because it only affected 'dormant shellfish beds' compared to the commercially active beds in the Islander East project. Accordingly, New Jersey state waters crossed by the proposed Raritan Bay Loop are currently classified as prohibited for shellfish harvest; in the waters crossed to the north of Sandy Hook, the NJDEP issues permits that allow the harvest of surf clam for bait purposes only (FEIS 4.5.2.4). Based on a number of studies on benthic recovery (e.g., AKRF, Inc. et al. 2012; Germano et al. 1994; Hirsch et al. 1978; Kenny and Rees 1994; LaSalle et al. 1991; Murray and Saffert 1999; Newell et al. 1998; and Rhoades et al. 1978; FEIS 4.5.2.8), benthic communities can generally be expected to recolonize through natural succession in approximately one to three years. Faster rates of recovery are likely in areas less affected by the Project. To verify that benthic communities recover as expected, Transco will develop a post-construction benthic sampling and monitoring plan that identifies the duration of the monitoring period, the timing of sampling surveys, success criteria for assessing recovery of benthic species, and reporting requirements (2019 Certificate Order - Environmental Condition No. 15). The plan will be reviewed prior to commencement of offshore construction. Furthermore, following completion of backfilling activities for the Raritan Bay Loop, Transco will conduct a hydrographic survey to verify that the contours of the seafloor have been adequately restored and will perform additional backfill as needed (FEIS 4.5.2.8). Therefore, it is anticipated that the seafloor available to harvesting equipment would not be detrimentally affected by construction activities.
52	Raritan Bay Loop • Impacts on New Jersey Transit railroad	One commenter raised concerns regarding the impact of the pipeline on New Jersey Transit's railroad tracks.	Transco is proposing to install the Raritan Bay Loop and associated cathodic protection cable across New Jersey's Transit's commuter railroad via HDD. Transco is also working with New Jersey Transit in connection with the crossing of its tracks. As such, Transco will avoid impacts to New Jersey Transit's tracks.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
53	Raritan Bay Loop • Impacts on Raritan Bay Slag Site	Commenters state that the Project will cross through the contaminated Raritan Bay Slag site, thereby releasing even more contamination into Raritan Bay.	The Raritan Bay Slag site (NJDEP Program Interest Number 514709), which is on the USEPA National Priorities List, is located along the southern shore and in the Raritan Bay in Old Bridge Township and Sayreville, New Jersey. The USEPA National Priorities List identifies lead as the single contaminant of concern for the site (EPA 2009). Associated Study Areas 7 and 11 (Jetty Sector) overlap with the proposed Project temporary workspace in Raritan Bay. However, locations that would be disturbed by the Project (e.g., the Morgan Shore Approach HDD exit pit) are outside the areas currently planned for remediation by the USEPA, based on lead concentrations. Transco considered results from USEPA's site investigation (CDM 2011) and conducted additional sampling in the area of the Morgan Shore Approach HDD exit pit to further investigate the extent of contamination near Area 7 (see *Offshore Environmental Sampling Report* in Appendix J to the Environmental Report in Transco's May 2025 WFD Permit application). Based on these results, sediments that will be disturbed during construction of the Raritan Bay Loop have concentrations of lead lower than the remediation goal identified in the USEPA's 2013 Record of Decision (EPA 2013) for the designated remediation areas. Additionally, Transco proposes to implement several BMPs during offshore construction to suitably control Project-related turbidity and suspended contaminants. These BMPs include the following: • Use of HDD for the Morgan Shore crossing which will reduce disturbance of contaminated nearshore sediments. • Use of an environmental bucket for all clamshell dredging in New Jersey waters. • No side-casting of dredged material. • No barge scow overflow in areas with sediments that have contaminant concentrations exceeding ER-M guidance values. • Development of a water quality monitoring plan, to be reviewed and approved by NJDEP prior to commencement of offshore construction. • Adjustment of dredging rate as necessary to meet water quality criteria specified in the permit and/or water quality monitoring plan. • Backfill material will be clean, sandy material, with a limited amount of fine-grained material (i.e., silt and clay). • During backfilling, the clamshell bucket will be lowered below the water line before releasing any material. Further, all material dredged during construction of the Raritan Bay Loop within Study Areas 7 and 11 will be disposed of at appropriately permitted upland facilities in accordance with Transco's draft Raritan Bay Loop Materials Management Plan (Appendix G to the Compliance Statement in Transco's May 2025 WFD Application). Because all Project-related offshore dredged areas will be backfilled with clean, sandy material from Department-approved sources, overall sediment contamination in Raritan Bay will be reduced. References: CDM. 2011. *Final Remedial Investigation Report: Raritan Bay Slag Superfund Site*. Final. Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2019. Superfund National Priorities List (NPL) Sites by State. Available at: https://www.epa.gov/superfund/national-priorities-list-npl-sites-state. Accessed August 30, 2019. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2013. *Record of Decision - Raritan Bay Slag Superfund Site, Townships of Old Bridge/Sayreville, New Jersey.* USEPA Region 2. May 2013. CERCLIS ID NJN000206276. Available at: https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/SiteProfiles/index.cfm?fuseaction=second.docdata&id=0206276. Accessed August 30, 2019. EPA. 2009. *Raritan Bay Slag.* November 2009 NPL Site Listing Narrative. Available at https://semspub.epa.gov/work/02/363174.pdf. Accessed on May 12, 2020.

		Commenters state that the Project will disturb sensitive habitats for clams, horseshoe crabs, fish, turtles, and other marine animals. A commenter states that data shows that benthic communities declined as a result of Transco's construction of the Rockaway Delivery Lateral. The commenter also referenced a study included in the FEIS related to adverse effects of turbidity on hard clams and noted that recovery from redistribution of sediments from construction could take 3 years or more. Commenters also raised concerns about Project impacts on migratory routes to upriver spawning grounds for Atlantic Sturgeon, River herring, and American Shad.	The Project was evaluated for potential impacts to sensitive habitat, including FERC's assessment of the potential effects of construction-related activities on offshore sensitive habitat in its review of the Project (FEIS 4.5.2.8, 4.5.3.2), and concluded that the Project will not result in significant adverse impacts. Considering the extent of the offshore impact relative to the area of similar habitat available in the New York Bight, as well as the temporary nature of the impact and rate of recovery by the affected species, no significant, long-term impacts on the benthic community or other offshore resources are expected from the sediment-disturbing activities (FEIS 4.5.2.8). The benthic communities, including clams and horseshoe crabs, in areas disturbed by Project activities are expected to recolonize through natural succession in approximately 1 to 3 years, based on the results of several studies identified in the FERC FEIS for the Project (see FEIS Section 4.5.2.8 at FERC Docket CP17-101). Mobile species, such as horseshoe crabs, will recolonize more quickly than non-mobile species. Faster rates of recovery are expected in areas less affected by the Project. As to turtles, the data sources used to identify potential sea turtle occurrence in the vicinity of the Project range from 1982 to 2017 (FEIS 4.6.3.4) and in 2023 (STSSN, 2023). The occurrence of a nesting Kemp's ridley sea turtle at the Gateway National Recreation area in July 2018 (NPS, 2018). The Project will not be located in the vicinity of the Gateway National Recreation area, and Transco will use NOAA Fisheries-approved observers to monitor for sea turtles within the clearance zone during pile driving activities when implementing its Marine Mammal Observer Training and Response Protocol Plan (FEIS 4.6.3.4). Additionally, Transco will train vessel operators and crews to recognize protected species and employ avoidance measures if sea turtles are observed. Further, vessel operators would also conform to federal regulations that prohibit approaching sea turtles at a distance closer than 150 feet (45.7 meters) (FEIS 4.6.3.4). Transco is adhering to multiple overlapping TOYR to the extent practicable, in part to help prevent impact on migratory routes to Atlantic sturgeon and river herring spawning grounds. Observance of TOYR for Atlantic sturgeon and river herring are also expected to help avoid Project impacts on other migrating anadromous species such as American shad. Transco is working with applicable agencies to allow flexibility where impacts are expected to be minimal or BMPs can be used to minimize impacts. Although species-specific BMPs have not been proposed for horseshoe crab, Transco will minimize seafloor disturbance to the extent practicable, implement BMPs during construction (discussed above), and backfill with clean material where necessary (FEIS 4.5.3.2). Additionally, Transco will backfill dredged areas with clean material, which will benefit benthic communities and water quality in the long term. Further, Transco will be required to conduct a post-construction benthic sampling and monitoring plan to assess the recovery of benthic species (2019 Certificate Order - Environmental Condition No. 15).
54	Raritan Bay Loop • Impacts on horseshoe crabs, fish, and other marine animals	Commenter states that habitat recovery estimates remain based on pre-2015 studies that fail to account for cumulative and ongoing impacts. Commenters raised concerns regarding marine mammal strikes/collisions, including the potential for strikes during nighttime work or inclement weather. Commenter raised concerns about impacts of thermal discharges on marine animals.	Although post-construction surveys for the Rockaway Delivery Lateral Project suggested that the concentration of surf clam in this area may have been declining, the decline was observed at both impacted survey sites and reference sites that were not subject to construction-related sediment disturbance (Ecology & Environment 2016) (FEIS 4.5.2.4). A survey conducted in 2012 also indicated an overall decline of surf clam in the vicinity of the Rockaway Peninsula compared to four previous surveys performed since 2002. This suggests that the overall surf clam decline was due to factors other than pipeline construction impacts. The studies from the FEIS referenced in the comment (Davis & Hidu 1969; Turner & Miller 1991) are included in a broad synthesis of turbidity effects on marine organisms (Wilber & Clarke 2001), which provides extensive data on the tolerances of hard clams and other shellfish to turbidity (see Table A-4 in Wilber & Clarke 2001). More broadly across all studies in that review, results demonstrate high tolerance of hard clams to turbidity, particularly over the short durations of increased turbidity expected at any given location during Project activities (< 8 hr; see below). For hard clam larvae exposed to elevated turbidity for 2 days, no effects were seen until concentrations reached 2,200 ppm. In the hard clam larvae 10-day exposure studies referenced here, no effects were observed at 500 ppm, and 10% mortality rates observed at 750 ppm did not increase even at concentrations of 2,000 ppm. No effects were seen in hard clam larvae exposed to 500 ppm for 10 days. These studies demonstrate that duration of exposure is extremely important to consider when evaluating effects of any given turbidity level (see expected duration of turbidity during construction below). As stated in the FEIS (4.5.3.2), there is potential for construction-related sediment resuspension and turbidity to result in temporary, minor, indirect and direct, adverse impacts on hard clams. Based on additional studies on benthic recovery (e.g., LaSalle et al. 1991; and Rhoads et al. 1978; FEIS

			4.5.2.8), hard clams are tolerant of naturally elevated suspended sediment concentrations (e.g., concentrations generated during storm events and seasonal flooding conditions or even local wind and tide events) and exhibit frequent reproduction and high dispersibility - characteristics that make them well-suited for continually changing habitats. To verify that benthic communities recover as expected, Transco will develop a 5-year post-construction benthic sampling and monitoring plan that identifies the timing of sampling surveys, success criteria for assessing recovery of benthic species, and reporting requirements (2019 Certificate Order - Environmental Condition No. 15). The plan will be reviewed by applicable agencies prior to commencement of offshore construction. Along the proposed route, hard clam (*Mercenaria mercenaria*) were only detected west of the Chapel Hill Channel. In these areas, Transco's Project-specific sediment modeling indicates that the maximum extent of Project-related TSS concentrations of 100 mg/L could be limited to 1,500 feet or less from the sediment disturbing activity. Within New Jersey waters, the sediment modeling indicates that the average overall duration of sediment-disturbing activity along any 1,000-ft segment of the route would be less than 10 continuous days. Ambient water quality conditions in the hard clam areas are expected to return within one to eight hours following the cessation of activities at any given location (see Transco's May 2025 Application – Appendix L). The increased sediment load from Project construction activities may adversely affect some hard clams outside the area of direct disturbance. However, given the relatively short duration of dredging and backfilling activities and the rapid pace at which resuspended sediments are expected to settle out of the water column, impacts of sedimentation and turbidity on hard clam populations (and other aquatic resources) are anticipated to be temporary and minor (FEIS 4.5.2.8). Notwithstanding, based on a number of studies on benthic recovery (e.g., AKRF, Inc. et al. 2012; Germano et al. 1994; Hirsch et al. 1978; Kenny and Rees 1994; LaSalle et al. 1991; Murray and Saffert 1999; Newell et al. 1998; and Rhoads et al. 1978; FEIS 4.5.2.8), benthic communities can generally be expected to recolonize through natural succession in approximately one to three years. Faster rates of recovery are likely in areas less affected by the Project. To verify that benthic communities recover as expected, Transco will develop a 5-year, post-construction benthic sampling and monitoring plan that identifies the timing of sampling surveys, success criteria for assessing recovery of benthic species, and reporting requirements (2019 Certificate Order - Environmental Condition No. 15). The plan will be reviewed and approved by applicable agencies prior to commencement of offshore construction. Contrary to commenter's claim regarding habitat recovery estimates, the previously conducted benthic survey is suitably representative of current conditions for the purpose of assessing potential and cumulative impacts. Additionally, FERC has confirmed that the FEIS is still valid in the 2025 Certificate Order. Minor changes in benthic community assemblages are unlikely to significantly alter recovery time. Dominant sediment types, which also impact benthic recovery, are even less likely to have changed since the time of Transco's Project-specific sediment surveys. As part of Transco's 2025 application to the USACE for a permit authorizing offshore placement of dredged material under Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, Transco queried the USCG National Response Center database to compile the spill history in the vicinity of the offshore portion of the Raritan Bay Loop portion of the Project for the period of October 2017 to June 2025 (i.e., since the date of last spill history submittal to the USACE). This included a review of all reported incidents that occurred in counties crossed by the Raritan Bay Loop, i.e., Middlesex and Monmouth counties in New Jersey, as well as Richmond and Queens counties in New York. The Transco team screened all the reported incidents and narrowed the list to 11 spill events that may have occurred within 1 mile of the Project's Raritan Bay Loop route since October 2017. Details provided in the spill history show that spill incidents within 1 mile of the route are small, localized, and discrete events. The identified spill events can be categorized into three types of incidents: • Sheens from unknown sources (4 incidents) • Sunken vessels/vessel accidents (6 incidents) • Wastewater storage tanks (1 incident) These spills are not unexpected for the Raritan Bay and Lower New York Bay given the frequent recreational and commercial vessel activity within these waterways, and diverse land uses along the waterfront, including marinas, working waterfront facilities, and highly urbanized coastal communities.

			Based on the information provided in the spill history and the best of Transco's knowledge regarding new sources of contamination, Transco concluded that the concentrations of sediment contaminants along the Raritan Bay Loop route would not have been affected by the spills potentially occurring near the route since 2017. Based, in part, on the updated spill history, the USACE issued a Section 103 permit for the Project on July 16, 2025. Further, Transco will conduct 5 years of post-construction monitoring to confirm recovery of the benthic community. (FEIS Section 5.2 Mitigation Recommendation #15). As to the potential for vessel strikes/collisions with marine animals, including turtles, many of the vessels associated with the Project will primarily be slow-moving or stationary. However, as part of permitting the NMFS Transco has provided mitigation to avoid/minimize marine mammal strikes/collision related to vessel activity. Minimization measures include: • Adherence to the speed restrictions to 10 knots (regardless of vessel size) when traveling within the North Atlantic right whale Seasonal Management Area or any established Dynamic Management Areas (DMAs). • Cease in-water activity if any marine mammal approaches within 10 meters and vessels must reduce speed to the minimum level required to maintain steerage and safe working conditions, as necessary to avoid direct physical interaction. • Daily monitoring of sources for North Atlantic right whale and other marine mammal presence (i.e., Whale Alert, Whale Map, Right Whale Sighting Advisory System, and the U.S. Coast Guard's VHF Channel 16). • At all times, Project vessels will 1) Maintain a vigilant watch for right whales and slow down or stop the vessel to avoid striking the animal(s); 2) Conform to regulations prohibiting approach of right whales closer than 500 yards (460 m) (50 CFR 224.103 (c)); and 3) Adhere to rules for DMAs if they are designated by NMFS in the Project area. • All transiting vessels will have a dedicated observer to watch for protected species and communicate with the captain to avoid any strikes or collisions. If vessels are transiting during periods of limited visibility (including at night and during inclement weather), all vessels will comply with safe vessel operation procedures, including reduced speed, which will further limit the risk to protected species. Given the above, the risk of impact from Project-related vessel traffic and vessel strikes on marine mammals will be temporary and negligible. Lastly, the Project will not have significant adverse impacts from thermal discharges. Within New Jersey, the Project crosses the open waters of Raritan Bay, which is subject to substantial salinity and temperature gradients driven by tides and large freshwater river discharge events (Young and Hillard 1984). The presence of barges and vessels for construction activities would not measurably raise water temperatures. Further, the amount of vessel traffic added by the project is small compared to the existing vessel traffic in the area. Drilling fluids will be responsibly used to minimize friction between the drill and surrounding sediments. Any nominal increase from friction during HDD activities would be quickly dissipated by surrounding sediments and/or water currents. Further, a majority of the HDD will be a few to several feet below the seabed surface, away from where benthic fish eggs would be found. The Project's offshore construction and operation activities would have an insignificant effect on the overall day-to-day temperature fluctuations and seasonal thermal cycles of these large waterbodies. Reference: Young, R. A. and B. F. Hillard. 1984. Suspended Matter Distributions and Fluxes Related to the Hudson-Raritan Estuarine Plume. December 1984. National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Technical Memorandum 8. Rockville, Maryland: NOAA National Ocean Service, Office of Oceanography and Marine Assessment. http://docs.lib.noaa.gov/noaa_documents/NOS/OMA/TM_NOS_OMA/nos_oma_8.PDF. Accessed August 5, 2016.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
55	Raritan Bay Loop • Impacts on shipping lanes	Commenters raise concerns related to the increased risk of impact of construction on shipping lanes.	Transco will develop a Mariner Communication Plan and a Navigation Plan which will detail construction mitigation for impacting shipping lanes and provide ample notice of construction activities in designated areas through Local Notice to Mariners.

		Commenters state that noise resulting from offshore construction will negatively impact marine life. Commenters also raised questions regarding an increase in requested takes in Transco's IHA. Commenters also claim that Transco underestimates the risks to marine mammals due to noise related to pile driving activities. Commenter states that there is a discrepancy in the number of species listed for Level A harassment. Commenter raises concerns about the use of Chirp sonar (2–16 kHz), which it alleges falls directly within ranges known to harm marine mammals.	Transco has analyzed potential impacts on marine mammals, fish, and sea turtles from noise generated during offshore construction activities. Transco's analysis regarding marine mammals is included in its Request for an IHA from NOAA Fisheries (submitted with revisions to NOAA Fisheries on May 30, 2025) and in the IHA, issued by NOAA Fisheries Office of Protected Resources (OPR) in September 2025. The analysis regarding fish is included in the "Latest Noise Modeling on Fish and Sea Turtles – January 2020 (Northeast Supply Enhancement Project)," submitted in January 2020. Through NOAA Fisheries re-consultation completed on August 18, 2025, the agency concluded that prior assessment of underwater noise for fish and sea turtles was adequate and underwater noise from the Project would not likely adversely affect threatened or endangered species (sea turtles and some fish). Nor would Project activities result in a take as defined under the Endangered Species Act. Transco estimates that Project-related construction vessels could generate underwater noise that peaks between 140 to 180 dB re 1 µPa at 3.3 feet at frequencies between 0.1 and 1 kilohertz (kHz) (LGL and JASCO, 2005). However, the Project area is in the vicinity of shipping lanes associated with the Port of New York and New Jersey, which is the largest port on the east coast of the United States. Based on the proximity of the pipeline route to this major shipping center, the background noise is likely dominated by large vessels (e.g., container ships) that produce source levels of 180 to 190 dB (re 1 µPa based on the root-mean-squared (RMS) metric) at frequencies between 200 and 500 hertz (Hz) (OSPAR Commission, 2009; Jasney et al., 2005). Therefore, the background noise in the underwater environment is likely similar to the noise that would be generated by the largest vessels that would be used during construction of the pipeline. As such, we do not expect that the relatively small number of vessels associated with the Project would substantially affect the existing underwater noise environment or aquatic resources (FEIS 4.5.2.8). Other noise from jet trenching and pile driving is expected to be temporary and is not expected to have population-level impacts on marine mammals, sea turtles, or fish species, which will be able to temporarily avoid the area of construction (FEIS Section 4.5.2.8). Further, underwater noise associated with the operation of non-pile-driving construction activities (e.g., heavy machinery operations, clamshell dredging, and jet trenching) is not a major concern for marine mammals because the noise is not expected to reach Level B harassment thresholds. NOAA Fisheries OPR has concurred with this determination and implemented a 10-meter exclusion zone to prevent any physical injury to the individual(s) that may come into direct contact with the equipment. The use of construction personnel has been approved by NOAA Fisheries OPR, and all personnel acting as observers for the 10-meter exclusion zone will be trained and adhere to all mitigation measures as set forth in the approved IHA permit issued September 2025. Construction personnel acting as observers will have no other construction-related responsibilities during times of protected species monitoring. Through consultation with NOAA Fisheries OPR and Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office (GARFO), Transco has committed to the IHA's required mitigation for pile driving. These requirements include measures such as pre-clearance and shutdown zones to minimize the risk of permanent hearing loss and ramp-up procedures that NOAA OPR and GARFO deems sufficient and effective. Transco estimates a total of 72 hours for pile installation, of which about 31 hours would be impact pile driving and about 41 hours would be vibratory pile driving. During the period of impact, potential noise impacts related to pile driving may include temporary or permanent impacts on marine mammal and fish auditory systems. FERC has accounted for these impacts on non-listed fish species in consultation with NOAA Fisheries Habitat Conservation Division, as reflected in the Essential Fish Habitat Assessment in the FEIS (FEIS Section 4.5.3). Transco will also implement its Marine Mammal Observer Training and Response Protocol Plan and utilize observers approved by NOAA Fisheries (Protected Species Observers) to monitor for protected marine species during pile driving activities (FEIS Section 5.1.6). Transco will also be required to adhere to TOYRs recommended by NJDEP, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, and NOAA Fisheries to complete all pile installation and removal activities outside of the Atlantic sturgeon peak spring and fall migration periods (FEIS Section 4.6.3.5) and North Atlantic right whale peak fall and winter migration periods. According to the FEIS and GARFO, noise from pile driving is not expected to harm bird or sea turtle species (FEIS Section 4.5.2.8). Transco also notes that the authorized marine mammal take numbers are based on NOAA Fisheries' feedback, guidance, and recommendations during 2025 consultation, following the NOAA Fisheries public notice for the proposed IHA (90 FR 38104). In September 2025, NOAA Fisheries made a negligible impact determination and a "small numbers" finding for marine mammals and issued the IHA to Transco (90 FR 45730). The issued IHA (90 FR 45730) includes Level B takes of 15 species and Level A takes of 7 species (humpback whale, minke whale, bottlenose dolphin, harbor porpoise, gray seal, harbor seal, and harp seal). Please note that in the final IHA (Table 11, 90 FR 45730), authorized seal takes are noted
56	Raritan Bay Loop • Noise		

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			as a guild, which includes gray, harbor, and harp seals as this is how their densities are estimated. In total, 4,868 Level B takes and 44 Level A takes are authorized for all seal species combined. As indicated in the IHA, authorization for incidental takings shall be granted if NMFS finds that the taking will have a negligible impact on the species or stocks. Table 1 in the final IHA notice (90 FR 45730) includes an analysis of the status of each species for which takes were requested, which considers their Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act status, stock abundance, identified level of Potential Biological Removal (PBR), and annual human-caused mortality and serious injury (Annual M/SI). The number of authorized takes is then taken into consideration given the previously mentioned variables understood about the stock to determine if a proposed action may or may not have an impact on the stock. Note that none of the species for which Level A take was authorized are listed as federally endangered. Lastly, the FEIS states that impacts on marine mammals from underwater noise would be negligible, due to their temporary and minor nature as well as the proposed minimization measures. A frequency-modulated (Chirp) acoustic sub-bottom profiler may be used during construction to help detect buried features and confirm the final burial depth of the pipeline (FEIS 4.5.2.8). This type of device typically emits sound in the range of 0.3 to 24 kHz at levels up to approximately 210 dB re 1 uPa RMS at 1 meter (Crocker and Fratantonio 2016). However, Transco anticipates using an equipment model with a maximum output of approximately 180 dB re 1 µPa RMS in the range of 2 to 24 kHz. The operating frequencies of this equipment model are within the generalized hearing ranges for all five marine mammal functional hearing groups, as the lower limit range of the generalized hearing ranges for low-frequency cetaceans is 7 Hz to 36 kHz and the upper limit range of the generalized hearing ranges for very high-frequency cetaceans is 200 Hz to 165 kHz (NMFS 2024). Despite the overlap, according to NOAA Fisheries' Offshore Wind Assessment Programmatic ESA Consultation (NMFS 2021), marine mammals would have to make a close approach and remain close to vessels operating Chirp sources (within 13 m) in order to receive multiple exposures at relatively high operating levels, to potentially result in any hearing impairment. Kremser et al. (2005) have noted that the probability of a whale swimming through the area of exposure when a sub-bottom profiler emits a pulse is small. This is because the marine mammal would have to pass the transducer at close range in order to be subjected to sound levels that could cause auditory injury. Additionally, the marine mammal would likely exhibit avoidance behavior to the area nearest the equipment rather than swim through at close range. Further, the restricted beamwidth and shape of the Chirp profiler makes it unlikely that a marine mammal would be exposed for an extended period of time during the passage of the vessel (NMFS 2021). The potential for auditory injury is even further reduced by the requirement in the issued IHA (90 FR 45730; Condition 4(h)) to shut down construction activities if a marine mammal approaches within 10 m. Transco will also comply with federal regulations to maintain a distance of 457 m from North Atlantic right whales.

57	Raritan Bay Loop • Exceedances of water quality standards	Commenters state that trenching and drilling in Raritan Bay will churn up toxins in the seabed and disrupt marine life and violate water quality standards. Commenter states that sedimentation would injure natural biota and render affected waters unsuitable for designated uses, including shellfish harvesting and maintenance, migration, and propagation of the natural and established biota. Commenter also states that the redistribution of sediments that fall out of suspension could bury benthic and demersal (bottom-dwelling) species, leaving benthic organisms, fish eggs, and larvae at risk of smothering or other injury. Commenter claims that Transco failed to consider the unusual tidal flows in Raritan Bay when analyzing impacts to water quality.	Although the Project will result in the temporary suspension of sediments within a localized area near dredging and backfilling activities, Transco's hydrodynamic and sediment transport modeling results indicate that the predicted plumes would be temporary, with TSS concentrations returning to ambient conditions within, at most, 8 hours after the associated dredging, trenching, or backfilling has ceased (FEIS 4.5.2.8). Data regarding tides, current velocity and strength, and circulation patterns were taken into consideration in the evaluation and modeling of construction impacts on resuspension of sediments, which were deemed temporary and minor (FEIS 4.5.2.8). Actual TSS concentrations during construction may be less than modeled concentrations based on the use of somewhat conservative modeling assumptions, particularly when taking into account slower rates of dredging and slack-tide pauses in some areas. Modeling results also indicate that Transco will be able to meet New Jersey State water quality standards for contaminants within 500 feet of the dredging activity. If they are a species sensitive to suspended sediment, fish will likely vacate immediate areas with elevated turbidity for nearby, similar waters and return once levels return to background. Transco will be required as a condition of the Department's authorizations to conduct water quality monitoring during construction and implement best management practices and corrective measures, as necessary, including changing the rate of advancement of the dredging activities; modifying hydraulic jetting pressures (for hand jetting and/or jet trenching); or implementing other reasonable operational controls that may reduce suspension of in-situ sediments as practicable. (See also 2019 Certificate Order, ¶ 49). Sediments along the Raritan Bay Loop were analyzed for contaminant concentrations. Up to approximately 800,000 cubic yards of the sediments with lower contaminant concentrations were determined to be suitable for in-water disposal at an offshore site (outside of New Jersey waters) based on USACE and USEPA testing guidelines. Areas along the Raritan Bay Loop identified as having elevated concentrations of contaminated sediment will be dredged using an environmental bucket and placed into a sealed barge. The sediments will be allowed to settle out of the water column within the barge. The decanted water will be returned to the location where it was collected. Water quality monitoring will be performed to verify that the decanting process has been completed prior to returning water back to Raritan Bay. In response to the NJDEP Notice of Denial letter dated June 5, 2019, Transco conducted contaminant dispersion modeling for six offshore sites located within 2 miles of the New Jersey shoreline (Milepost [MP] 12.2 to MP 14.2) where sediment samples collected during fall 2018 had indicated an exceedance of effects range-median (ER-M) guidance thresholds for sediment toxicity (see Appendix F-5 to Transco's Supplement to the WFD Permit application, dated June 28, 2019). Transco sampled six other sites between MP 12.2 and MP 14.2 in fall 2018 where ER-M exceedances were not detected. The fall 2018 sampling was conducted in accordance with an NJDEP-approved Sediment Sampling and Analysis Plan. Therefore, the Department has determined that the fall 2018 samples are reasonably representative of the contaminant concentrations for sediments that would be disturbed between MP 12.2 and MP 14.2. Transco also notes that ER-M and ER-L guidance values are not water quality standards; the identified exceedances pertain to the potential for toxicity to benthic organisms in the existing (pre-construction) sediment. Results of Transco's contaminant dispersion modeling indicate that the contaminant levels in the water column associated with Project construction would not exceed the applicable chronic or acute toxicity criteria presented at N.J.A.C. 7:9B for saline waters more than 500 feet from the dredging activity. It is reasonable to expect that modeling of sediments with lower (effects range-low [ER-L]) concentrations would also indicate compliance with the applicable chronic or acute toxicity criteria within 500 feet of the dredging activity. While the presence of offshore construction equipment may temporarily preclude use of the active work area for other activities (e.g., recreational fishing), the predicted temporary increases in suspended contaminant concentrations in the immediate vicinity of the work area would not render the water unsuitable for designated uses. Dredging/trenching activities are not expected to last cumulatively more than 10 days at any given location in New Jersey waters, Transco's hydrodynamic and sediment transport modeling results indicate that the predicted plumes would be temporary, with TSS concentrations returning to ambient conditions within, at most, 8 hours after the associated dredging, trenching, or backfilling has ceased (FEIS 4.5.2.8). The area subject to Project-related sedimentation greater than 1.2 inches is a small fraction of the habitat available in the adjacent waterbodies. Further, New Jersey state waters crossed by the proposed Raritan Bay Loop are currently classified as prohibited for shellfish harvest; in the waters crossed to the north of Sandy Hook, the Department issues permits that allow

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			the harvest of surf clam for bait purposes only (FEIS 4.5.2.4). Project construction will adhere to TOYRs for several species in New Jersey, such as anadromous fish (including alewife and blueback herring), Atlantic sturgeon, and winter flounder, with exceptions for low-impact activities approved by the Department and NOAA Fisheries (FEIS 4.6.3.5). Observance of TOYR for Atlantic sturgeon and river herring are expected to help avoid Project impacts on other migrating anadromous species such as American shad. Additionally, sediment with higher contaminant levels will be mixed with adjacent less-contaminated material and dispersed away from the point of sediment disturbance, resulting in dilution of the contaminants. The diluted contaminant levels in the redeposited material are expected to be similar to ambient contaminant concentrations in surface sediments at the depositional locations. Further, contaminated dredged material would be removed and backfill will consist of clean, sandy material, thereby reducing overall sediment contamination in Raritan Bay and resulting in a long-term benefit to natural aquatic biota. As described above, the results of Transco's sediment modeling indicate that the contaminant levels in the water column associated with Project construction would not exceed the applicable chronic or acute toxicity criteria presented at N.J.A.C. 7:9B for saline waters more than 500 feet from the dredging activity. This includes the criteria for total mercury; currently, there is no numeric water quality standard for methylmercury at N.J.A.C. 7:9B. There do not appear to be any promulgated acute or chronic criteria for bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, phenanthrene, manganese, or 4,4'-DDE. Based on consultations with NJDEP staff following a June 20, 2019, meeting, for these four contaminants of concern, However, Transco's modeling results for mercury, arsenic, and polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) Aroclors demonstrated that the implementation of construction BMPs and reduced dredging rates during construction activities will control and reduce contaminant dispersion sufficient to meet surface water quality standards (SWQS) for contaminants within 500 feet of the dredging activity. Therefore, it is expected that there will be similar control of the dispersion of bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, phenanthrene, manganese, and 4,4'-DDE. Model predictions indicate that maximum concentrations for all seven contaminants of concern are reduced when the average dredging rate is slowed. (See Transco's 2020 WFD application, Appendix F-5.) Based on the relatively limited distribution of upper-level exceedances for mercury and other heavy metals along the Project route, a 0.5% or less resuspension in those areas, the short duration of turbidity plumes, and the expected fate of metals released into the marine environment, the risk to aquatic resources from exposure to resuspended metals is expected to be low. (FEIS 4.5.2.8). The redeposited sediment is expected to be similar in contaminant concentration to the ambient conditions of the surface sediments at the depositional locations (FEIS 4.5.2.8). Any supplemental backfill would be clean, sandy material procured from a separately permitted vendor. In summary, this demonstrated compliance with acute and chronic SWQS (for the above-mentioned contaminants) promulgated in N.J.A.C. 7:9B within 500 feet of the dredging activity as indicated by modeling, coupled with the BMPs Transco has committed to implement, support a conclusion that there will be no adverse ecological impacts or impacts to water quality due to resuspension of contaminants. In addition, any contaminant concentrations that are introduced into the water column will be localized, temporary, and of short duration.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
58	Raritan Bay Loop • Bioaccumulation	Commenters state that Transco's contaminant modeling does not account for bioaccumulation of synergistic effects on organisms.	Transco considered bioaccumulation of sediment contaminants in the document *Evaluation of Risks to Ecological Receptors due to Resuspended Contaminants* (see Transco's NJDEP FWPA/Coastal Wetlands (CW)/WDF/FHACA Compliance Statement 2025 application, Appendix L). The report concluded that that there is a low risk of adverse effects on ecological receptors from exposure to metals and organic contaminants in sediment that will be suspended in the water column and redeposited during Project-related dredging/jetting activities. In particular, the results of Total Bioaccumulation Potential modeling using maximum PCB concentrations measured along the offshore route in 2016 suggest that the entrainment and redeposition of even the most contaminated sediments along the route will not adversely affect local biota or food webs. Additionally, bioassays were performed to assess the toxicities of material proposed for dredging and placement at an offshore disposal site that is outside of New Jersey waters (i.e., the Historic Area Remediation Site). The assessment adhered to USACE and USEPA testing guidelines for offshore disposal of dredged material and included solid-phase bioaccumulation testing (*see USACE Supplemental Public Notice NAN-2016-00908-A-EHA, Issue Date 17 Oct 2019*). Based on the results of this testing, most of the material to be clamshell dredged (i.e., up to approximately 800,000 cubic yards) was determined to be suitable for in-water disposal at the offshore site.

59	Raritan Bay Loop • Sediment Modeling	Commenter claims that Transco's supplemental modeling, particularly the modeling included in Addendum 2, provides an unrealistic depiction of the best management practices and NJDEP should rely on the modeling originally provided as part of Transco's 2018 Application.	As part of its environmental analysis for the Project, Transco developed a Project-specific hydrodynamic model to model the circulation patterns and water volume flux through the study area (Raritan Bay, Lower New York Bay, and the Atlantic Ocean) and to provide hydrodynamic conditions (spatially and temporally varying currents). This Project and site-specific hydrodynamic model then served as an input to Transco's sediment transport model, which was used to predict sediment plumes and deposition. This type of hydrodynamic model (BFHDYRO) has previously undergone extensive testing against analytical solutions and has been found to perform accurately and quickly. BFHYDRO has been previously used to predict time-varying currents for assessments of cable and pipeline crossings in the lower Hudson River and New York Harbor (between Bayonne, New Jersey, and Brooklyn, New York), as well as time-varying currents, salinity, and temperature for assessment of a thermal discharge from a power plant approximately 42 miles upstream of the Battery at the Indian Point Energy Center. The same hydrodynamic model output used in the sediment transport modeling was also used for the contaminant dispersion model scenarios. A description of the BFHYDRO modeling system and a full summary of the results are presented in the Modeling Protocol and the Hydrodynamic and Sediment Transport Modeling Reports included as Appendix F of Transco's January 2020 WFD Application. Transco initially modeled substantially faster dredging rates using a conventional clamshell dredge bucket with scow barge overflow to assess potential "worst-case" sediment and contaminant deposition scenarios. However, when accounting for a realistic dredging rate, pauses during slack tides in the areas of greatest concern, and use of an environmental bucket, the models indicate that the Project will comply with New Jersey State water quality standards for contaminants within 500 feet of the dredging activity. (See Transco's 2020 WFD application, Appendix F.) The Department will require Transco to use an environmental bucket for all clamshell dredging in New Jersey. The assumptions of 2.5% and 0.5% clamshell dredge loss rates used in Addendum 2 scenarios are based on the use of an environmental bucket with and without overflow, respectively. These values are less than the loss rate assumptions for clamshell dredging with a conventional bucket presented in the base-case and Addendum 1 scenarios. However, a 0.5% average loss rate (i.e., resuspension factor) is still considered a conservative (i.e., upper-level) estimate for mechanical dredges with environmental buckets, not considering scow overflow (Palermo et al. 2008; Schroeder n.d.). Another study indicates that the total average loss of sediment during clamshell dredging in New York Harbor was approximately 2%, including scow overflow (Tavolaro 1984). Other studies also support the application of resuspension values of less than 2.5% for clamshell dredging with scow overflow (e.g., Hayes and Wu 2001). In comparison, average loss (i.e., resuspension factor) for a conventional clamshell dredge bucket has been reported to be approximately 1%, not considering barge overflow (Palermo et al. 2008). Another study indicates that the total average loss of sediment during clamshell dredging in New York Harbor is approximately 2%, including scow overflow (Tavolaro 1984). Other studies also support the application of resuspension values of 5% or less for clamshell dredging, with and without scow overflow (e.g., Hayes and Wu 2001). Therefore, conservative resuspension factors used in Addendum 2 modeling for the use of an environmental bucket are more consistent with reported resuspension values for clamshell dredging using a conventional bucket. Therefore, while the use of an environmental bucket is anticipated for the full duration of dredging at the majority of clamshell dredging sites in New Jersey, the modeling results in Addendum 2 account for realistic sediment resuspension assumptions even in cases where a conventional bucket may be applied due to sediment characteristics (e.g., areas with predominantly sandy material). Note that Scenarios B-14, B-15, and B-16 for dredging of backfill material from channels are no longer being considered under Transco's permit application because Transco will obtain suitable backfill material from one or more vendors that will obtain the material under separate permits and associated water quality certificates. Transco has committed to water quality monitoring during construction to ensure that the best management practices are properly implemented to control turbidity and associated contaminants. As part of its May 2025 WFD Permit application (see Appendix N) to NJDEP, Transco has provided a draft Water Quality Monitoring Plan (WQMP). The plan was developed through consultation with NJDEP and in accordance with New Jersey Surface Water Quality Standards (N.J.A.C. 7:9B). The final WQMP will incorporate relevant permit conditions in the anticipated NJDEP water quality certification(s) for the Project.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			See further detail in Master Response Document under Key Issues "Water Quality Standards", "Surface Water Quality: Water Quality Monitoring Plan", and "Raritan Bay Loop: Exceedances of water quality standards." References: Hayes, D., and P. Wu. 2001. "Simple Approach to TSS Source Strength Estimates." Proceedings of the WEDA XXI Conference, Houston, TX, June 25–27, 2001. https://semspub.epa.gov/work/02/70619.pdf. Accessed September 8, 2017. Palermo, M. R., P. R. Schroeder, T. J. Estes, and N. R. Francingues. 2008. "Technical Guidelines for Environmental Dredging of Contaminated Sediments." September 2008. ERDC/EL TR-08-29. Environmental Laboratory, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, Mississippi. http://hdl.handle.net/11681/6894. Accessed September 8, 2017. Schroeder, P.R. not dated. USACE Technical Guidelines for Predicting the 3 Rs of Environmental Dredging. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, Mississippi. https://semspub.epa.gov/src/document/06/9559351. Accessed December 1, 2017. Tavolaro, J. F. 1984. A sediment budget study of clamshell dredging and ocean disposal activities in the New York bight. *Environmental Geology and Water Sciences*. September 1984 6(3): 133–140.
60	Raritan Bay Loop • Turbidity impacts on submerged aquatic vegetation	Commenters raise concerns about sediment clouds blocking sunlight, thereby harming eelgrass beds that fish and crabs need to survive.	No submerged aquatic vegetation was observed along the Raritan Bay Loop during pre-construction surveys (FEIS 4.5.2.1). Further, nearshore areas where submerged aquatic vegetation is most likely to be present are being crossed by horizontal directional drill (HDD), thus avoiding a majority of construction impacts. Sediment plume modeling completed for the Project demonstrates that the turbidity plume avoids these shallow coastal areas. Transco will be required to monitor turbidity during construction through both laboratory-analyzed samples and real-time measurements; corrective measures will be employed, if required, in order to comply with the turbidity criteria in the permit and/or Department-approved water quality monitoring plan.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
61	Raritan Bay Loop • Turbidity impacts on Fish	Commenters state that an increase in turbidity during Project construction will negatively impact fish physiology. Commenters question whether Transco can address contamination and turbidity by dredging at a slower pace and still comply with a more compressed schedule.	Considering the extent of the offshore impact relative to the area of similar habitat available in the New York Bight, as well as the rate of recovery by the affected species, no significant, long-term impacts on the benthic community or other offshore resources are expected from the sediment-disturbing activities. (FEIS 4.5.2.8). The benthic communities in areas disturbed by Project activities are expected to recolonize through natural succession in approximately 1 to 3 years, based on the results of several studies identified in the FERC FEIS for the Project. (FEIS 4.5.2.8). Faster rates of recovery are expected in areas less affected by the Project. Additionally, Transco will backfill dredged areas with clean material, which will benefit benthic communities and water quality in the long term. To verify that affected benthic communities recover as expected, Transco has committed to a 5-year post-construction benthic sampling and monitoring program. Transco initially modeled substantially faster dredging rates using a conventional clamshell dredge bucket with scow barge overflow to assess potential "worst-case" sediment and contaminant deposition scenarios. However, when accounting for a realistic dredging rate, pauses during slack tides in the areas of greatest concern, and use of an environmental bucket, the models indicate that the Project will comply with New Jersey State water quality standards for contaminants within 500 feet of the dredging activity. The results of Transco's sediment modeling indicate that the contaminant levels in the water column associated with Project construction would not exceed the applicable chronic or acute toxicity criteria presented at N.J.A.C. 7:9B for saline waters more than 500 feet from the dredging activity. Additionally, sediment with higher contaminant levels will be mixed with adjacent less-contaminated material and dispersed away from the point of sediment disturbance, resulting in dilution of the contaminants. The diluted contaminant levels in the redeposited material are expected to be similar to ambient contaminant concentrations in surface sediments at the depositional locations. Further, contaminated dredged material would be removed and backfill will consist of clean, sandy material, thereby reducing overall sediment contamination in Raritan Bay and resulting in a long-term benefit to natural aquatic biota. The construction execution plan represented in the Project record captures contingency built into the schedule based on these conservative rates of performance to accommodate operational and/or mechanical issues and expected progress rates while still achieving compliance with the TOYR. The schedule reflects both the number of days anticipated to complete each construction activity and potential operational and mechanical downtime. Operational and mechanical downtime allowances included in the schedule vary by activity and range from 8% to 24%, depending on the activity. Transco will continuously track progress against the planned offshore construction schedule and is committed to providing the construction resources necessary to complete the Project within the defined time period while also maintaining compliance with water quality standards and TOYRs. The dredging rates that are proposed to sustain compliance with water quality standards based on sediment modeling are consistent with the rates anticipated as part of the construction execution plan, so the Department does not anticipate that these rates will conflict with any species' TOYR. The Department will condition its approval of the Project's Water Quality Certification on Transco's compliance with all TOYRs required by the Department, in consultation with NOAA Fisheries.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
62	Raritan Bay Loop • Use of the Historic Area Remediation Site (HARS)	Commenter claims that ocean disposal would utilize remaining capacity at the HARS, thereby harming navigation and shipping industries	The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issued a permit for the Project on July 16, 2025, authorizing placement for approximately 800,000 cubic yards of dredged material at the offshore Historic Area Remediation Site (NAN-2016-00908) under Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act. Previously, on June 1, 2023, USACE-NYD formally requested EPA Region 2 to begin the Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS) designation process in the New York Bight, to provide for future management of dredged material necessary to maintain safe navigation, promote marine commerce, and safeguard the economic well-being of the region. Elected officials and concerned stakeholders were notified on June 2, 2023, and informational meetings were held with two concerned stakeholder groups (Regional Dredging Team; HARS Scientific Review Panel) during the week of July 17, 2023. The ODMDS designation process will be conducted in compliance with all applicable laws including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The NEPA evaluation may include the preparation of an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement. The process includes, but is not limited to, the issuance of a Notice of Intent to prepare environmental documentation, initial scoping, literature reviews, identification of data gaps, data collection (as needed), and robust public outreach via scoping, meetings, and hearings. The entire designation process is anticipated to take 4 to 5 years. (Source: USACE Fact Sheet pub. August 3, 2023).
63	Safety • Age of existing pipelines	Commenters express concerns over the age of the existing pipelines that will be connected to Compressor Station 206 and that the increase in pressure in these lines increases the risk of leaks, fires, and explosions. Commenter expressed concern over the status of the coating and welds of the existing pipelines.	The existing pipelines that Compressor Station 206 will connect to were initially installed in 1950 (Mainline "A") and 1969 (Mainline "C") and were relocated and replaced in 1987. The lines have had various pressures throughout the years based on flow and demand but have never exceeded the maximum operating pressure of 800 psi and will not exceed 800 psi with the addition of the compressor station. They have operated safely at or below 800 psi for decades. The maximum operating pressure will remain at 800 psi. The existing pipelines are currently fit for service based on Transco's engineering and design specifications at the time of construction along with Transco's Integrity Management Program (IMP), which includes an internal inspection (pigging) program and cathodic protection. Any time a pipeline is excavated, company personnel inspect the pipeline and coating for evidence of damage or corrosion. Internal, electronic inspection devices, called smart pigs, are also used to detect any anomalies. Although the pipeline safety regulations focus on high consequence and/or high-risk areas, Transco's overall pipeline integrity plan covers rigorous inspections for our entire pipeline system. Transco has been smart pigging its pipeline system since 1987. Cathodic protection is a low-voltage electrical system that, along with the pipe's coating, is designed to prevent corrosion of the steel pipeline. Transco personnel check the voltage and amperage every two months as well as the pipe-to-soil potentials and rectifiers. In addition, annual surveys are completed. All individuals involved in pipeline integrity/corrosion control work are required to be certified by an outside entity, specifically the National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE), prior to being made responsible for cathodic protection readings, remediation installation, and related work.
64	Safety • Blasting	Commenters expressed concern related to the impacts of blasting at the Trap Rock quarry on Compressor Station 206.	While not relevant to the pending applications before the NJDEP, safety is Transco's top priority when constructing and operating natural gas pipeline projects and associated facilities. Transco conducted a detailed analysis to determine if blasting will have any impact on the compressor station. The analysis concluded that blast-induced vibration will not affect the operation of the compressor station or cause long-term maintenance issues. Transco maintains a robust inspection and maintenance program that includes visual inspections, aerial inspections, and physical inspections of the pipeline. The original pipelines traversing the Trap Rock property were installed in 1950 (Mainline "A") and 1969 (Mainline "C") and were relocated and replaced in 1987 to accommodate the expansion of the quarry and continued safe operation of the pipeline. In addition, the relocated pipelines were aligned such that Trap Rock blasting events will not be performed within 1,500 feet of the pipelines. Transco's internal allowable peak particle velocity (PPV) limitation on buried in-service pipelines is 4 inches/second, which is considered stringent by industry standards. The 1,500-foot separation results in theoretical PPV values of less than 1 inch/second during blasting events, which is well below Transco's 4 inch/second limitation. In addition, Trap Rock conducts all blasting operations in accordance with N.J.A.C. 12:190-7:26, which states that the PPV

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			associated with blasting activities may not exceed 2 inches/second for aboveground structures (buildings, residences, etc.). Therefore, the PPV resulting from a Trap Rock blasting event will not exceed Transco's 4 inch/second limitation. Transco conducted a Blast Vibration Analysis to determine if blasting will have any impact on the compressor station. Blast vibration monitoring was conducted by Transco on November 10, 2016, and December 2, 2016, during scheduled blasting events at Trap Rock Industries, Inc. The vibration due to the blasting activities was measured with vibration monitoring sensors placed at designated locations on the Compressor Station 206 property prior to blasting. The monitoring sensors measured the peak particle velocity, sound pressure, and dominant frequency induced by the vibration source (i.e., the mine blasting activity). Measurements were collected every 2 seconds with a trigger level of 0.05 inch/second, which provided a full histogram of peak particle velocity once the system was triggered by a particle velocity greater than 0.05 inch/second. In addition to the data retrieved from the monitoring sensors, previous blast vibration data collected by the mine operator was provided to Transco. The historical data were compared with data collected to establish historical context for the anticipated design loads for the compressor station foundations. Results indicated that blast-induced ground vibration will not exceed the maximum measured values. In addition, there will be 16 vibration sensors installed on each Solar Mars 100 compressor unit. The lower detection limit of the sensors is 200 millivolts/mil. The vibration limit requirements on the unit bearings that would initiate a unit shut-down range from 3.2 mils peak-to-peak to 4.0 mils peak-to peak. Based on the analysis conducted, the blasting events initiate a displacement of 0.011 millimeters; 0.011 millimeters converts to 0.43 mils. Thus, a blasting event would not trip the Solar Mars 100 vibration sensors. The peak blast-induced displacement of the compressor unit skid was compared to the lower detection limit of the vibration sensors on the Solar Mars 100 units; the estimated 0.007 millimeter displacement (0.28 mils peak to peak) is less than the vibration limit requirements on the unit bearings. Compressor stations with this type of unit (turbine) are designed to produce almost zero vibration. Negligible vibration from equipment operation and movement of gas through the suction and discharge piping does occur; however, this negligible vibration in combination with a blast will not exceed the vibration limit requirements on the unit bearings. Therefore, the blast-induced vibration would not adversely affect the operation of the compressor station or cause long-term maintenance issues. In the event that the vibration sensors were to trip, the Mars 100 turbine would enter into shut down mode. During shut down, the unit valves would close in order to isolate the unit from the compressor station. To date, no operational or maintenance issues have been attributed to nearby mining operations on any portion of Transco's pipeline system. Trap Rock conducts all blasting operations in accordance with N.J.A.C. 12:190-7:26, which states that the PPV associated with blasting activities may not exceed 2 inches/second for aboveground structures (buildings, residences, etc.). In addition, there are multiple structures and residences that are closer to the active Trap Rock mining area than the proposed Compressor Station 206; therefore, PPV of 2 inches/second would not be experienced at Compressor Station 206. A PPV of 2 inches/sec would not trip the vibration sensors on the Mars 100 units. Additionally, the foundations of Compressor Station 206 will be designed with a safety factor to prevent displacement if future blast intensity increases. Additionally, Chapter 278 of the Franklin Township, New Jersey Township Code regulates quarries and blasting within the Township limits. The Franklin Township Zoning Map, issued by the Franklin Township Department of Planning and Zoning depicts boundaries for mining districts with the designation "M-3." The northernmost boundary of the Trap Rock "M-3" zone ends at the property line of Block 5.02, lots 11.02, 12, and 16. Blasting along the northern face of the quarry may not extend past this boundary and will therefore not extend north toward the proposed compressor station site.
65	Safety • Class of pipe used for Project	Commenter stated that Transco uses Class 1 and 2 pipes in connection with the Project.	As noted by FERC in the FEIS, the DOT defines pipeline Class areas and High Consequence Areas based primarily on proximity of natural gas facilities to human populations and specifies more rigorous safety requirements for increasingly populated areas. Transco's existing Mainlines are located in relatively low population Class 1 and Class 2 areas near the Trap Rock quarry, but are constructed and operated in accordance with more stringent Class 3 standards for added safety. These operating measures include the periodic inspection of the pipelines using internal tools that monitor the condition of the pipeline and identify areas for repair or replacement. The suction and discharge pipelines that would connect Compressor Station 206 to the Mainline system would also be constructed and operated in accordance with Class 3 standards and would not be within a High Consequence Area. (FEIS 4.11.1).

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			For the Madison Loop, 0.8 mile (24 percent) of the pipeline occurs in Class 1 areas, but Transco would design, construct, and operate the pipeline to Class 3 standards in these areas, resulting in the entire Madison Loop meeting Class 3 standards. (FEIS 4.11.1) As to the Raritan Bay Loop, the onshore portion will be constructed to Class 3 standards while the offshore portion will be constructed to Class 1 standards, consistent with USDOT regulations. (FEIS 4.11.1).
66	Safety • Compressor station safety measures	Commenters expressed concern over the potential for a fire or an explosion at Compressor Station 206. Commenters are concerned that first responders are not trained for potential emergencies at compressor station 206	While not relevant to the pending applications before NJDEP, the compressor buildings are built with noncombustible material and will be sufficiently ventilated to minimize the potential for gas to accumulate within enclosed areas. The new compressor station will be equipped with automatic emergency gas and flame detection and shutdown systems. Transco tests these safety and emergency systems routinely to ensure they are operating properly. The emergency shutdown system design implements an automatic shutdown of the compressor station in the instance of detection of a gas leak, fire, or gas pressure approaching system design limits. The most effective and immediate way to begin to address a natural gas pipeline fire is to shut off the gas source, and that is performed automatically by the safety systems within the compressor station. Thus, no special fire-fighting apparatus is needed to fight a high-pressure natural gas fire. However, Transco will maintain hand-held dry chemical fire extinguishers at the compressor station. In the unlikely event of an emergency, local first responders will address any fire outside the operational footprint of the compressor station. Transco will coordinate with local first responders to review emergency response plans, provide on-site training and simulated emergency exercises, and support any emergency response actions.
67	Safety • Emergency response	Commenters expressed concern over the availability and response time of local emergency responders in the event of an emergency at Compressor Station 206. Commenters state that Compressor Station 206 will be unmanned so no one will be there in the event of an emergency	While not relevant to the pending applications before NJDEP, as previously described, no special fire-fighting apparatus, including a firewater pond and/or diesel driven firewater pump with hydrants and monitors, is needed to fight a high-pressure natural gas fire. Transco will comply with, and in most cases exceed, the requirements of the USDOT, the OSHA, and other applicable regulations, standards, and guidelines for safety. This will include compliance with applicable design standards and codes, construction provisions as mandated, and operation procedures and standards. Specifically, Transco will comply with 49 CFR Part 192, which prescribes the minimum standards for operating and maintaining pipeline facilitate including the requirement to establish a written plan governing these activities. Under Section 192.615, each pipeline operator must also establish an emergency plan that provides written procedures to minimize the hazards from a gas pipeline emergency. Key elements of the plan include procedures for: • Receiving, identifying, and classifying emergency events (gas leakage, fires, explosions, and natural disasters); • Establishing and maintaining communications with local fire, police, and public officials, and coordinating emergency response; • Making personnel, equipment, tools, and materials available at the scene of an emergency; • Protecting people first and then property, and ensuring that they are safe from actual or potential hazards; and • Emergency shutdown of systems and safely restoring service. The new compressor station will be manned during business hours, Monday through Friday, and remotely from Transco's pipeline control center located in Houston, Texas. Remote monitoring is conducted 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with 24/7 on-call support provided by local operations personnel. (Resource Report 1, p. 1-14). Under 49 CFR Section 192.615, each operator must also establish and maintain liaison with appropriate fire, police, and other public officials to learn the resources and responsibilities of each organization that may respond to a gas pipeline emergency and coordinate mutual assistance in responding to emergencies. Each operator must also establish a continuing education program to enable customers, the public, government officials, and those engaged in excavation activities to recognize a gas pipeline emergency and report it to the appropriate public officials. As noted above, Transco will coordinate with local first responders to review emergency response plans, provide on-site training and simulated emergency exercises, and support any emergency response actions.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
68	Safety • Impacts on Delaware and Raritan (D&R) Canal and Millstone River	Commenter claim that pipelines crossing under the D&R Canal and Millstone River will fail causing damage to these resources.	The project does not involve the addition of new pipeline under the D&R Canal or Millstone River.
69	Safety • Leaks and spills	Commenters raised concerns about the impacts of spills from condensate tanks at Compressor Station 206 on groundwater. Commenters raised concerns regarding leaks and spills that may occur during construction and the potential for the release of contaminants into surrounding waters.	Transco would install and maintain facilities specifically designed and constructed to safely contain hazardous chemicals, including diesel exhaust fluid (urea), oily water, and natural gas condensate. These products would be stored in aboveground tanks constructed of heavy-duty double-walled plastic or carbon steel situated in external concrete containment secondary containment structures. Urea would be stored in two, 12,000-gallon tanks; oily water would be stored in one 8,400-gallon tank; and natural gas condensate would be stored in one 4,200-gallon tank. (FEIS 4.3.1.8). Transco would implement its Spill Plan to avoid or minimize effects associated with spills or leaks of hazardous liquids. These plans include storing hazardous materials away from wetlands and waterbodies, restrictions on refueling within 100 feet of wetlands and waterbodies, and the use of secondary containment structures for petroleum products. Transco's Spill Plan also specifies routine inspections for storage tanks; soil spill response kits on every vehicle that transports fuel; and measures to contain, clean up, and properly dispose of spills. Transco's implementation of these plans and measures would adequately address the storage and transfer of hazardous materials and petroleum products, and the appropriate response in the event of a spill. Because of these precautions, impacts on waterbodies would be temporary and minor. FERC ultimately determined that operation of Compressor Station 206 would not represent a significant risk to groundwater resources in the area. (FEIS 4.3.1.8).
70	Safety • Safety standards and regulations	Commenters raise concerns related to safety oversight of the Project and Transco's safety record.	While not relevant to the pending applications before the NJDEP, while FERC has oversight in ensuring that the facilities are designed according to the latest USDOT-Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) safety standards and are safely constructed, once the natural gas is flowing through the new facilities, the USDOT-PHMSA assumes oversight responsibility during the operational life of the pipeline and supporting appurtenances such as compressor stations. Transco meets or exceeds existing safety standards of the USDOT-PHMSA and OSHA, and the guidelines of industry organizations such as the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America. This will include compliance with applicable design standards and codes, construction provisions as mandated, and operation procedures and standards, such as participation with the New Jersey one-call system. FERC analyzed reliability and safety in its FEIS. Transco notes that, in connection with its Garden State Expansion Project, NJDEP acknowledged FERC and USDOT-PHMSA's expertise in and authority over pipeline safety, and its lack of jurisdiction over these matters, stating: "The operations regulations include stringent requirements from FERC, and under the USDOT Minimum Federal Safety Standards. As review of these practices are outside the Division's jurisdiction, the Division defers to the FERC and the Federal Department of Transportation for oversight. The Division notes that the FERC issued a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the proposed natural gas delivery on April 7, 2016. The Department has no authority over industry construction standards or specifications and defers to the federal agencies with expertise in these areas."
71	Stormwater Management • Compliance with the Stormwater Management Rules	Commenters state that the stormwater basin design at Compressor Station 206 is undersized, fails to meet New Jersey's requirements and will not function properly. Commenters also state that Transco is using an	On August 21, 2025, Transco submitted an updated stormwater design for Compressor Station 206, that addresses compliance with the current NJDEP Stormwater Management Regulations at N.J.A.C. 7:8 (July 17, 2023) and was deemed technically complete on September 4, 2025.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
		incorrect time of concentration method, which inflates Transco's compliance claim. Commenters raised concerns that the groundwater mounding analysis provided in the application is incorrect.	
72	Stormwater Management • Increased flooding	Commenters raised concerns that South Brunswick and Franklin Township residents downstream of Compressor Station 206 may be subject to flooding since NJDEP recently noted that a short-term water use permit by rule or temporary dewatering permit may be required for construction.	The proposed development of Compressor Station 206 will not result in increased flooding. Since the January 2020 permit applications, Transco has further refined and updated the stormwater management system to reflect NJDEP's current requirements, including the design of multiple small-scale infiltration basins to meet the 2.5-acre drainage area limit for groundwater recharge and water quality compliance. These basins were designed in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:8-5.6(b)3 and Chapter 9.8 of the New Jersey Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Manual, which collectively require that post-construction peak runoff rates for the 2-, 10-, and 100-year storm events are 50, 75, and 80 percent, respectively, of the pre-construction peak runoff rates (i.e., post-construction peak rates are less than pre-construction peak rates). Outlined in the updated Stormwater Management Report prepared by AECOM, dated August 2025, and included with Transco's FWPA individual permit application, these measures reflect all changes and requests for additional information from NJDEP as described in NJDEP's comments with respect to the NJDEP's analysis of the infiltration basins. It is also noted that the infiltration basins are not located within, nor will they discharge to, any regulated flood hazard area. They have been designed using NJDEP's current rainfall data, including a 100-year storm depth of 9.08 inches for present conditions and 12.33 inches for future conditions, which exceeds the rainfall depths used in the original 2020 design. Additionally, the change in land cover (i.e. from forested land in some areas) was accounted for in the surface runoff coefficients utilized in the hydrologic analysis. Regarding the comment's reference to dewatering, NJDEP has noted that a temporary dewatering permit or water-use permit-by-rule may be required during construction. Such a permit is standard for large earthwork projects and applies to short-term groundwater control (if needed) during excavation only. Any temporary dewatering operations at CS206 will be designed and implemented in accordance with NJDEP requirements and will not alter post-construction hydrology or increase downstream flooding. All stormwater controls described above will be fully in place prior to facility operation, ensuring that the permanent post-construction conditions comply with NJDEP's stormwater quantity and quality standards.
73	Stormwater Management • Status of Project as "major development"	Commenters state that both Compressor Station 206 and the Madison Loop are considered to be "major developments" under the Stormwater Management rules and, therefore, the entire Project needs to be in compliance with the Stormwater Management Rules.	As to Compressor Station 206, Transco submitted an updated stormwater design for Compressor Station 206 that demonstrates compliance with the current NJDEP Stormwater Management Regulations at N.J.A.C. 7:8. The Madison Loop is a linear development project under the Stormwater Management regulations and, therefore, exempt from the groundwater recharge, stormwater runoff quantity, and stormwater runoff quality requirements at N.J.A.C. 7:8-5.4 and 5.5. In addition, the Madison Loop will not include the addition of new impervious cover.
74	Surface Water Quality • Impact of stormwater and erosion on water quality	Commenters state that impacts from stormwater runoff at Compressor Station 206 will negatively impact surface water quality.	As described in Transco's May 2025 FWPA and FHACA permit applications, SESC Plans for all Project components have been developed and will be implemented to minimize potential sediment release into environmentally sensitive areas as a result of Project construction activities. A detailed list of the BMPs and soil erosion and sediment controls is included in Environmental Report, Part III. Section 95 Best Management Practices, of Transco's May 2025 FWPA/CW/WDF/FHACA Individual Permit application. Measures to address stormwater management for Compressor Station 206 have also been developed and are outlined in the Stormwater Management Report prepared by AECOM, dated August 2025. Transco's implementation of BMPs, as described in its permit applications, is anticipated to reduce the potential for significant short- or long-term adverse impacts resulting from the Project.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
75	Surface Water Quality • Water Quality Monitoring Plan	Commenters state that Transco's Water Quality Monitoring Plan (WQMP) is inadequate.	As part of its May 2025 FWPA/CW/WDF/FHACA Individual Permit application (see Appendix M of the Environmental Report) to NJDEP, Transco has provided a draft WQMP. The plan was developed through consultation with NJDEP and in accordance with New Jersey Surface Water Quality Standards (N.J.A.C. 7:9B). The final WQMP will incorporate relevant permit conditions in the anticipated NJDEP water quality certification(s) for the Project. See also 2019 Certificate Order, ¶ 49.
76	Tidelands Utility License	Commenters state that the Project is not in the public interest and, therefore, the Tidelands Resource Council should reject any application for a Tidelands Utility License.	The Tidelands Resource Council is responsible for determining "whether applications for the lease, license, or grant of riparian lands are in the public interest." N.J.S.A. 12:3-12.1. For the reasons set forth above, the Project is in the public interest. Assuming the Waterfront Development Permit is issued for the Project, Transco's pending Tidelands Utility License will be presented to the Tidelands Resource Council.
77	Tree Clearing Impacts	The commenters state removal of forested land to construct and operate the Project will potentially result in increased flooding events and further impacts to wetlands as the forests help to absorb stormwater runoff. A commenter alleged that there was no factual determination by Transco that their Erosion and Sediment Control Plan would ensure that ground or surface water would not be degraded.	As described in Transco's May 2025 FWPA/CW/WDF/FHACA Individual Permit application, the Project was designed to avoid impacts to wetlands and other regulated natural resource features. Where Transco could not reasonably avoid impacts to regulated features, Transco minimized impacts by avoiding and/or reducing disturbance areas to the greatest extent practicable. While the disturbance of wetlands and forested areas during construction and operation of the Project may have negative impacts on wetland functions and other secondary impacts, Transco has demonstrated that it designed the Project to avoid and minimize these impacts to the greatest extent practicable. Transco will implement BMPs such as soil erosion and sediment control measures and the timely restoration of vegetated areas following construction activities, which are anticipated to reduce the potential for significant short- or long-term adverse impacts resulting from the Project. See Transco's FWW/CW/WFD/FHA Individual Permit application, Environmental Report, Section 9.5 Best Management Practices. In palustrine forested (PFO) / palustrine scrub-shrub (PSS) wetlands located in temporary workspaces outside of the permanent maintenance corridor, vegetation clearing will consist of cutting vegetation flush to the ground, and no grubbing of stumps is proposed. This clearing method will serve to preserve vegetation composition and effectuate regeneration of this vegetation. Additionally, these temporary workspaces will be restored in place, in accordance with a NJDEP-approved restoration plan. Over time, these temporary workspaces will recapture functions and values lost during construction of the Project. The SESC Plan was reviewed, approved, and certified by the Somerset-Union Soil Conservation District in March 2018 for compliance with the Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control. An offsite stability analysis was prepared within the SESC Plan for the basin discharge in accordance with the standards to demonstrate stability both at the discharge point and downstream of the discharge point. Transco resubmitted an application to the Somerset-Union Soil Conservation District in 2025. Transco will comply with the approved SESC Plan.
78	Vernal Pools	Commenters state that the Project will impact vernal pools and vernal pool habitat.	Transco has conducted numerous field surveys for wetlands and waterbodies since 2016 by trained wetland delineators in accordance with 1989 Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Jurisdictional Wetlands. No vernal pools were documented within the Compressor Station 206 LOD during any of the surveys completed by trained wetland delineators. Additionally, NJDEP visited the Compressor Station 206 property to validate survey results. Potential vernal pools were identified near the compressor station LOD using NJDEP's online NJ-GeoWeb tool. The dispersal areas of these off-site vernal pools extend into the compressor station LOD; however, Transco has minimized impacts to these potential dispersal areas to the extent practicable. For example, the compressor station facility footprint has also been reduced and shifted to further minimize impacts on wetlands and transition areas. The Project has been designed to ensure that fauna have access to the off-site vernal pools. A contiguous patch of forest will be maintained to the east and northeast of the existing vernal pool on the Higgins property. This will provide fauna uninhibited access to the vernal pool and its dispersal areas. Access to the dispersal area for the potential vernal pool located to the east of the suction discharge tie-in will also be maintained in all directions except for a narrow area northwest of the pool where access to the tie-in area is proposed and where it enters the facility.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
79	Water Quality Standards	Commenter states that Project activities shall not "cause or contribute to a violation of any applicable State water quality standard" and raises concerns with sampling to establish baseline conditions. The comment also raises concerns related to the protection of existing uses.	Transco will be required to meet the water quality criteria in the Water Quality Certificate (WQC) for work in New Jersey and/or the associated water quality monitoring plan. Transco will adhere to those criteria during construction through the use of best management practices and corrective measures (i.e., adaptive management procedures). Transco will conduct monitoring to ensure BMPs are appropriately implemented to suitably control turbidity and associated contaminants. Transco will be required to submit all analytical results in a timely manner and report any exceedances of water quality criteria specified in the WQC and/or water quality monitoring plan. Transco will apply corrective measures (i.e., adaptive management) if exceedances are observed. To avoid temporary impacts to water quality on shore, a SESC Plan will be adopted, and BMPs will be implemented during construction of the proposed Project. A detailed list of these controls is included in the Environmental Report, Part III, Section 9.0, Best Management Practices. Pursuant to the New Jersey Stormwater Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:8-5.2(d)) construction of an underground utility line, provided that the disturbed areas are revegetated upon completion, are exempt from the regulations set by N.J.A.C. 7:8 for groundwater recharge, stormwater runoff quantity, and stormwater runoff quality requirements. While the presence of offshore construction equipment may temporarily preclude use of the active work area for other activities (e.g., recreational fishing), the predicted temporary increases in turbidity and suspended contaminant concentrations in the immediate vicinity of the work area would not render the water unsuitable for designated uses.
80	Water Quality Standards	Commenter asked how Transco would avoid or minimize adverse impacts to surface water quality from the construction of the Raritan Bay Loop.	Transco has committed to implementing BMPs and adaptive management procedures to minimize Project-related water quality impacts and sedimentation, including using an environmental bucket for all clamshell dredging and prohibiting scow overflow in areas with elevated contaminants. These BMPs will reduce or avoid impacts on water quality associated with turbidity and contaminated sediments to the maximum extent practicable. Project-specific sediment modeling indicates that Transco can comply with acute and chronic surface water quality standards promulgated in N.J.A.C. 7:9B within 500 feet of the dredging activity. In addition, any turbidity and resuspended contaminants that are introduced into the water column will be localized, temporary, and of short duration. Transco has committed to water quality monitoring during construction to ensure that the measures are properly implemented to control turbidity and associated contaminants. Considering the above, FERC ultimately concluded in the FEIS (see Section 4.5.2.8) that given the relatively short duration of dredging and backfilling activities, and the rapid pace at which resuspended sediments and associated contaminants are expected to settle out of the water column, impacts of sedimentation and turbidity on aquatic resources are anticipated to be temporary and minor.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
81	Water Quality Standards • Surface Water Quality – Turbidity and Containment Monitoring/Toxic Sediments and Human Health/Mixing Zones	Commenters argue that the Draft Contaminant Monitoring Plan lacks contaminant specific monitoring stations at the mixing zone boundary, and they are concerned about plume impact management for larger areas. Commenters are also concerned about human health exceedances of 4,4'-DDE which are said to occur in endangered specific habitats, and synergistic/cumulative effects across multiple contaminants specifically referencing N.J.A.C. 7:9B-1.14(d) where protection of benthic communities are required. Commenters claim that a regulatory mixing zone is not allowed under NJ Law in T&E habitat – also, for contaminants including PCBs, mercury, and DDE, mixing zones are not allowed for a "new discharge"	Consistent with N.J.A.C. 7:7-12.7(c)10.iv, Transco will control Project-related turbidity and resuspended contaminants by applying best management practices, such as clamshell dredging with an environmental bucket, and implementing adaptive management procedures, as warranted, based on water quality monitoring during construction. Human health-based ambient criteria have been established in saline water due to consumption of fish (NJAC 7:9B-1.5(a)5). However, the Project-related increase in DDE and other re-suspended contaminant levels would be very short in duration, i.e., dredging/trenching activities would occur for cumulatively less than approximately 10 days at any given point in New Jersey. Based on sediment modeling results, ambient conditions are expected to return in 1 to 6 hours following completion of any sediment-disturbing activities in New Jersey. Further, the area affected is currently prohibited for shellfish harvest, i.e., New Jersey does not allow human consumption of shellfish from the areas crossed by the Project route. Therefore, Project-related increases in DDE concentrations will not persist long enough to affect human health due to fish or shellfish consumption. See responses to comments above related to bioaccumulation potential, including toxicity testing conducted for offshore disposal.
82	Wetlands • Avoidance and minimization of impacts	Commenters raise concerns regarding impacts to wetlands, including the wetlands impacted by the suction and discharge pipeline area at Compressor Station 206. Commenter states that Transco has failed to demonstrate that it has avoided and minimized impacts to wetlands. Commenter states that Transco's application suggests that it might alter the Higgins access road if the Project after approval which raises concerns about hidden impacts.	Transco has sought to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands, waterbodies, transition areas, and riparian areas to the greatest extent practicable, as detailed in its May 2025 FWW and FHA permit applications. Specifically, since its initial applications filed in June 2017, Transco has continually improved the Project by reducing impacts to wetlands, transition areas, and riparian zones. Specifically, over the course of this permitting process, Transco has reduced permanent wetlands impacts by 3.533 acres, bringing the total permanent wetlands impacts associated with the entire Project to just 1.229 acres including 1.064 acres of freshwater wetland and 0.165 acres of coastal wetlands. Similarly, taking into consideration the Department's acceptance of the barred owl sighting in April 2019, wetland transition areas have been reduced from 4.186 to 1.325 acres of permanent impacts, and riparian zone impacts have been reduced from 2.754 to 1.6825 acres of permanent impacts. The only impacts to wetlands (exceptional or otherwise) associated with Compressor Station 206 relate to the proposed suction and discharge piping area. These activities are necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of Compressor Station 206 and, therefore, the Project as a whole. Compressor Station 206 must tie into Transco's existing pipelines. There are specific requirements for siting the tie-in assembly, and it cannot be located at another place along Transco's existing pipelines as doing so would either be impracticable or create greater wetlands impact. There is no practicable alternative location or design of the tie-in and suction and discharge that would have fewer impacts to regulated features. Accordingly, the location of Transco's existing pipelines on the Compressor Station 206 site and the fact that there are no practicable alternative locations for the suction and discharge piping and tie-in area that would have fewer environmental impacts necessarily requires some limited impacts to these wetlands and transition areas. Transco has established that it has avoided and minimized impacts to regulated areas, including wetlands and transition areas, to the greatest extent practicable.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			Transco is required to construct the Project, including the Higgins access road, within the limits of disturbance approved by FERC which would be consistent with the plans submitted to the NJDEP with Transco's permit applications and which may be approved.
83	Wetlands • Identification and delineation of wetlands	Commenters state that Transco did not identify all the regulated wetland areas near the proposed Higgins Farm Access Road and Compressor Station 206 site. Commenters express concern that Transco may expand or widen the Higgins Farm Access Road at a later date.	All regulated areas within the survey area and 150 ft of the proposed LOD were delineated. Forested wetlands to the north of the Higgins access road (outside of the surveyed area) were noted during the field surveys. A 150 ft transition area was included on the permit plans to calculate potential impacts to transition area. During the NJDEP field inspection to confirm the limits of the wetland delineation, a forested wetland was delineated outside the survey area north of the Higgins access road. This forested wetland is located outside the LOD. Transition area associated with this wetland overlap with existing transition areas depicted on the permit plans. The NJDEP confirmed wetlands and associated transition areas related to Compressor Station 206, including the access road, are accurately depicted on the permit plans during an October 3, 2025 site visit. Transco's permitting plans depict Transco's proposed extension of the existing Higgins Farm Access Road to the Compressor Station 206 site. Transco does not have plans to further expand or alter the road beyond what is depicted in these plans.
84	Wetlands • Impacts on coastal wetlands	Commenters alleged that impacts on coastal wetlands and habitat were not fully disclosed. Commenters state that Transco's application for a coastal wetlands permit must include site plans showing the details of any clearing, grading, filling, excavation, or dredging; changes in bathymetry; and the anticipated limits of disturbance. N.J.A.C. 7:7-23.4(c)4.	Coastal wetlands are those areas identified by the coastal wetland limit line (upper wetland limit boundary) as regulated by the Coastal Wetlands Act of 1970. This line is identified as the Promulgated Coastal Wetland Line 1970. The Project will result in 0.165 acres of permanent impacts to mapped coastal wetlands. The Project will result in approximately 1.369 acres of temporary impacts that are less than six months in duration to coastal wetlands. These temporary impacts will occur as a result of construction access and work locations along the Madison Loop. Impacts to coastal wetlands and waterfront development areas are discussed in Part IV and Table 21 of the Environmental Report. Part III, Section 3.0 of the Compliance Statement includes information regarding the Project's impact on coastal wetlands. Following extensive efforts to first avoid and then minimize impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and open waters, the proposed Project will result in impacts on freshwater wetlands and coastal wetlands. The proposed Project will disturb wetlands regulated under both the New Jersey Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act at N.J.A.C. 7:7A and the New Jersey Coastal Wetlands Act of 1970. Authorization for disturbance of wetlands regulated under N.J.A.C. 7:7A is being requested through an Application for a Freshwater Wetlands Individual Permit. Part II of the Compliance Statement demonstrates the Project's compliance with N.J.A.C. 7:7A. The proposed Project requires water access as a central purpose of the basic function of the activity; although the Project activities are not specifically defined as a "water dependent use" at N.J.A.C. 7:7-1.5, the alignment must cross tidal waterways and their associated wetlands in order to reach the Project terminus in New York. Within the New Jersey coastal zone, Project workspace for the Madison Loop will overlap three delineated wetlands, identified as W-T07-003, W-T07-004, and W-T01-017. These wetlands are regulated as both mapped coastal wetlands under the New Jersey Coastal Wetlands Act of 1970 and unmapped coastal wetlands under the New Jersey Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act because a portion of each lies landward of the New Jersey upper wetland boundary. All are tidally influenced. No wetlands have been identified within the onshore portion of the Raritan Bay Loop. Within the New Jersey coastal zone, the proposed Project will result in the disturbance of 1.369 acres of mapped coastal wetlands including 0.165 acres of permanent impacts and 1.369 acres of temporary impacts. These disturbances are illustrated on the Waterfront Development Permit Plans prepared in compliance with N.J.A.C. 7:7-23.4 (c)4. The proposed Project has no prudent or feasible alternative on a non-wetland site, will result in minimum feasible alteration or impairment of natural tidal circulation, and will result in minimum feasible alteration or impairment of natural contour or the natural vegetation of the wetlands. Disturbances of wetlands W-T07-004 and W-T01-017 will be minimized through the implementation of HDD technology. Specifically, Transco will cross wetland W-T07-004 using HDD, although a portion of the wetland will be impacted to accommodate HDD workspace at the entry point near MP11.45. Transco will also cross wetland W-T01-017 using HDD, although a portion of the wetland will be impacted to accommodate HDD

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			workspace at the exit point near MP11.85. It is not practicable to avoid the wetland impacts at the HDD entry and exit points due to equipment space requirements and other constraints, such as the proximity of the route to a residential neighborhood near MP11.40, southwest of Gondek Drive, and a residential neighborhood near MP11.80, northeast of Lockwood Marina. The portions of wetlands crossed by HDD may be subject to temporary impacts from foot traffic only in order to lay HDD tracking wires and/or a hydrostatic test water withdrawal hose. Transco will use a conventional open-cut method in the remaining wetland areas in the New Jersey coastal zone. To minimize impacts on the remaining wetland areas within the construction workspace, Transco will adhere to the Transco Procedures, included with Transco's application for a USACE and NJDEP Permits. Procedures for construction in wetlands that are unsaturated at the time of construction will be similar to those used in upland areas. Transco will temporarily store onshore trench spoil in a ridge along the pipeline trench, leaving gaps at appropriate intervals to provide natural circulation or drainage of water. Topsoil will be segregated in unsaturated wetlands adjacent to the trench to preserve the seed bank and allow for successful revegetation. Construction will proceed in saturated wetlands, potentially when standing water is present, but topsoil will not be segregated because saturated topsoil will be difficult to isolate. Before crossing wetlands that are saturated or that contain soils unable to support construction equipment without considerable soil disturbance, Transco will stabilize the ROW using equipment mats to help ensure stable, safe working conditions and to prevent significant rutting/soil disturbance. To minimize erosion and promote revegetation within the wetland, removing the root mats of woody vegetation will be allowed only directly over the trench area or where required to ensure safe working conditions. This serves to enhance regeneration of vegetation on the construction and permanent ROW. Transco will not install permanent erosion-control structures that could alter hydrology (e.g., slope breakers) within wetlands, but such structures may be used in the adjacent upland areas to control erosion and sedimentation. All disturbances to mapped coastal wetlands will be temporary, and the wetlands will be restored following construction in accordance with the Transco Procedures and an NJDEP-approved restoration plan. In accordance with the Transco Procedures, wetlands will be revegetated with an approved seed mix or annual ryegrass, where standing water is not present, to stabilize disturbed soils. Affected wetland areas will be allowed to revegetate naturally from existing adjacent seed banks. Wetland areas will not be amended with fertilizer, lime, or mulch unless required by appropriate federal and state agencies. Wetlands will be monitored for a period of three to five years after construction is completed to ensure successful revegetation of the Project area. Revegetation will be considered successful when the vegetative cover returns to at least 80% of the type, density, and distribution of the native vegetation in adjacent, undisturbed portions of the wetland. Transco will mitigate unavoidable degradation of the wetlands as necessary in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.
85	Wetlands • Impacts on freshwater wetlands	Commenters claim that Transco failed to sufficiently identify permanent, temporary, and secondary/indirect impacts on wetlands. Commenter states that the Project will impact wetlands which filter harmful contaminants from drinking water and support biodiversity.	Transco has sought to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands, waterbodies, transition areas, and riparian areas to the greatest extent practicable, as detailed in its May 2025 FWPA and FHACA permit applications. Specifically, since its initial applications filed in June 2017, Transco has continually improved the Project by reducing impacts to wetlands, transition areas, and riparian zones. Specifically, over the course of this permitting process, Transco has reduced permanent wetlands impacts by 3.533 acres, bringing the total permanent wetlands impacts associated with the entire Project to just 1.229 acres including 1.064 acres of freshwater wetland and 0.165 acres of coastal wetlands. Similarly, taking into consideration the Department's acceptance of the barred owl sighting in April 2019, wetland transition areas have been reduced from 4.186 to 1.325 acres of permanent impacts, and riparian zone impacts have been reduced from 2.754 to 1.6825 acres of permanent impacts. The Project Description (Part III of the Environmental Report) includes a detailed description of the proposed activities. Impacts to Freshwater Wetlands, Open Waters, Transition Areas, Coastal Wetlands, Waterfront Development Areas and Riparian Zones are discussed in Part IV of the Environmental Report. As described in Section 1.1, freshwater wetland impacts are those wetland and water areas located above the coastal wetland limit line (upper wetland limit boundary) as regulated by the Coastal Wetlands Act of 1970 to the wetland boundary as determined through the wetland delineation procedure and those wetland areas delineated during the wetland delineation procedure not associated with the upper wetland limit boundary. Transition areas were determined for all freshwater wetlands within the Project area based on best professional judgement

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			as well as previous correspondence with the NJDEP.. Impacts to freshwater wetlands, transition areas and State open waters are summarized in Table 20. Detailed breakdowns by vegetation communities are contained in the Wetland Utility Crossing Tabulation tables on Wetland Permit Plan Sheets 3 through 16. In compliance with NJDEP regulations, all impacts to forested area are considered "permanent" impacts. Temporary impacts are defined as less than six months in duration and will occur as a result of construction access, work locations and construction laydown areas. Mitigation in the form of restoration of these areas will be completed upon completion of the proposed Project, as necessary. Temporarily disturbed areas will be restored to their pre-existing conditions. Transco has received an approved Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for the Madison Loop from the Freehold Soil Conservation District that addresses both the temporary stabilization and permanent restoration of the pipeline right-of-way to ensure proper handling of all areas of topography present along the route, where not avoided by HDD. All disturbed areas will be provided with a permanent vegetative cover in accordance with the standards for permanent vegetative cover provided in the Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control in New Jersey, and a project specific Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan approved by the Soil Conservation District, or as directed by Transco Environmental Management. Should these restoration activities occur during inappropriate seasons for seeding (i.e., November through February), they will be stabilized with mulch in accordance with the standards for mulch provided in the Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control in New Jersey. Such areas shall be provided with permanent vegetative cover (i.e., seed and new mulch applied) at the next appropriate growing season. All soil erosion and sediment control measures installed prior to soil disturbances will be maintained until stabilization is accomplished. Due to the Project's linear requirements and association with exist rights-of-way (ROWs) and pipeline tie-ins, construction activities could not be designed to avoid all aquatic ecosystems identified within the vicinity of the Project. As a result, the Project will result in alteration (temporary and permanent) of the aquatic ecosystem. The Project will result in 1.064 acres of freshwater wetlands, including 0.843 acres for construction of Compressor Station 206 and 0.221 acres for construction of the Madison Loop. The Project does not propose any permanent impacts to existing stream channels. In addition, the proposed Project will result in 1.325 acres of permanent impacts to freshwater wetland transition areas. Permanent impacts to transition areas include 0.491 for construction of Compressor Station 206 and 0.834 acres for construction of the pipeline (Madison Loop). The Project will permanently impact 0.165 acres mapped coastal wetlands and approximately 1.369 acres of temporary impacts that are less than six months in duration to coastal wetlands. Impacts associated with the proposed Project are discussed in the Environmental Report, Part V. Temporarily disturbed areas (access roads, workspaces, etc.) will be restored to their pre-existing conditions to the extent practicable. All disturbed areas will be provided with a permanent vegetative cover in accordance with the Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control in New Jersey, and a project specific Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan approved by the Somerset -Union Soil Conservation District (Compressor Station 206), Freehold Soil Conservation District (Madison Loop and Raritan Bay Loop (onshore)), or as directed by the Transco Environmental Management. It is anticipated that the proposed onshore Project activities will not contribute to a violation of any State water quality standards. To avoid temporary impacts to water quality, a Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be adopted, and Best Management Practices will be implemented during construction of the proposed Project. A detailed list of these controls is included in the Environmental Report, Part III, Section 9.0, Best Management Practices. It is not expected that the Project will cause a decrease in biodiversity. The Project will avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential impacts on fish and wildlife. Information regarding the historic or current presence of Federal and/or State-listed endangered, threatened, special concern, proposed, or candidate species, or habitat to support those species located in the vicinity of the Project area is summarized in the Environmental Report, Part III, Section 6.0 Threatened and Endangered Species.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
			A request for information regarding the threatened and endangered species within the vicinity of the project was submitted to the NHP on May 6, 2025. Previous NHP database letters for the Madison Loop, dated July 8, 2019 and May 19, 2017 indicate the presence of suitable habitat for the bald eagle (foraging and nesting habitat), the State-threatened black-crowned night-heron (foraging habitat), and the osprey (foraging and nesting habitat) within areas located to the east of Route 9 and generally in association with Cheesequake Creek and its adjacent wetlands. In January 2025, the bald eagle and osprey were removed from the state's list of endangered species. According to the Landscape Project (Version 3.4) habitat is mapped for saltmarsh sparrow and black-crowned night-heron between Gondeck Drive and the Raritan Bay (MP11.45 to MP12.15). Impacts to the majority of wetlands and threatened and endangered species habitat will be avoided through the use of an HDD from MP11.49 to MP11.84. The Project will impact areas of wetland that are identified as foraging habitat for black-crowned night-heron and breeding habitat for saltmarsh sparrow, however, the Project will not result in impacts to any mapped suitable habitat for the listed breeding population. It is anticipated that impacts to suitable habitat will be minor and temporary in nature and will not represent any significant, long-term, adverse impact to black-crowned night-heron, salt marsh sparrow or habitat. In 2017, no endangered or threatened species were identified by the NHP on the proposed Compressor Station 206 site (and previously proposed Trap Rock access road) in Franklin Township (letter dated June 23, 2017). However, in response to a report of a State-threatened barred owl near Compressor Station 206, NJDEP biologists conducted an inspection of the site and contiguous forested area on April 4, 2019. The site visit resulted in NJDEP's acceptance of the sighting report as valid due to the presence of suitable forested habitat conditions on site and the larger contiguous forested area. Transco has conducted additional detailed engineering to reduce the impacts to the potential onsite habitat for the barred owl which comprises the exceptional value forested wetlands and transition areas. As a result, Transco has eliminated the impacts to exceptional resource value forested wetland transition areas and wetlands associated with the access road and compressor station facility. Due to the potential presence of suitable barred owl habitat within the vicinity of the Compressor Station 206, a barred owl presence/absence survey was conducted for Block 5.02, Lot 25. Direct surveys to determine the presence or absence of barred owl from the site or vicinity during the breeding season were conducted on April 14, April 17, April 23, April 30, and May 13, 2025. A full presence/absence survey resulted in the absence of barred owl from the site and immediate vicinity. The negative vocalization survey results provide strong evidence that the subject site and vicinity do not provide critical habitat for barred owl. To minimize potential construction related impacts to state-listed plant and wildlife species, Transco would adhere to permit conditions imposing seasonal work restrictions based on sensitive life stages. Construction activities likely to cause adverse effects will not be performed during certain restricted time periods. Proposed mitigation and BMPs will ensure the continued existence of a local population of threatened or endangered species will not be jeopardized by the proposed Project.

Item	Key Issue	Representative Comment	Response
86	Wetlands • Impacts on hydrology	Commenter states that any modification to wetlands has the potential to modify groundwater flow paths and thus modify the discharge that currently drives the hydrology of the wetlands. Commenter specifically states that upland construction-related discharge changes at mileposts 10.6-10.9 could push beyond the limits of the wetlands system. Commenter also states that Dewatering the coastal wetland at milepost 11.48 will exacerbate compaction and put tidal wetlands at risk.	Permanent impacts to wetlands W-T01-011A-1/W-T01-012D-1 (near 10.69-10.74) and W-T07-002A-1/W-T07-001D-1/W-T07-001C-1 are not proposed. Construction of the project will result in both permanent and temporary impacts to transition areas associated with these wetlands. Permanent transition area impacts are associated with tree clearing necessary for construction of the pipeline and will not affect groundwater elevations. Temporary impact areas will be restored to pre-existing conditions and will not modify groundwater flow paths and wetland hydrology. Disturbances of wetlands W-T07-004 (near 11.45) and W-T01-017(near 11.77) will be minimized through the implementation of HDD technology. Specifically, Transco will cross wetland W-T07-004 using HDD, although a portion of the wetland will be temporarily impacted to accommodate HDD workspace at the entry point near MP11.45. Transco will also cross wetland W-T01-017 using HDD, although a portion of the wetland will be temporarily impacted to accommodate HDD workspace at the exit point near MP11.85. It is not practicable to avoid the wetland impacts at the HDD entry and exit points due to equipment space requirements and other constraints, such as the proximity of the route to a residential neighborhood near MP11.40, southwest of Gondek Drive, and a residential neighborhood near MP11.80, northeast of Lockwood Marina. The portions of wetlands crossed by HDD may be subject to temporary impacts from foot traffic only in order to lay HDD tracking wires and/or a hydrostatic test water withdrawal hose. Construction of the pipeline via HDD will not result in dewatering of the coastal wetlands. Temporarily disturbed areas will be restored to their pre-existing conditions. All disturbed areas will be provided with a permanent vegetative cover in accordance with the standards for permanent vegetative cover provided in the Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control in New Jersey, and a project specific Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan approved by the Freehold Soil Conservation District, or as directed by Transco Environmental Management. Should these restoration activities occur during inappropriate seasons for seeding (i.e., November through February), they will be stabilized in accordance with the standards provided in the Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control in New Jersey. Such areas shall be provided with permanent vegetative cover (i.e., seed and new mulch applied) at the next appropriate growing season. All soil erosion and sediment control measures installed prior to soil disturbances will be maintained until stabilization is accomplished.
87	Wetlands • Impacts on wetlands in the Meadowlands	Commenter states that the Project is expected to have a negative effect on the Meadowlands.	None of the Project components are located within the Meadowlands. As such, the Project will not impact wetlands within the Meadowlands.
88	Wetlands • Resource value classification of wetlands	Commenters alleged that Transco failed to identify what impacted wetlands are exceptional resource value.	Transco provided the NJDEP resource value classification of wetlands in Table 11 of the Environmental Report. These are discussed in Part III. Section 5.0 of the Environmental Report.

List of Acronyms

BMP	Best Management Practices
CER	Creditable Emissions Reduction
CERC	Continuous Emission Reduction Credit
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CSRR	Contaminated Site Remediation & Redevelopment
CZM	Coastal Zone Management
dBA	Decibels On The A-Weighted Scale
dbh	Diameter At Breast Height
EDR	Environmental Data Resources, Inc.,
ERCs	Emission Reduction Credits
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FHACA	Flood Hazard Area Control Act
FWPA	Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act
GARFO	Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWRA	Global Warming Response Act
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutants
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drill
IHA	Incidental Harassment Authorization
LCP	Linear Construction Plan
LOD	Limit Of Disturbance
LSRP	Licensed Site Remediation Professional
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NHP	National Heritage Program
NJDEP	New Jersey Department Of Environmental Protection
NOAA	National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration
NSA	Noise Sensitive Area
NSR	New Source Review
NYPSC	New York State Public Service Commission
NOx	Nitrogen Oxides
OPR	Office Of Protected Resources
PFO	Palustrine Forested
PHMSA	Pipeline And Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
PM	Particulate Matter
PPV	Peak Particle Velocity
Project	Northeast Supply Enhancement Project
PSS	Palustrine Scrub-Shrub
ROW	Right-Of-Way
SDRP	State Development and Redevelopment Plan
SESC	Soil Erosion And Sediment Control
SO_2	Sulfur Dioxide
SOTA	State-Of-The-Art
STOP ACT	Shore Tourism And Ocean Protection Act
SWQS	Surface Water Quality Standards
TOYR	Time-Of-Year Restrictions
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
USCG	U.S. Coast Guard
USDOT	U.S. Department Of Transportation
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds
WQMP	Water Quality Monitoring Plan

EXHIBIT A

192 FERC ¶ 61,184
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: David Rosner, Chairman;
Lindsay S. See and Judy W. Chang.

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC — Docket Nos. CP17-101-007, CP20-49-001

ORDER ISSUING CERTIFICATE

(Issued August 28, 2025)

1. On May 29, 2025, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC (Transco), filed a petition pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA)[1] and section 385.207 and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations[2] requesting reissuance of its certificate of public convenience and necessity, as amended, authorizing Transco to construct and operate the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project.[3] The project is an expansion of Transco's system in Pennsylvania and New Jersey and its offshore pipeline system in New Jersey and New York state waters, and is designed to provide up to 400,000 dekatherms per day (Dth/d) of additional firm transportation service.

2. For the reasons discussed below, we grant Transco's petition and reissue a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the project, subject to certain conditions.

I. Background

3. Transco, a Delaware limited liability company, is a natural gas company as defined by section 2(6) of the NGA,[4] engaged in the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce and subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. Transco's

[1] 15 U.S.C. § 717f(c).

[2] 18 C.F.R. § 385.207, pt. 157 (2024).

[3] *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC*, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 (2019) (Certificate Order), *order denying reh'g and stay*, 171 FERC ¶ 61,031 (2020) (Rehearing Order), *amended*, 172 FERC ¶ 61,036 (2020) (Amendment Order), *vacated*, 187 FERC ¶ 61,145 (2024).

[4] 15 U.S.C. § 717a(6).

transmission system extends from Texas, Louisiana, and the offshore Gulf of America area, through Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, to its termini in the New York City metropolitan area.

4. The Commission issued Transco a certificate of public convenience and necessity on May 3, 2019, authorizing the company to construct and operate the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project.[5] The project is designed to provide up to 400,000 Dth/day of incremental firm transportation service from Transco's Compressor Station 195 in York County, Pennsylvania, to its offshore Rockaway Transfer Point, an existing interconnection between Transco's Lower New York Bay Lateral and its Rockaway Delivery Lateral in New York State waters.[6] The Certificate Order authorized Transco to construct and operate the following facilities:

- approximately 10.2 miles of 42-inch-diameter onshore pipeline loop in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (Quarryville Loop);
- approximately 3.4 miles of 26-inch-diameter onshore pipeline loop in Middlesex County, New Jersey (Madison Loop);
- approximately 23.3 miles of 26-inch-diameter offshore pipeline loop in Middlesex and Monmouth Counties, New Jersey, and Queens and Richmond Counties, New York, and approximately 0.2 miles of 26-inch-diameter onshore pipeline loop in Middlesex County, New Jersey (Raritan Bay Loop);[7]
- a new 21,902 horsepower (hp) electric motor-driven compression unit at the existing Compressor Station 200 in Chester County, Pennsylvania;
- a new 32,000 hp compressor station consisting of two 16,000 hp natural gas-fired, turbine-driven compressor units in Somerset County, New Jersey (Compressor Station 206); and

[5] Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 (2019).

[6] *Id*. P 4.

[7] The offshore portion of the Raritan Bay Loop will cross approximately 6.0 miles of New Jersey State waters and approximately 17.3 miles of New York State waters.

- various ancillary facilities including a communication tower, mainline valves, launchers and receivers, and other aboveground and underground facilities.

5. As described in the Certificate Order, Transco held an open season for the project that resulted in Transco executing two binding precedent agreements for the entire 400,000 Dth/d of transportation service created by the project. Specifically, Transco executed binding precedent agreements with two subsidiaries of National Grid: The Brooklyn Union Gas Company, d/b/a National Grid NY for 211,300 Dth/d for a term of 15 years, and KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid for 188,700 Dth/d for a term of 15 years.[8] The Certificate Order authorized Transco to charge initial incremental recourse rates under Rate Schedule FT for firm service using the capacity created by the project facilities[9] and to charge its generally applicable system fuel and electric power rates.[10]

6. Several community groups sought rehearing and stay of the Certificate Order. On April 16, 2020, the Commission issued an order denying the requests for rehearing and dismissing the request for stay as moot. The Commission issued an order amending the Certificate Order on July 16, 2020, to allow Transco to use an existing road to access Transco's proposed Compressor Station 206, in lieu of constructing a new, permanent access road approved in the Certificate Order.[11]

7. The Certificate Order's authorization was conditioned on Transco constructing and placing the project into service by May 3, 2021.[12] The Certificate Order also required Transco to obtain "all applicable authorizations required under federal law (or evidence of waiver thereof)" prior to commencing construction.[13] On May 15, 2020, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (New York State DEC) and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (New Jersey DEP) each denied

[8] Both companies serve residential and commercial customers in the New York City area.

[9] Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 at PP 19-24.

[10] *Id*. P 25.

[11] Amendment Order, 172 FERC ¶ 61,036 (2020).

[12] Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 at ordering para. (B)(1).

[13] *Id.* at app. A, env't condition 10.

Transco's applications for a water quality certification under section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

8. On March 19, 2021, Transco filed a request for a two-year extension of time to complete the project and place it in service due to delays in the receipt of water quality certifications from New York State DEC and New Jersey DEP. The Commission granted the extension request, setting the new in-service deadline as May 3, 2023.[14] On January 18, 2024, the Commission granted Transco a second extension, which extended the in-service deadline an additional year, to May 3, 2024.[15] In both extension orders, the Commission noted that the Certificate Order's public interest findings and environmental analysis continued to be valid, as no changes in fact or law had been identified that would require the Commission to reconsider its prior findings.[16] Environmental Groups[17] filed a timely request for rehearing of the second extension order. On April 10, 2024, Transco informed the Commission that it planned to let the certificate for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project expire in May 2024, and would not seek an additional extension.[18] On June 10, 2024, the Commission issued an order vacating the certificate for the project and dismissing Environmental Groups' rehearing request as moot.[19]

II. Requested Action

9. In its May 29, 2025 petition, Transco requests reissuance of the certificate for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, stating that the purpose, scope, and impact of the project have not changed since issuance of the Certificate Order in 2019. Transco seeks

[14] *See Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 175 FERC ¶ 61,148 (2021) (Extension Order I).

[15] *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 186 FERC ¶ 61,038 (2024) (Extension Order II).

[16] Extension Order I, 175 FERC ¶ 61,148 at PP 14, 17; Extension Order II, 186 FERC ¶ 61,038 at PP 19, 23-25.

[17] Specifically, the Princeton Manor Homeowners Association, Central Jersey Safe Energy Coalition, NY/NJ Baykeeper, and Food & Water Watch.

[18] *See* Williams Company April 11, 2024 Memos to Commission staff; Williams Company April 12, 2024 Memo to Commission staff.

[19] *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 187 FERC ¶ 61,145 (2024). Once the certificate for the project was vacated, the precedent agreements for the project were terminated in accordance with their terms. *See* Transco Petition at 11.

authorization to construct and operate the same facilities described in the Certificate Order, as amended.

10. Transco maintains that strong market demand for the project remains and states that it has executed new precedent agreements with the previous project shippers for 100% of the project's firm transportation service.[20] The precedent agreements provide for the parties to execute 15-year service agreements under Transco's Rate Schedule FT.[21] Further, Transco states that as was the case before, most of the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would still be constructed utilizing Transco's exiting rights-of-way, minimizing impacts on the environment and landowners, and that it is working closely with landowners to obtain the remaining property rights.

11. Transco also notes that it is in discussions with officials in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania to obtain the federal permits necessary to construct and operate the project. Transco filed new applications for water quality certification with New York State DEC, New Jersey DEP, and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (Pennsylvania DEP) on May 30, 2025.[22]

III. Notice, Interventions, and Comments

12. Notice of Transco's petition was published in the *Federal Register* on June 9, 2025,[23] with interventions, comments, and protests due June 24, 2025. A number of timely notices of intervention[24] and unopposed motions to intervene were filed.[25] Several

[20] Transco May 29, 2025 Petition at 1 (Petition); Transco August 5, 2025 Submittal of Precedent Agreements at 1.

[21] Transco August 5, 2025 Submittal of Precedent Agreements at 1. The precedent agreements also set forth the negotiated transportation rates agreed to with the project shippers.

[22] *See* Transco's June 6, 2025 Supplemental Information for Petition.

[23] 90 Fed. Reg. 24272 (June 9, 2025).

[24] Under Rule 214(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, these agencies became parties to the proceeding upon the timely filing of their notices of intervention. 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(a)(2) (2024).

[25] Timely, unopposed motions to intervene are granted by operation of Rule 214(c)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(c)(1).

late motions to intervene were also filed. Mr. Clifford G. Higgins, III's late motion to intervene was granted,[26] and several other late motions to intervene were denied.[27]

13. The Commission also received comments both in support of and opposed to the petition. Commenters in support of the petition generally note that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would bring jobs to the area and provide needed natural gas infrastructure to meet end-user growth in the New York City area. Commenters opposed to the petition question whether the Commission has the authority to reissue the certificate for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project and whether there is market need for the project. Commenters are also concerned with the cost to ratepayers and claim that the project is inconsistent with New Jersey and New York's goals for renewable energy and reductions in natural gas usage. Additionally, commenters express concerns regarding a number of environmental issues, including impacts to environmental resources and whether Commission staff needs to conduct a supplemental environmental analysis. Transco filed an answer to several of the protests,[28] which Central Jersey Safe Energy Coalition, Food & Water Watch, New Jersey League of Conservation Voters Education Fund, NY/NJ Baykeeper, Princeton Manor Homeowners Association, Sierra Club, and Surfrider Foundation (collectively, Sierra Club) argue should be rejected because it was filed more than 30 days after the protests.[29] Sierra Club also filed an answer to Transco's answer. Although the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure do not permit answers to protests, we find good cause to waive our rules and accept the answers because they provide information that has assisted in our decision-making process.[30] We address these issues below.

IV. Procedural Issues

A. Treating the Petition as a New Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity

14. Commenters assert that the petition should be treated as a new application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of the NGA and assigned

[26] July 17, 2025 Notice Granting Late Intervention.

[27] July 17, 2025 Notice Denying Late Interventions.

[28] Transco August 5, 2025 Answer.

[29] Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 2 (citing 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(d)(2)(ii)) (2024).

[30] *See* 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2).

a new docket number.[31] Because Transco is proposing to construct and operate the same project that was authorized in the Certificate Order, as amended, we find that assigning the proposal a new docket number is not necessary.[32] Moreover, if the Commission assigned the petition a new docket number, the stakeholders following the dockets for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would risk missing filings that could impact their interests. In any event, as discussed below, we analyze the petition under the Commission's Certificate Policy Statement,[33] using the same criteria that would have been used had Transco filed a new application.

B. Inadequate Comment Period

15. Several commenters requested that the Commission extend the public comment period for 90 days to allow the public more time to review Transco's petition and provide informed feedback.[34] The comment period for the petition was consistent with the Commission's practice of providing a 21-day comment period for applications filed pursuant to section 7 of the NGA. It is the Commission's practice to consider all comments filed in natural gas infrastructure proceedings, even those filed after established deadlines, to the extent possible and without delaying Commission action.[35] This order addresses comments that were filed after the close of the comment period. The 21-day comment period is adequate and consistent with the Commission's standard

[31] *See, e.g.,* Barbara Cuthbert June 11, 2025 Comments; Carol Kuehn June 17, 2025 Comments.

[32] *See Fla. Mun. Power Agency v. FERC*, 315 F.3d 362, 366 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (citing *Telecomm. Resellers Assoc. v. FCC*, 141 F.3d 1193, 1196 (D.C. Cir. 1998)) (administrative agencies enjoy broad discretion to manage their own dockets).

[33] *Certification of New Interstate Nat. Gas Pipeline Facilities*, 88 FERC ¶ 61,227 (Certificate Policy Statement), *corrected*, 89 FERC ¶ 61,040 (1999), *clarified*, 90 FERC ¶ 61,128, *further clarified*, 92 FERC ¶ 61,094 (2000).

[34] *See, e.g.*, Kirk Frost June 9, 2025 Comment at 2; ReThink Energy NJ June 11, 2025 Comment; Dr. Barbara Cuthbert June 11, 2025 Comment; Jane Winn June 11, 2025 Comment; Aruna Mota June 13, 2025 Comment; Carol Kuehn June 17, 2025 Comment; Robert Gowin June 20, 2025 Comment; Gulnara Latypova June 20, 2025 Comment, Lucia Dlugacz June 20, 2025 Comment; Paula Zevin June 20, 2025 Comment at 2; Therresa Durando June 23, 2025 Comment; Lakshmi Devi Abiram June 23, 2025 Comment; Vikram Oza Comment June 23, 2025; Krishna Nori June 23, 2025 Comment; Haripriya Bhamidipaty June 23, 2025 Comment; James T. Mulroy June 24, 2025 Comment.

[35] *See Saguaro Connector Pipeline, LLC*, 186 FERC ¶ 61,114, P 40 (2024).

practice for applications considered under section 7 of the NGA, and we therefore find no reason to extend it.[36]

V. Discussion

16. Because the facilities Transco requests reauthorization to construct and operate will be used to transport natural gas in interstate commerce subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, the proposal is subject to the requirements of NGA section 7, subsections (c) and (e).[37]

A. Legal Basis to Reissue Certification

17. Commenters contend that there is no legal basis for Transco's request for the Commission to reissue a certificate for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, arguing that once the Commission issued the order vacating the certificate the project was legally "dead."[38] They assert that the NGA does not grant the Commission authority to reissue a certificate, and, in fact, the Commission's rules prohibit it.[39] Specifically, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) and Sierra Club argue that Rule 2008 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, which governs post-expiration extensions of time, applies to Transco's petition and Transco failed to demonstrate "extraordinary circumstances sufficient to justify the failure to act in a timely manner."[40] Sierra Club further asserts that the only procedure by which Transco may obtain a certificate for the project is to submit a new application that meets the requirements specified in section 7 of the NGA and the Commission's regulations.[41] It argues that, contrary to Transco's assertions, this proceeding is not like instances where the Commission reissues a certificate after the original certificate is vacated by a court because here there is no court

[36] We note that no comments were received after August 4, 2025.

[37] 15 U.S.C. §§ 717f(c), (e).

[38] *See, e.g.*, NRDC June 24, 2025 Comment at 3; *see also* Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 2-3.

[39] *See* Siera Club June 24, 2025 Comment at 4.

[40] NRDC June 24, 2025 Comment at 3-4 (citing 18 C.F.R. § 385.2008(b) (2024)); Sierra Club June 24, 2025 Comment at 4-5. Sierra Club asserts that when acting on requests for extensions of time, the Commission is merely modifying the terms and conditions attached to a certificate. Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 3.

[41] Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 3.

opinion to guide the Commission to address particular deficiencies in the underlying proceeding.[42]

18. NRDC compares Transco's petition to *Jordan Cove Energy Project*, where the Commission vacated its prior authorization and required the applicant to file a new application when converting a proposed liquefied natural gas (LNG) import facility to an export facility.[43] NRDC also cites *Spire STL Pipeline LLC*, where the D.C. Circuit vacated and remanded the Commission's certificate and the Commission subsequently granted Spire's new application for a temporary certificate pending the Commission's action on remand.[44] NRDC contends that Transco's situation is similar and that it should have to file a new application for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project.

19. Sierra Club and NRDC misapply Rule 2008. The request before us is not to extend the deadline to complete construction in the Certificate Order, but to reissue a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing Transco to construct and operate the project. As Transco explains in its answer, a more appropriate comparison would be to situations where the Commission reinstates certificate authority after a court vacates a certificate.[45] In fact, *Spire STL Pipeline LLC*, which NRDC references, is an apt example. There, on remand, the Commission considered the existing record, as well as the circumstances that had changed since the original certificate was issued.[46] Specifically, the Commission considered new information about need for the project and updated its environmental analysis as necessary.[47] As in *Spire STL Pipeline LLC*, here we consider updated precedent agreements and new studies in evaluating project need.[48]

---

[42] *Id.* at 3-4.

[43] NRDC June 24, 2025 Comment at 4-5 (citing *Jordan Cove Energy Project*, 129 FERC ¶ 61,234, at PP 37-38 (2009), *order granting reh'g and vacating certificate*, 139 FERC ¶ 61,040 (2012)).

[44] *Id*. at 5 (citing *Spire STL Pipeline LLC*, 181 FERC ¶ 61,232, at P 24 (2022), *order on reh'g,* 183 FERC ¶ 61,048 (2023)).

[45] Transco August 5, 2025 Answer at 5.

[46] *Spire STL Pipeline LLC*, 181 FERC ¶ 61,232, at P 24 (2022), *order on reh'g,* 183 FERC ¶ 61,048.

[47] *Id*. P 49.

[48] *Infra* at PP 26-42.

The Commission did not conduct additional environmental analysis for the resource areas that had not changed since the original environmental review of the project.[49]

20. Contrary to NRDC's assertion, *Jordan Cove Energy Project* is not applicable here because in that proceeding, the Commission required Jordan Cove to file a new application due to the fact that the company proposed dramatically different facilities and operations (export versus import) than those that had previously been authorized.[50] The Commission noted that its public interest analysis was based on Jordan Cove's original purpose to import foreign LNG into the U.S. to provide greater supply reliability to domestic markets.[51] It was clear that Jordan Cove no longer planned to import LNG, and instead had changed its plans to export domestic LNG to foreign markets and install different facilities necessary to carry out this purpose.[52] Given the fact that the purpose, scope, facilities to be installed, and impacts of the Jordan Cove project were all changing, the Commission determined it could not rely on its prior findings to support a public interest determination and required Jordan Cove to file a new application.[53] Here, Transco is requesting reissuance of the certificate for the same project as was authorized in the Certificate Order, with the same purpose, scope, and proposed facilities.

21. Moreover, while commenters claim that the Commission is not allowed to reissue the certificate authorizing the project, they fail to point to any section of the NGA, Commission rule, or Commission precedent to substantiate that assertion. Sierra Club argues that the Commission has explained that it adheres to construction completion deadlines in certificate orders to protect the information supporting the determination from going stale, to prevent neighboring landowners from indefinitely being burdened by the looming possibility of the project being built, and to prevent developers from inhibiting competition.[54] But the Commission's precedent regarding those concerns apply to extensions of time to complete construction, which as we explain above is not what Transco is requesting in its petition. Rather, this action is taken pursuant to section 7 of the NGA, which requires the Commission to authorize the construction and operation of natural gas facilities that are or will be required by the public convenience

[49] *Spire STL Pipeline LLC*, 181 FERC ¶ 61,232, at P 66 (2022).

[50] *Jordan Cove Energy Project*, 129 FERC ¶ 61,234, at PP 37-38 (2009), *order granting reh'g and vacating certificate*, 139 FERC ¶ 61,040 (2012).

[51] *Jordan Cove Energy Project*, 139 FERC ¶ 61,040 at P 18.

[52] *Id*. P 20.

[53] *Id.*

[54] Sierra Club June 24, 2025 Comment at 4.

and necessity.[55] In considering Transco's request for reissuance, below we apply the Certificate Policy Statement to assess whether there is a need for the project and whether the project will serve the public interest, as we would for a new NGA Section 7 application. Thus, our authority under section 7 of the NGA to reissue a certificate of public convenience and necessity is no different than our authority to issue a certificate in the first instance.[56]

B. Certificate Policy Statement

22. Because we are reissuing the certificate, we apply the Certificate Policy Statement to assess whether there is a need for a proposed project and whether the proposed project will serve the public interest.

23. The Certificate Policy Statement provides guidance for evaluating proposals to certificate new construction.[57] The Certificate Policy Statement establishes criteria for determining whether there is a need for a proposed project and whether the proposed project will serve the public interest. It explains that, in deciding whether to authorize the construction of new pipeline facilities, the Commission balances the public benefits against the potential adverse consequences. The Commission's goal is to appropriately consider the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives, the possibility of overbuilding, subsidization by existing customers, the applicant's responsibility for unsubscribed capacity, the avoidance of unnecessary disruptions of the environment, and the unneeded exercise of eminent domain in evaluating new project construction.

24. Under this policy, the threshold requirement for applicants proposing new projects is that the applicant must be prepared to financially support the project without relying on subsidization from its existing customers. The next step is to determine whether the applicant has made efforts to eliminate or minimize any adverse effects the project might have on the applicant's existing customers, existing pipelines in the market and their captive customers, and landowners and communities affected by the proposed project and the route of the new pipeline facilities. If residual adverse effects on these interest groups are identified after efforts have been made to minimize them, the Commission will evaluate the project by balancing the evidence of public benefits to be achieved against the residual adverse effects. This is essentially an economic test. Only when the benefits

[55] 15 U.S.C. § 717f(e).

[56] As demonstrated by the discussion below, we find that there is sufficient information in the record for our action and disagree with Sierra Club's assertion that Transco should be required to file a new application.

[57] Certificate Policy Statement, 88 FERC ¶ 61,227.

outweigh the adverse effects on economic interests will the Commission proceed to complete the environmental analysis, where other interests are considered.

1. No Subsidy Requirement

25. As discussed above, the threshold requirement for applicants proposing new projects is that the applicant must be prepared to financially support the project without relying on subsidization from its existing customers. The Commission has determined, in general, that when a pipeline proposes an incremental rate for service utilizing proposed expansion capacity that is higher than the generally applicable system rate, the pipeline satisfies the threshold requirement that the project will not be subsidized by existing customers.[58] The Certificate Order found that the project as proposed will not be subsidized by existing customers.[59] In its petition, Transco continues to propose the same incremental recourse rate designed to recover the incremental cost of service attributable to the project facilities;[60] we therefore continue to find that the project will not be subsidized by existing customers.

2. Project Need

26. Transco states that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project is designed to provide additional firm transportation service to resolve the supply shortfall and pipeline constraints in the New York market area.[61] In the Certificate Order, the Commission determined that Transco had sufficiently demonstrated that there is market demand for the project, having entered into long-term precedent agreements for the full amount of additional firm transportation service to be made possible by the project.[62] As noted above, although the precedent agreements analyzed in the Certificate Order were terminated once the certificate for the project was vacated, Transco has executed new binding precedent agreements with unaffiliated project shippers for 100% of the firm transportation service to be created by the project.[63] The Commission has continuously found that precedent agreements are the best evidence that the service to be provided by

---

[58] *See, e.g.*, *Dominion Transmission, Inc.*, 155 FERC ¶ 61,106, at P 15 (2016); *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Corp.*, 98 FERC ¶ 61,155, at 61,552 (2002).

[59] Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 at P 14.

[60] Transco Petition at 13-14.

[61] Transco Petition at 8.

[62] Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 at P 16.

[63] *See* Transco August 5, 2025 Submittal of Precedent Agreements at 1.

the project is needed to connect supply and demand, as precedent agreements involve parties engaging in negotiations for pipeline transportation services to meet individualized needs.[64] It is the Commission's policy to respect freely-negotiated private contracts,[65] and absent plausible evidence of self-dealing between affiliates,[66] the Commission does not look behind precedent agreements to question individual shippers' business decisions to enter into contracts.[67] We therefore find Transco's precedent agreements for 100% of the project's firm transportation service to be significant evidence of market need for the project.[68]

27. Additionally, Transco cites the Final Gas Systems Long-Term Plan Addendum (Long-Term Plan Addendum) that National Grid, the parent company of the project shippers, filed in July 2025 with the New York State Public Service Commission. The Long-Term Plan Addendum projects that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would increase firm gas supply to downstate New York by approximately 13%, thereby

[64] *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC*, 190 FERC ¶ 61,048, at PP 27, 29 (2025).

[65] *Re Cent. Me. Power Co.*, 57 FERC ¶ 61,083, at 61,303 (1991) (acknowledging that it is Commission policy to respect freely negotiated private contracts).

[66] *Env't Def. Fund v. FERC*, 2 F.4th 953, 975 (D.C. Cir. 2021) (finding plausible evidence of self-dealing "more than enough to require the Commission to 'look behind' the precedent agreement in determining market need").

[67] *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC*, 190 FERC ¶ 61,048 at P 27 (citing Certificate Policy Statement, 88 FERC at 61,744 ("the Commission gives equal weight to contracts between an applicant and its affiliates and an applicant and unrelated third parties and does not look behind the contracts to determine whether the customer commitments represent genuine growth in market demand")).

[68] The significance of precedent agreements and the Commission's reliance on them as part of its need determination has been frequently affirmed by the courts. *See*, *e.g.*, *Food & Water Watch v. FERC*, 104 F.4th 336, 347 (D.C. Cir. 2024) (East 300) (citations omitted); *Del. Riverkeeper Network v. FERC*, 45 F.4th 104, 114 (D.C. Cir. 2022); *City of Oberlin, Ohio v. FERC*, 39 F.4th 719, 722 (D.C. Cir. 2022); *Sierra Club v. FERC*, 38 F.4th 220, 230 (D.C. Cir. 2022) (citations omitted); *Birckhead v. FERC*, 925 F.3d 510, 517-18 (D.C. Cir. 2019); *City of Oberlin, Ohio v. FERC*, 937 F.3d 599 (D.C. Cir. 2019); *Sierra Club v. FERC*, 867 F.3d 1357, 1379 (D.C. Cir. 2017); *Myersville Citizens for a Rural Cmty., Inc. v. FERC*, 783 F.3d 1301, 1311 (D.C. Cir. 2015); *Minisink Residents for Env't Pres. & Safety v. FERC*, 762 F.3d 97, 111 & n.10 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (quoting Certificate Policy Statement, 88 FERC at 61,748); *Twp. of Bordentown, N.J. v. FERC*, 903 F.3d 234, 262-63 (3d Cir. 2018); *Appalachian Voices v. FERC*, No. 17-1271, 2019 WL 847199, at *1 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 19, 2019).

reducing National Grid's risk of supply shortfalls during periods of peak demand and system stress.[69] The Long-Term Plan Addendum states that the region's "gas network operates without a contingency margin, with no excess capacity reserved for emergencies like unexpected demand spikes or supply disruptions. Inadequate upstream gas supply infrastructure has therefore left New York City and Long Island at an increased risk of a catastrophic gas system outage,"[70] and "NESE would increase the reliability of Transco's critical gas transmission system by adding compression and pipeline loops," which "reduces the probability of a catastrophic gas outage in Downstate New York, protecting against the loss of life and significant economic costs such an event would cause."[71] The Long-Term Plan Addendum explains that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project will have regional supply flexibility and reliability benefits, allowing National Grid to shift supplies between Transco and Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, and provide supply to its non-firm customers that would otherwise rely on delivered fuels.[72] National Grid states in the Addendum that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project is the "only material, near-term proposal that can efficiently and cost effectively address the full scope of downstate New York's gas system resilience challenges."[73]

---

[69] Transco August 5, 2025 Answer at 13 (citing Case 24-G-0248, *In the Matter of a Review of the Long-Term Gas System Plans of The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid*, "Cover Letter" at 2 (July 2, 2025)). *See also* Case 24-G-0248, *In the Matter of a Review of the Long-Term Gas System Plans of The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid*, at 5 (noting that "New York families and businesses depend on natural gas to meet more than 68% of heating demand, and to fuel nearly half of all electric generation in New York State").

[70] *Id.* at 8.

[71] *Id.* at 9.

[72] Transco August 5, 2025 Answer at 14. National Grid states in its addendum that maintaining service during high demand days can "require up to 240 [compressed natural gas] truck deliveries per day navigating ice- and snow-covered roads, an approach that is logistically complex, weather-dependent, and inherently risk-intensive." *See* Case 24-G-0248, *In the Matter of a Review of the Long-Term Gas System Plans of The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid*, at 8.

[73] Transco August 5, 2025 Answer at 14 (citing Case 24-G-0248, *In the Matter of a Review of the Long-Term Gas System Plans of The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a*

28. Transco also provides market studies to bolster its argument that the project is needed.[74] Transco argues that demand has not lessened since the Certificate Order, and in fact the need for energy supply in the Northeast has become even more urgent. In support for this claim, Transco cites the Northeast Power Coordinating Council's *Northeast Gas/Electric System Study* (NPCC Study), which concludes that existing gas infrastructure in New York is unable to meet the demand from most electric generators during a cold snap.[75] Transco also cites the Commission's most recent State of the Markets Report, which found that almost all major natural gas trading hubs in the country saw price reductions in the last year, except for Transco Zone 6 N.Y., which saw a 14% increase in natural gas prices.[76] The State of the Market Report also found that resource adequacy risk is growing in winter due to the combined factors of electrification of heating load, winter gas pipeline constraints, retirements of fuel-secure generating capacity, and tightening winter conditions in neighboring regions. Consequently, Transco asserts this project will benefit the wider New York and New Jersey region.[77]

National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid, "Cover Letter" at 4).

[74] Transco Petition at 8-10; Transco August 5, 2025 Answer at 12-17.

[75] Transco Petition at 8 (citing Northeast Power Coordinating Council, *Northeast Gas/Electric System Study*, at 5 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://tinyurl.com/2wpftzpe). *See also* NPCC Study at 5-6 ("Recent experience with Winter Storm Elliott reveals the fragility of the New York Facilities System when upstream supply is materially reduced"; "During more temperate weather conditions when more gas-fired generation is scheduled on the New York Facilities System, the loss of compression or mainline deliverability on any one pipeline serving Consolidated Edison Co. of New York (Con Edison) and/or National Grid would likely result in the loss of significant gas-fired generation"; and "The constrained baseline operating conditions on the gas systems in New England and New York during cold weather mean that limited gas-fired generation options are expected to be available to respond to electric contingencies, which could take the form of a sudden nuclear plant or HVDC transmission outage.").

[76] Transco Petition at 9-10 (citing FERC, *2024 State of the Markets: Staff Report*, at 17 (Mar. 20, 2025), https://www.ferc.gov/news-events/news/SMR-2024).

[77] Moreover, Transco asserts that reissuance of Northeast Supply Enhancement Project certificate would accomplish many of the goals in Executive Order 14156, *Declaring a National Energy Emergency*, Exec. Order No. 14156, 90 Fed. Reg. 8433 (Jan 20, 2025), and Executive Order 14154, *Unleashing American Energy*, Exec. Order No. 14154, 90 Fed. Reg. 8353 (Jan. 20, 2025), which direct agencies to support

Transco concludes that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project is the most economically and environmentally effective way to resolve the supply shortfall and pipeline constraints in the New York market area.

29. Sierra Club claims that nothing in Transco's petition demonstrates "specific need" for the project.[78] It asserts that there is a forecasted reduction of demand in the project's intended market, citing the shippers' apparent lack of foreknowledge of Transco's petition and New York City Local Law 154 which prohibits natural gas installation in new construction.[79] Sierra Club argues that Transco has been inconsistent about whether the evidence supporting the need for the project is the same as what the Commission relied on in originally granting a certificate for the project.[80]

30. We note that subsequent to Sierra Club filing its initial comments, Transco and National Grid's affiliates entered into precedent agreements for the entirety of the project's firm capacity. As explained above, the project is fully subscribed, and it is the Commission's policy that precedent agreements reflect the best evidence of market need, absent evidence of self-dealing.[81] Here, there is no evidence of self-dealing provided by Sierra Club or any other commenter and the precedent agreements are convincing evidence of project need. Moreover, we disagree that there has been a change in market conditions that suggests a reversal of the project need demonstrated in the Certificate Order. The same source that Sierra Club cites for the reduction in demand caused by New York City Local Law 154, National Grid's March 2025 Final Gas System Long-Term Plan, projects that the company will face a shortfall in supply to meet its reference

---

infrastructure development, particularly in the northeastern United States to enhance energy reliability.

[78] Sierra Club June 24, 2025 Comment at 6.

[79] *Id*. at 7 (citing National Grid, *Final Gas System Long-Term Plan: Case No. 24-G-0248*, n. 33 (Mar. 7, 2025), https://www.nationalgrid.com/document/558131/download).

[80] Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 5.

[81] *See supra* n.68. *See also Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 190 FERC ¶ 61,048 at PP 27-30 (explaining how the Commission determines project need and that the Commission treats "precedent agreements as persuasive evidence of market need and will not look beyond them to assess need by other means unless there is credible, contrary evidence discounting their probative value.").

Design Day standard by 2028 in downstate New York, and states that "the company continues to seek new supply and demand options."[82]

31. Next, Sierra Club avers that Transco belies its own claim of continued market need by referencing power generation demand when the project's original shippers were local distribution companies (LDC).[83] Yet there is nothing inconsistent with citing the need for natural gas for power generation when discussing LDC shippers, as LDCs can serve many different customer types, not just residential and commercial. Many natural gas-fired generators in the United States are located behind city gates and contract for natural gas supply through LDCs. Transco's additional mention of the further uses of natural gas delivered to Long Island strengthens, rather than undermines, the showing of need for this project.

32. Sierra Club also contends that the Commission's study on Winter Storm Elliott found that "supply disruptions that occurred during that extreme storm event were not due to a lack of transmission capacity but the lack of supply source diversity, which is not a problem that the Project will fix."[84]

33. We disagree with the Sierra Club's claims regarding Winter Storm Elliott. The Commission's final report of the Inquiry into Bulk-Power System Operations During December 2022 Winter Storm Elliott (Elliott Inquiry) reviews the impact of a region-wide storm on electricity markets, electric reliability, and natural gas utilities in the Northeast region of the United States.[85] The phrase "supply source diversity" or similar does not appear in the report, and the report covers a large variety of coinciding issues that led to electricity and natural gas reliability challenges during Winter Storm Elliott. These included natural gas production outages, but also poor communication between market participants, lack of winterization of generation and pipeline facilities, and contractual decisions made by market participants.[86] The Elliott Inquiry's

[82] *See* National Grid, *Final Gas System Long-Term Plan: Case No. 24-G-0248*, n. 33 (Mar. 7, 2025), https://www.nationalgrid.com/document/558131/download.

[83] Sierra Club July 24, 2025 Comment at 8; *see also* Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 6.

[84] *Id.*

[85] *Inquiry into Bulk-Power System Operations During December 2022 Winter Storm Elliott* (Oct. 2023).

[86] *Id.* at 21.

recommendations focus on improving industry communication, winterization of infrastructure, and electricity market refinements.[87]

34. The Elliott Inquiry did not cite inadequate transmission capacity for supply disruptions during the extreme weather event because upstream issues largely meant that there was not enough natural gas available to determine whether a pipeline capacity constraint existed.[88] However, we note that during Winter Storm Elliott, while pipelines deployed line pack and storage, and dispatched personnel to respond to constrained conditions,[89] most of them also needed to issue critical notices and Operational Flow Orders (OFO) (which can indicate limited availability of non-firm capacity), and some issued force majeures (which curtail even firm transportation).[90] Some LDCs, like ConEd, which serves over a million customers in and around New York City, had to establish an internal gas system emergency to preserve their system reliability.[91] While interstate pipeline operators used every tool (e.g., OFOs) to avoid disruptions in service, "some operators were forced to make difficult decisions such as curtailing firm natural gas customers, to allow the system to recover from reliability-threatening conditions rather than deteriorate into an uncontrolled loss of an entire pipeline."[92] As the storm progressed, supply shortfalls continued and customers' demand increased to a level where some customers began taking more gas than what they supplied and/or confirmed through nominations, which contributed to low pipeline pressures.[93] Moreover, low pipeline pressures caused by reduced gas supply entering pipelines *combined with increased demand* also resulted in issues at interstate pipeline interconnections with other pipelines, where shippers' gas supply quantities were inconsistent with shippers' confirmed nominations on the receiving pipeline.[94] As a result, confirmed nominations

[87] *Id.* at 137-145.

[88] *Id.* at 87.

[89] These efforts were successful at the onset of the storm, allowing pipelines to deliver confirmed nominations of gas to meet customers' demand. *Id*. at 77.

[90] *Id.* at 21; *see also id.* at 77 ("To meet confirmed nominations of customers, pipelines used line pack and/or gas from storage to try to cover shortfalls as much as possible.").

[91] *Id.*

[92] *Id.* at 22.

[93] *Id.* at 77.

[94] *Id.* at 78.

failed to align with the quantity of gas flowing, requiring some pipelines to implement scheduling restrictions and forcibly reduce previously confirmed nominations.[95]

35. While it is true that natural gas supply decreased during Winter Storm Elliott, lower 48 state demand for natural gas set new records: December 23, 2022 demand for gas totaled 162.5 Bcf/d, exceeding the previous record daily high of 137.4 Bcf/d set on January 1, 2018.[96] The combination of additional "…demand volumes in conjunction with continuing supply shortfalls" led to low pressures on the interstate pipelines in the Northeast and "exacerbating pipelines' integrity issues was that some generators may have flowed in excess amounts over their confirmed nominations."[97] Further, natural gas storage withdrawals appeared to more than offset the natural gas production declines.[98] Thus, challenges associated with pipeline pressures—which could have been alleviated in part by additional interstate pipeline capacity—show that natural gas production declines alone were not solely responsible for interstate pipeline issues during Winter Storm Elliott.

36. In the intervening years, there have been widespread industry efforts to improve natural gas production reliability in extreme winter conditions. If growing demand creates a market need for new transmission capacity, it is unreasonable to presume that production declines during extreme weather will preclude it from being used to its maximum capacity and therefore render it wholly unnecessary. New York's close proximity to the Appalachian natural gas production basin allows for access to plentiful natural gas supply from the basin. Supply diversity achieved through long-distance pipelines connecting to other supply basins much farther away would be costlier and less reliable than LDCs and other customers working with natural gas producers to ensure reliable intra-regional supply. Transco sufficiently demonstrated need with the precedent

[95] *Id.* at 78-79.

[96] *Id.* at 112.

[97] *Id.* at 87.

[98] For example, on December 24, 2022, daily dry natural gas production declined to 18% or nearly 17 Bcf/d, below the pre-event level, while net natural gas storage withdrawals reached 60 Bcf/d. *Id.* at 52-53, 84, 110. Marcellus and Utica Shale Basin production volumes reached a low on December 24, 2022, and December 26, 2022, respectively, declining by nearly 23% and 54%, compared to the maximum production in the Appalachian Basin five days prior, while natural gas storage withdrawals in the Northeast increased to roughly 18 Bcf/d, up approximately 45% from the prior five days. *Id.* at 87.

agreements for 100% of the project capacity, and Sierra Club does not provide evidence discounting their probative value or sufficient contrary evidence regarding need.

37. Mr. Kirk Frost states that updated hydraulic modeling will show that Transco's pipeline system has expanded and gained supply diversity since the Certificate Order, which he suggests indicates decreased dependency on additional capacity from any one source.[99] Similarly, Sierra Club contends that Transco fails to acknowledge that the gas transmission network in the area has changed.[100] Neither Sierra Club nor Mr. Frost provides any information showing that this specific project is not needed by the project's shippers or, more generally, to provide additional transportation capacity to the New York market, or otherwise address the capacity constraints in that market.

38. Several commenters state that the project conflicts with New York and New Jersey statutes that codify goals for renewable energy and reductions in natural gas consumption.[101] They cite the New Jersey Clean Energy Act of 2018 (NJ Act), which requires utilities to adopt energy efficiency programs and peak demand reduction programs and achieve annual reductions in the use of natural gas, and the New York Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act (Climate Act) that sets greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction standards in all sectors of New York's economy.[102]

39. As we have previously determined, a project providing supply diversity and mitigating constraints during peak demand is not incompatible with state statutes requiring a reduction in the average annual use of natural gas or reduction in GHG emissions.[103] Here, the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project is designed to enhance reliability, flexibility, and efficiency on a critical part of Transco's system and provide access to supplies of natural gas in a constrained market.[104] The project would improve

[99] Kirk Frost June 4, 2025 Comment at 5.

[100] Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 6.

[101] *See, e.g.*, Karen Crovicz June 13, 2025 Comment; ReThink Energy New Jersey June 10 2025 Comment; Angela Hsu June 16, 2025 Comment; Barabara Cuthbert June 16, 2025 Comment; Sara S. Gronin June 20, 2025 Comment; Linda R. Powell June 24, 2025 Comment; Monica Ramchandani June 24, 2025 Comment; Anne Marquardat June 24, 2025 Comment.

[102] *See, e.g.*, ReThink Energy New Jersey June 10 2025 Comment (citing N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.9, et al.); New Jersey League of Conservation Voters June 20, 2025 Comment.

[103] *See Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 190 FERC ¶ 61,048 at P 72.

[104] Transco Petition at 2.

the efficiency resiliency and reliability of gas service to residential and commercial loads and help to reduce gas prices in New York City, including during peak demand days.[105] New Jersey and New York's clean energy laws are complex statutory frameworks and are not inherently inconsistent with the project just because it is supplying natural gas to the New York City area. New York's Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act mandates certain levels of GHG reductions but does not prohibit the use of natural gas by LDC-customers.[106] We note that none of the project's LDC shippers are located in New Jersey and any service to New Jersey is speculative. Nonetheless, but to the extent the project serves New Jersey LDCs, as we have found in other cases, providing additional access to economically priced domestic gas supplies in not inconsistent with the New Jersey Clean Energy Act.[107] We find both that the project is not inconsistent with the states' requirements, nor do those requirements undermine the need for the project. [108]

40. Several commenters contend, without support, that the project would increase costs for ratepayers in the New York City and New Jersey areas.[109] Making the same claim, South Brunswick Township cites a 2020 study conducted by the Institute for

---

[105] *Id.* at 16.

[106] *Iroquois Gas Transmission Sys., L.P.,* 178 FERC ¶ 61,200, P 15 (2022). National Grid also noted that "NESE will not hinder progress toward [the Climate Act's] targets. Instead, it supports emissions reductions and air quality improvements by facilitating fuel-switching and avoiding the use of diesel trucks for CNG supply." Case 24-G-0248, *In the Matter of a Review of the Long-Term Gas System Plans of The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid*, at 11 (July 2, 2025)).

[107] *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC*, 192 FERC ¶ 61,134, PP 85-89.

[108] *See Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 190 FERC ¶ 61,048 at P 72 (concluding, with respect to a project with capacity contracted for by New Jersey LDCs, that the project was not inconsistent with New Jersey's clean energy laws and that those laws did not "undermine the need for the project [as] demonstrated by the precedent agreements").

[109] *See, e.g.*, Anne Marqurardat June 24, 2025 Comment; Francis M. Womack, III June 26, 2025 Comment. Bare assertions are insufficient to challenge a project sponsor's demonstration of need. *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 190 FERC ¶ 61,048 at P 30 (citing *Entergy Ark., Inc.*, 141 FERC ¶ 61,269, at P 30 (2012) ("The Commission has long held that protestors must provide more than unsubstantiated allegations in support of their positions"); *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 131 FERC ¶ 61,173, at P 93 (2010)).

Energy Economics and Financial Analysis that states the project would require ratepayers to pay $193 million a year for 15 years.[110] Transco rebuts this claim citing a recent study conducted by Levitan & Associates, Inc. which finds that the project would provide economic benefit to ratepayers by reducing wholesale electric energy prices, with an estimated average savings across NYISO of $446 million per year in the first five years due to lessened congestion along major gas supply aggregation points, which will decrease prices during the peak heating season.[111] We find that the 2020 study relied upon by South Brunswick Township is based on several assumptions about the demand reduction predicated on the economic slowdown impact of COVID-19, as well as the potential for large-scale boiler replacement with electric heat pumps, neither of which materialized in the past five years, and thus is no longer a relevant barometer, particularly based on how projections for future energy and natural gas demand in the region has changed over the past five years.[112] Further, the economic argument of potential alternatives (large-scale boiler replacement with electric heat pumps and gas to hydrogen conversions) is not supported by a relative weighing of those costs, whereas we note that the Levitan study does incorporate cost reduction projections that are more closely calibrated to market conditions that we have noted in the past few years.

41. Last, Public Citizen accuses Transco's petition of being the result of political pressure, and that, on that basis, a certificate of public convenience and necessity cannot be granted.[113] Public Citizen speculates that there was a *quid pro quo* involving stopping attacks on New York offshore wind projects and congestion pricing in exchange for New York's support of the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project.[114] Speculation is not relevant to our determination of whether there is a need for a proposed project and

[110] South Brunswick Township June 26, 2025 Comment at 1.

[111] Transco August 5, 2025 Answer at 15 (citing Case 24-G-0248, *In the Matter of a Review of the Long-Term Gas System Plans of The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid*, at 1 (July 2, 2025)).

[112] Specifically, U.S. natural gas demand declined from 85.3 billion cubic feet (Bcf) per day in 2019 to 84 Bcf per day in 2021. However, since 2021, natural gas demand has increased to 91.4 Bcf per day in 2025. EIA, Short-Term Energy Outlook Data Browser, Table 5a, (Aug. 21, 2025), https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/steo/data/browser/#/?v=15&f=A&s=0&start=2019&end=2026&ctype=linechart&maptype=0&linechart=NGMPPUS.

[113] Public Citizen June 24, 2025 Comment at 1, 6.

[114] *Id*. at 1.

whether the proposed project will serve the public interest.[115] In any event, Transco has submitted precedent agreements along with credible market studies to demonstrate need for the project, consistent with the Certificate Policy Statement.

42. We find that there is no basis in the record here to depart from the Commission's general rule that the Commission does not look behind precedent agreements to question individual shippers' business decisions to enter into contracts, which has been upheld by the courts.[116] Commenters have failed to provide sufficient credible contrary evidence to rebut the record evidence of need as demonstrated by Transco's precedent agreements for 100% of the project's capacity.[117] Accordingly, based on Transco's precedent agreements for 100% of the project's capacity and also noting that there are credible market studies that show that the project may help alleviate reliability issues for project shippers and end-users, provide reliability and system resilience benefits to the wider

[115] *See Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 190 FERC ¶ 61,048 at P 30 (citing *Tenn. Gas Pipeline Co.*, 98 FERC ¶ 61,166, at 61,618 (2002) (declining to accept assertions where analysis was based on unsupported assumptions)); *see also Mich. Pub. Power Agency v. FERC*, 963 F.2d 1574, 1580 (D.C. Cir. 1992) ("We see no grounds to require [the Commission] to allocate its limited resources to full-fledged investigation of the . . . claims, which were primarily hypotheticals with no evident basis in fact or experience.").

[116] Certificate Policy Statement, 88 FERC at 61,744 ("the Commission … does not look behind the contracts to determine whether the customer commitments represent genuine growth in market demand"); *see Twp. of Bordentown, N.J. v. FERC*, 903 F.3d 234, 263 (3d Cir. 2018) (*Twp. of Bordentown*) (affirming the Commission's reliance on precedent agreement as evidence of market need and explaining that a "contract for a pipeline's capacity is a useful indicator of need because it reflects a 'business decision' that such a need exists"); *see also United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Serv. Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332, 344 (1956) (recognizing in the context of rate changes, that "by preserving the integrity of contracts, [the NGA] permits the stability of supply arrangements which all agree is essential to the health of the natural gas industry" and stating that the NGA "affords a reasonable accommodation between the conflicting interests of contract stability on the one hand and public regulation on the other."); *Cheyenne Connector, LLC*, 168 FERC ¶ 61,180, at P 27 (2019) (citing Certificate Policy Statement, 88 FERC at 61,744) (explaining that it is longstanding Commission policy to not second guess the business decisions of pipeline shippers).

[117] *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 192 FERC ¶ 61,134, at P 45 (2025) (reaffirming the Commission's policy of respecting a project sponsor's privately negotiated contracts absent credible contrary evidence, as a demonstrated need for a natural gas infrastructure project).

New York region, and reduce energy prices for consumers, we find there is a demonstrated need for the project.

3. Impacts on Existing Customers, Existing Pipelines or Storage Providers and Their Customers, and Landowners and Surrounding Communities

43. The Certificate Order found that the project would have no adverse effect on service to Transco's existing customers, or on other pipelines in the region or their captive customers.[118] Transco reiterates in its petition that there will be no adverse effect on service to Transco's existing customers because the proposed expansion facilities are designed to provide incremental service to meet the needs of the project shippers, without degrading service to Transco's existing customers.[119] Additionally, Transco asserts that the project shippers will use the capacity provided under the project to serve the incremental growth requirements of their markets, not to displace existing service providers.[120] We continue to find that the proposed project will have no adverse effect on service to Transco's existing customers and there will be no adverse impact on other pipelines in the region or their captive customers.

44. The Certificate Order also found that Transco has taken appropriate steps to minimize adverse impacts to landowners and surrounding communities,[121] noting that much of the onshore portion of the proposed project will be co-located along Transco's existing right-of-way. Specifically, approximately 97% of the project's Quarryville Loop is located within and alongside the existing Transco Mainline right-of-way, and 100% of the project's Madison Loop is located within and alongside Transco's existing Lower Bay Loop C right-of-way.[122] Further, Transco has obtained all of the onshore permanent right-of-way necessary to construct and operate the project in Pennsylvania, and all but two tracts onshore in New Jersey, and states that it is working closely with landowners to obtain the property rights for required temporary workspace.[123] Some commenters question the status of agreements for use of the access road to the Compressor

[118] Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 at P 15.

[119] Transco Petition at 14.

[120] *Id.* at 15.

[121] Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 at P 17.

[122] *Id.* P 17.

[123] Transco Petition at 10-11, 17.

Station 206 site that was authorized in the 2020 Amendment Order.[124] Construction of the access road would require Transco to obtain the easements necessary for such construction. We therefore continue to find that the project will have minimal impacts on landowners and surrounding communities.

4. Certificate Policy Statement Conclusion

45. Based on the benefits the project will provide and the minimal adverse impacts on exiting shippers, other pipelines and their captive customers, and landowners and surrounding communities, we continue to find that, consistent with the Certificate Policy Statement and NGA section 7(c), the public convenience and necessity requires approval of the project, subject to the environmental and other conditions in the Certificate Order, as amended, and in this order.

C. Rates

46. In the Certificate Order, the Commission approved an incremental daily recourse reservation charge of $1.12995 per Dth and an initial incremental usage charge of $0.00500 per Dth under Rate Schedule FT for firm service using the incremental capacity created by the project facilities.[125] Additionally, the Commission authorized Transco to charge its generally applicable system fuel and electric power rates.[126] Transco proposes the same rates as authorized by the Commission in the Certificate Order[127] and requests the Commission adopt those previously approved rates for the project. Because Transco is requesting reissuance of the certificate to construct and operate the project exactly as authorized in the Certificate Order, we find it appropriate to use the previously authorized rates as the initial incremental rates for the project.

47. Section 154.309 of the Commission's regulations[128] includes bookkeeping and accounting requirements applicable to all expansions for which incremental rates are charged. The requirements ensure that costs are properly allocated between pipelines' existing shippers and incremental expansion shippers. Therefore, consistent with the Certificate Order, Transco is required to keep separate books and accounting of costs and revenues attributable to the incremental capacity created by the Northeast Supply

[124] Barbara Cuthbert June 11, 2025 Comment at 1.

[125] Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 at PP 20-24.

[126] *Id*. P 25.

[127] *Id.* P 24.

[128] 18 C.F.R. § 154.309 (2024).

Enhancement Project as required by section 154.309.[129] The books should be maintained with applicable cross-references as required by section 154.309. This information must be in sufficient detail so that the data can be identified in Statements G, I, and J in any future NGA section 4 or 5 rate case, and the information must be provided consistent with Order No. 710.[130]

48. Transco states that, as previously authorized in the Certificate Order, it will provide service to the project shippers under a negotiated rate agreement. Transco must file either its negotiated rate agreement or tariff records setting forth the essential terms of the agreement associated with the project, in accordance with the Alternative Rate Policy Statement[131] and the Commission's negotiated rate policies.[132]

D. Environmental Analysis

49. To satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA),[133] Commission staff evaluated the potential environmental impacts of Transco's March 27, 2017 application for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project in an environmental impact statement (EIS). On January 25, 2019, Commission staff issued the final EIS for the project,[134] and public notice of the availability of the final EIS was

---

[129] *Id.*

[130] *See Revisions to Forms, Statements, & Reporting Requirements for Nat. Gas Pipelines*, Order No. 710, FERC Stats. & Regs ¶ 31,267 (2008) (cross-referenced at 122 FERC ¶ 61,262).

[131] *Alts. to Traditional Cost-of-Serv. Ratemaking for Nat. Gas Pipelines; Regul. of Negotiated Transportation* Servs. of Nat. Gas Pipelines, 74 FERC ¶ 61,076, *clarification granted*, 74 FERC ¶ 61,194, *order on reh'g and clarification*, 75 FERC ¶ 61,024, *reh'g denied*, 75 FERC ¶ 61,066, *reh'g dismissed*, 75 FERC ¶ 61,291 (1996), *petition denied sub nom. Burlington Res. Oil & Gas Co. v. FERC*, 172 F.3d 918 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (Alternative Rate Policy Statement).

[132] *Nat. Gas Pipelines Negotiated Rate Policies and Pracs.; Modification of Negotiated Rate Pol'y*, 104 FERC ¶ 61,134 (2003), *order on reh'g and clarification*, 114 FERC ¶ 61,042, *dismissing reh'g and denying clarification*, 114 FERC ¶ 61,304 (2006).

[133] 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 *et seq.*; *see also* 18 C.F.R. pt. 380 (2024) (Commission's regulations implementing NEPA).

[134] Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Docket No. CP17-101-000 (issued Jan. 25, 2019) (Final EIS).

published in the *Federal Register* on February 1, 2019.[135] The final EIS addressed geology; soils; water resources; wetlands; vegetation; wildlife and aquatic resources; threatened, endangered, and other special status species; land use, recreation, and visual resources; socioeconomics; cultural resources; air quality and noise; safety; cumulative impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions and climate change; and alternatives. On April 24, 2020, the Commission issued an environmental assessment (EA) regarding use of an alternative access road to access Compressor Station 206.[136] The final EIS, as amended by the EA, concluded that construction and operation of the project will result in some adverse environmental impacts, but impacts will be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the implementation of Transco's proposed, and Commission staff's recommended, mitigation measures, which were included as conditions to the Certificate Order. Ordering paragraph (B) of this order incorporates the Environmental Conditions of the Certificate Order.

50. As discussed above, Transco states in its petition that the purpose, need for, scope of, and impacts of the project have not changed.[137] In response to the notice of petition issued on June 3, 2025, we received comments raising environmental issues. Specifically, many comments reprise environmental issues that were analyzed in the 2019 final EIS for the project, with a focus on the environmental issues associated with the Raritan Bay Loop and Compressor Station 206. The topics raised by commenters and discussed below include: environmental baseline data; the need for supplemental NEPA analysis; water quality and contaminated sediments; wildlife and fish habitat; recreation and socioeconomic impacts to Raritan Bay; vessel traffic; alternatives; groundwater; flooding; wildlife and vegetation offshore; population and traffic; property values; air quality; noise; public safety; cumulative impacts; and climate change.

51. On July 11, 2025, Commission staff issued an environmental assessment report concluding that it is appropriate to rely on the final EIS, as amended by the EA, to satisfy NEPA requirements for reissuance of certificate authority for the project, based on staff's determination that there is no new information that provides a different picture of the environmental landscape not already considered. The environmental comments received are discussed below.

52. Under NEPA, the Commission considers impacts on all potentially affected communities. Project activities that would affect local communities include construction and operation of the Quarryville, Madison, and Raritan Bay Loops, Compressor Station

---

[135] 84 Fed. Reg. 1119 (Feb. 1, 2019).

[136] Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC, Environmental Assessment, Docket No. CP20-49-000 (issued Apr. 24, 2020) (EA).

[137] Transco Petition at 1.

206, and the new compressor unit at Compressor Station 200. Transco would utilize 14,523.7 acres during construction, of which 14,165.5 acres (98%) consists of open water in Raritan Bay and Lower New York Bay.[138] Operation of the project would require 145.2 acres, 31.3 acres of land and 85.6 acres of seafloor.[139] As described in the EIS and below, the project's potential impacts on local communities during construction include air quality and noise impacts, visual and recreational impacts, traffic impacts, and housing impacts, all of which would be less than significant throughout the construction period. The operation of the project will also have less than significant impacts on local communities. Similarly, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts with other projects would be less than significant.[140] The EIS recommended implementation of Transco's proposed construction procedures and mitigation measures and Commission staff recommendations, which we have adopted in this order.

1. Environmental Baseline Data and Need for Supplemental NEPA

53. Commenters state that Transco's claim that the project impacts have not changed is inaccurate because environmental baseline data is 5-10 years old and not reflective of the current situation, making the conclusions in the final EIS and Certificate Order outdated.[141] Specifically, commenters note that there have been clean-up activities at Superfund Sites by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) since the project received its certificate in 2019.[142] All four of the Superfund Sites identified by the commenters are existing sites; two of which are not located within the project area and

[138] Final EIS at 2-8.

[139] *Id*.

[140] *Id*. at 4-390.

[141] Kirkman Frost June 4, 2025 Comment at 2 and 3; Kirkman Frost June 5, 2025 Comment at 1; ReThink Energy NJ June 10, 2025 Comment at 1.

[142] Drew Cuthbert June 23, 2025 Comment at 3.

therefore are not discussed further.[143] The remaining sites, the Higgins Farm site and the Raritan Bay Slag site, are discussed below[144] and in the final EIS.[145]

54. Commenters also claim that sediment contaminant levels in Raritan Bay have changed since the application was originally filed and reference updates at the Raritan Bay Slag site.[146] As discussed in the final EIS, the Raritan Bay Slag site is in the Laurence Harbor section of Old Bridge and in Sayreville, New Jersey.[147] In the late 1960s and early 1970s, metal slag and battery casings were deposited along the beachfront in this area, resulting in elevated metal concentrations in nearshore soils and offshore sediments. Commission staff's examination of available records found that EPA's clean-up of the Raritan Bay Slag site continues. Specifically, the EPA currently is working with the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) to procure a contractor for the cleanup of the Seawall Sector and has started design work for the Jetty Sector of the Raritan Bay Slag site with plans to begin cleanup work there once work at the Seawall Sector is complete.[148] As indicated in the final EIS, Transco is continuing to consult with the EPA regarding construction in the Raritan Bay Slag site.[149] We find that there is no record evidence that the baseline sediment contaminant levels in Raritan Bay have changed.

55. Next, Commenters claim that environmental conditions such as wind speeds, air quality, water quality, vegetation and wetlands in the construction area, and coastal zones

---

[143] Hercules Incorporated in Parlin, NJ (EPA ID: NJD002521961) is about 1.5 miles from the project and DuPont Imaging Department's cleanup activities (EPA ID: NJD002444024) is about 0.75 mile from the project.

[144] *See infra* PP 57-59, 69-70.

[145] Final EIS at 4-250 to 4-251.

[146] Kirkman Frost June 4, 2025 Comment at 2 and 3 and Drew Cuthbert June 23, 2025 Comment at 3.

[147] Final EIS at 4-251.

[148] EPA, *Superfund Site: Raritan Bay Slag Old Bridge TWP/Sayreville, NJ Cleanup Activities* (Aug. 12, 2025), https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/SiteProfiles/index.cfm?fuseaction=second.cleanup&id=0206276.

[149] Final EIS at 4-124.

have changed, which could affect the issuance of required permits.[150] Additionally, Mr. Robert Wonsor states that the Transco is improperly seeking to be held to environmental standards that are over five years old.[151] We note that the project will be held to all current federal regulatory requirements and standards. Environmental Condition 10 of the Certificate Order requires Transco to file documentation that all applicable authorizations required under federal law (or evidence of waiver thereof) are received, and Environmental Condition 20 requires Transco to file documentation of consistency with the Coastal Zone Management Act. Additionally, Environmental Condition 14 requires Transco to file documentation of consultation with the New York State DEC, New Jersey DEP, and U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regarding its final proposed mitigation for fisheries and aquatic resources, including timing restriction commitments and allowable work within these periods. Transco will provide any updated data, as required and developed through agency consultations, to comply with revised permit conditions. Therefore, we conclude that any environmental baseline changes that may have occurred since the final EIS would be taken into consideration during the appropriate permitting processes. Given this, and that no commenter has provided substantial evidence of changes in the environmental baseline, we believe there is no need to alter the baseline other than, as discussed below, with respect to EPA's revised standards for PM2.5.

56. Last, commenters argue that the Commission must conduct a new, or supplemental, NEPA analysis for the project, based on the claim that the baseline data has changed.[152] We disagree that supplemental NEPA is required. The decision whether to complete a supplemental EIS is left to agency discretion under a "rule of reason" standard.[153] Any new information brought to the attention of the Commission must be

[150] Kirkman Frost June 4, 2025 Comment at 2 and 3 and June 5, 2025 Comment at 1.

[151] Robert Wonsor June 16, 2025 Intervention.

[152] *See, e.g.*, NRDC June 24, 2025 Comment at 6. To support their argument commenters cite to the Commission's staff guidance manual on implementation of NEPA which states that Commission staff may rely on an EIS previously prepared by staff, provided that the prior EIS meets the standards under NEPA for an adequate EIS and can be used in its entirety to support the proposed action without need for supplementing. FERC Staff Guidance Manual on Implementation of The National Environmental Policy Act, June 2025, at 14.

[153] *Marsh v. Or. Nat. Res. Council*, 490 U.S. 360, 373 (1989); *Friends of the River v. FERC*, 720 F.2d 93, 109-10 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *Marsh*, 490 U.S. at 375-76; *see also Friends of Cap. Crescent Trail v. FTA*, 877 F.3d 1051, 1059 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (*Friends of Cap. Crescent Trail*) ("If an agency's decision not to prepare a [supplemental EIS] turns

sufficient to show that the remaining federal action will affect the environment in a significant manner or to a significant extent *not already considered*.[154] In other words, a supplemental EIS "must only be prepared where new information provides a *seriously* different picture of the environmental landscape."[155] Whether an agency must complete a supplemental EIS "turns on the value of the new information to the still pending decisionmaking process."[156] We agree with staff's conclusion in the environmental

---

on a factual dispute the resolution of which implicated substantial agency expertise, the court defers to the agency's judgment.") (quoting *Marsh*, 490 U.S. at 376).

[154] *Marsh*, 490 U.S. at 374.

[155] *Stand Up for Cal. v. Dep't of the Interior*, 994 F.3d 616, 629 (D.C. Cir. 2021) (*Stand Up for Cal.*) (emphasis in original) (quoting *Friends of Cap. Crescent Trail*, 877 F.3d at 1060 (internal quotation marks omitted)); *see Seven Cnty. Infrastructure Coal. v. Eagle Cnty., Colo*., 145 S. Ct. 1497, 1513 (2025) ("As the Court has emphasized on several occasions, and we doubly underscore again today, 'inherent in NEPA . . . is a "rule of reason," which ensures that agencies determine whether and to what extent to prepare an EIS based on the usefulness of any new potential information to the decisionmaking process.'"); *see also Laguna Greenbelt, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Transp.*, 42 F.3d 517, 529 (9th Cir. 1994) (supplemental EIS not required to assess impact of fires when agency took requisite "hard look," relying on scientific expertise of two coordinating agencies who concluded no new significant impacts resulted); *Animal Def. Council v. Hodel*, 840 F.2d 1432, 1439 (9th Cir. 1988) (agency decision not to supplement EIS in light of new information was reasonable where agency "carefully considered the information, evaluated its impact, and supported its decision not to supplement with a statement of explanation").

[156] *Id*. An agency need not supplement an EIS every time new information comes to light after an EIS is finalized. *Marsh*, 490 U.S.at 373-74; *see Vt. Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 519, 554 (1978) (citing *ICC v. Jersey City,* 322 U.S. 503, 514 (1944)) ("Administrative consideration of evidence . . . always creates a gap between the time the record is closed and the time the administrative decision is promulgated [and, we might add, the time the decision is judicially reviewed]. . . . If upon the coming down of the order litigants might demand rehearings as a matter of law because some new circumstance has arisen, some new trend has been observed, or some new fact discovered, there would be little hope that the administrative process could ever be consummated in an order that would not be subject to reopening."); *Friends of Cap. Crescent Trail*, 877 F.3d at 1060 (stating that "[o]ver the course of a long-running project, new information will arise that affects, in some way, the analysis contained in a prior [final EIS]" and that "NEPA does not require agencies to needlessly repeat their environmental impact analyses every time such information comes to light"); *N.M. ex rel. Richardson v. Bureau of Land Mgmt.*, 565 F.3d 683, 708 (10th

assessment report that it is appropriate to rely on the final EIS, as amended by the EA, to satisfy NEPA requirements for Transco's petition to reissue the certificate authority for the project because we do not find that there is new information that provides a different picture of the environmental landscape than what was already considered in the final EIS and EA.[157]

2. Raritan Bay

a. Raritan Bay Water Quality and Raritan Bay Slag Site Contaminated Sediments

57. Mr. Kirkman Frost claims that because the sediment analysis was performed in 2017, it is likely that the sediment contaminant levels in Raritan Bay have changed since the application was originally filed, including updates at the Raritan Bay Slag site.[158] Mr. Frost further states that the sediment dynamics in Raritan Bay are influenced by a variety of factors including shipping traffic, tidal currents, storm events, and human activities such as dredging and construction, and that the rate and extent of sediment change in the bay requires considering these factors and their interactions.

58. Sediments within Raritan and Lower New York Bays contain contaminants from historical and ongoing anthropogenic sources. Contaminants that become resuspended during sediment-disturbing activities, such as Transco's pipeline construction, are expected to generally be adsorbed to organic material and fine-grained sediment and redeposited as sediment-bound compounds. The redeposited sediment is expected to be similar in contaminant concentration to the ambient conditions of the surface sediments at the depositional locations.[159] As indicated in the final EIS, the New York State DEC will require, and Transco has committed to, monitoring of the water column for chemical

---

Cir. 2009) ("Of course, every change however minor will not necessitate a new substantive analysis and repetition of the EIS process. To make such a requirement would lead agencies into Xeno's paradox, always being halfway to the end of the process but never quite there.").

[157] *Seven Cnty. Infrastructure Coal. v. Eagle Cnty., Colo.*, 145 S. Ct. at 1513 ("we doubly underscore again today, 'inherent in NEPA . . . is a rule of reason, which ensures that agencies determine whether and to what extent to prepare an EIS based on the usefulness of any new potential information to the decisionmaking process'"); *id.* (explaining that agencies are entitled to deference about where to draw the line, including whether and to what degree it should consider indirect environmental effects).

[158] Kirkman Frost, June 4, 2025 Comment at 2 and 3.

[159] Final EIS at ES-11.

contaminants in New York State waters to ensure compliance with state water quality standards as part of the project's New York State DEC water quality certification.[160] Transco would be required to perform any sediment sampling, as necessary, to acquire appropriate permits prior to receiving any authorization from the Commission to proceed with construction activities. The final EIS concludes that based on the relatively limited distribution of upper-level exceedances for mercury and other heavy metals along the project route, the short duration of turbidity plumes, and the expected fate of metals released into the marine environment, the risk to aquatic resources from exposure to resuspended inorganic contaminants is expected to be low.[161] We agree with this conclusion.

59. Next, commenters assert that the project could cause chemical leakage into Raritan Bay.[162] As discussed in the final EIS, Transco would implement the measures in its Spill Plan, which include conducting routine inspections of construction equipment, tanks, and storage areas, and the use of secondary containment around all containers and tanks to help reduce the potential for spills and leaks.[163] Additionally, all offshore vessels would be expected to comply with U.S. Coast Guard requirements for the prevention and control of oil and fuel spills[164] and would be required to register for the EPA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Vessel General Permit, which includes measures to protect against impacts associated with discharges incidental to the operations of commercial vessels.[165] The final EIS concludes that Transco's implementation of its Spill Plan and mitigation measures would adequately minimize the effects of potential spills on waterbodies.[166] We agree with this conclusion.

b. Raritan Bay Wildlife and Fish Habitat

60. Commenters state that efforts to cleanup and maintain the Raritan Bay have improved habitats for wildlife, marine mammals, fish and shellfish, and claim that the

[160] *Id.* at 4-125.

[161] *Id.* at ES-12.

[162] *See, e.g.*, Michele Pabuwal June 5, 2025 Intervention; Neeta H. Shah June 13, 2025 Intervention; Bart N Dandrea June 13, 2025 Intervention.

[163] Final EIS at 4-95.

[164] MARPOL, Annex V, Pub. L. 100−220 [101 Stat. 1458].

[165] Final EIS at 4-136.

[166] *Id.* at 4-48.

construction activities, vessels and equipment, noise, disruptions, and potential for chemical leakage from the project could severely damage the Bay's environment and economy (boating, fishing, tourism and related activities) that are reliant on clean water and healthy habitats.[167] The final EIS notes that the Raritan Bay Loop is located in a marine area that supports Essential Fish Habitat for 33 species, diadromous and marine fisheries, and a number of fish and invertebrate species with ecological, commercial, or recreational importance.[168] As indicated in the final EIS, Commission staff anticipates that impacts on aquatic resources due to seafloor disturbance would be minor as pelagic fish, sea turtles, and marine mammals would likely temporarily vacate the affected area to avoid the disturbance.[169] Benthic invertebrates and demersal (bottom-dwelling) fish species in or near areas directly impacted by construction would be most affected, but the final EIS determines that affected benthic communities would re-establish within a short time as native assemblages recolonize the area or a new community develops. As detailed in the final EIS, the primary adverse effects on aquatic resources from construction of the Raritan Bay Loop include impacts from seafloor disturbing activities and noise. Because the loop would be installed beneath the seafloor, operation of the pipeline will have little to no impact on aquatic resources.[170]

61. The final EIS concludes that, based on the relatively limited duration, extent, and magnitude of project-related turbidity and sediment redeposition, as well as Transco's commitment to restrict work in sensitive areas as much as possible, no significant, long-term impacts on the pelagic or benthic community or other aquatic resources are expected from the project-related seafloor-disturbing activities.[171] Environmental Condition 14 of the Certificate Order, incorporated by reference by Ordering Paragraph (B), requires Transco to file documentation of its consultations with New York State DEC, New Jersey DEP, and the NMFS regarding its final mitigation for fisheries and aquatic resources, including construction timing window commitments. In addition, to verify that benthic communities recover as expected, Environmental Condition 15 requires Transco to file a 5-year post-construction benthic sampling and monitoring plan, prepared in consultation with the NMFS, for review and written approval of the Director of the Office of Energy Projects.

---

[167] *See, e.g.*, Mustafa Turan June 5, 2025, Comment; Manish Podder June 5, 2025 Intervention, Missy Holzer June 5, 2025 Intervention.

[168] Final EIS at 5-10.

[169] *Id*.

[170] *Id.*

[171] Final EIS at ES-12.

62. Commenters state that there is danger of vessel strikes or collisions with marine mammals in the proposed pipeline area in Raritan Bay.[172] The final EIS states that construction vessel traffic would increase the potential for collision or injury to larger offshore species; however, the effect would be small and localized relative to existing traffic into and out of the busy Port of New Jersey and New York.[173] Transco would implement its Marine Mammal Observer Training and Response Protocol Plan and utilize NMFS-approved observers to monitor for protected species and marine mammals during construction activities. Therefore, the final EIS concludes that the impact of vessel traffic and vessel strikes on offshore resources would be temporary and negligible.[174] We agree.

c. Raritan Bay Recreation and Socioeconomic Effects

63. Commenters state the construction activities, vessels and equipment, noise, and disruptions from the project could severely damage Raritan Bay's environment and economy, including boating, fishing, eco-tourism, and related activities.[175]

64. The offshore portion of the Raritan Bay Loop would cross both New Jersey and New York state-owned submerged land. The final EIS concludes that construction of the project would have temporary and minor impacts on various offshore recreational activities such as fishing, whale watching, and scuba diving.[176] The final EIS also concludes that operation of the Raritan Bay Loop would have no significant impact on offshore commercial and recreational activity and would have no visual impact on the area as the entire facility would be installed below the seafloor at USACE-designated burial depths.[177] We agree with these conclusions.

---

[172] *See, e.g.*, Mustafa Turan June 5, 2025, Comment; Manish Podder June 5, 2025 Intervention; Missy Holzer June 5, 2025 Intervention.

[173] Final EIS at 5-14.

[174] *Id.* at 4-136.

[175] *See, e.g.*, Ron Blava June 5, 2025 Intervention; Michelle Davis June 12, 2025 Intervention; Perry J Spada June 13, 2025 Intervention.

[176] Final EIS at 5-18.

[177] *Id.* at 5-19.

d. Vessel Traffic

65. Commenters contend that there has been an increase in shipping and vessel traffic in Raritan Bay since issuance of the final EIS.[178] The final EIS indicates that the Raritan Bay Loop would cross the entry into one of the most active ports in the world and that this area experiences high levels of commercial ship traffic and periodic maintenance dredging activity.[179] The final EIS concludes that impacts on commercial ship traffic during construction of the Raritan Bay Loop would be short term and mainly limited to a safety zone around the temporary workspace that would be used during offshore construction and commissioning of the pipeline.[180] Vessels would be advised to avoid these safety zones. Specifically, a Special Notice to Mariners would be submitted to the U. S. Coast Guard to advise commercial vessels of the construction schedule and location of the restricted area, which would be marked by buoys and monitored by escort boats. The final EIS concludes that these temporary restrictions are not expected to adversely affect commercial shipping because there is ample room in the surrounding area for ships to transit to and from local harbor destinations.[181] Additionally, there would be communication between construction vessels and other boat traffic to ensure that adequate safety margins are maintained. Recreational boating that does occur in the area would be subject to the same restrictions imposed on commercial vessels discussed above. Recreational boaters would have access to the same Special Notice to Mariners that would be available to fishermen and commercial ships.

66. The required mitigation measures would apply to all vessels and are not dependent on the number of vessels in the area at any given time, such that any increase in marine traffic will not be an issue. The final EIS concludes that operation of the Raritan Bay Loop would have no significant impact on offshore commercial and recreational activity and would have no visual impact on the area as the entire facility would be installed below the seafloor at USACE-designated burial depths.[182] We conclude that the effects analyzed and the required mitigation measures identified in the final EIS fully support the conclusion that no significant effects on commercial or recreational boating are expected.

---

[178] Kirkman Frost June 4, 2025 Comment at 5.

[179] Final EIS at 5-24.

[180] *Id.* at 5-18.

[181] *Id.*

[182] *Id.* at 4-246 & 4-253.

3. Alternatives

67. Commenters assert that alternatives exist for the location or design of Compressor Station 206 and that Transco should move the station to a remote location away from residences.[183] The final EIS addresses site alternatives including alternative sites for Compressor Station 206 that are farther from residential areas and modifications to existing facilities to avoid the need for the station. The final EIS concludes that none of the alternatives are feasible or offer a significant environmental advantage, and finds that the proposed project, as modified by Commission staff's recommended mitigation measures is the preferred alternative.[184] We agree with this conclusion.

68. Commenters also suggest that the use of electric motor-driven compressors for Compressor Station 206 would avoid the local operating air emissions associated with the proposed natural gas-fired turbines.[185] The electric motor-driven compression alternative would require the construction of 3.9 miles of new, high voltage power line to the compressor station and an electric substation at the site, increasing impacts on resources and landowners.[186] Therefore, the final EIS concludes that the electric motor-driven compression alternative would result in greater impacts on most resources and affect numerous more homeowners during construction than use of natural gas-powered compressor units as proposed by Transco and does not offer a significant environmental advantage over Transco's proposal.[187] We agree.

4. Higgins Farm Superfund Site Groundwater

69. Several commenters express concern regarding the impacts that construction of the project may have on EPA's groundwater remediation efforts at the Higgins Farm

---

[183] Ram Anbarasan June 5, 2025 Comment.

[184] Final EIS at 5-27. *See Seven Cnty. Infrastructure Coal. v. Eagle Cnty., Colo.*, 145 S. Ct. at 1513.

[185] Robert Farrauto June 20, 2025 Comment; Robert A Heyer June 23, 2025 Intervention.

[186] Final EIS at 3-39.

[187] Final EIS at 3-43. *See, e.g.*, *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC*, 184 FERC ¶ 61,066, at P 73 (2023), *order on reh'g and clarification*, 186 FERC ¶ 61,063, at P 22 (2024) (finding that an electric motor-driven compression alternative would not offer significant environmental advantages over the proposed use of natural gas-powered compressor units).

Superfund site.[188] Higgins Farm is adjacent to the Compressor Station 206 site and, as described in the final EIS, EPA continues to remediate and monitor contaminated groundwater emanating from the site.[189] The EPA expects contaminant concentrations to continue to decline, but states that continued evaluation is necessary to confirm contaminant concentration reduction and the downgradient extent of contamination.[190]

70. Perchloroethylene is one of the primary contaminants of concern at the Higgins Farm Superfund site. Data indicate that the perchloroethylene plume within the groundwater column is about 850 feet from the proposed compressor building, and that the affected groundwater unit occurs about 30 feet below the proposed facility.[191] As discussed in the Certificate Order and final EIS, EPA concluded that construction and operation of Compressor Station 206 is unlikely to affect EPA's ongoing cleanup operations at the site.[192] We agree with this conclusion.

5. Outstanding Water Quality Certifications

71. Commenters express concern over the outstanding state permits and note that unresolved issues remain from the original Certificate Order conditions regarding Transco's applications for water quality certifications pursuant to section 401 of the CWA.[193] Commenters contend that it is disingenuous for Transco to pursue water quality certifications from New York State DEC and New Jersey DEP after not acting to rectify deficiencies in their prior applications and failing to meet the Commission's deadline for constructing and placing the project into service.[194]

---

[188] Karen Parise June 20, 2025 Comment; Drew Cuthbert June 23, 2025 Comment at 3.

[189] Final EIS at 4-30.

[190] EPA, *Fifth Five-Year Review Report for Higgins Farm Superfund Site, Franklin Township, Somerset County, New Jersey* (May 23, 2023) https://semspub.epa.gov/work/02/642122.pdf, at 10.

[191] *Id.* at ES-9.

[192] Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 at P 40; final EIS at 4-32.

[193] Barbara Cuthbert June 11, 2025 Comment at 3; Elizabeth A Roedell June 16, 2025 Comment.

[194] Barbara Cuthbert June 11, 2025 Comment at 3.

72. Transco provided a table updating the status of federal, state, and local agency permits and approvals for the project,[195] and filed requests for water quality certifications for the project with both New York State DEC and the New Jersey DEP on May 30, 2025.[196] New York State DEC filed a comment stating that it received a request for a water quality certification, and confirming a reasonable period of time of six months to act on Transco's request.[197] Environmental Condition 10 requires Transco to file documentation that all applicable authorizations required under federal law (or evidence of waiver thereof), which includes CWA section 401 water quality certifications, have been received prior to the start of construction. Additionally, we are including a new Environmental Condition 4 that requires Transco to file the complete water quality certifications within five days of receipt, and requires Transco to file for written approval any revisions to its project design necessary to comply with the certifications' conditions prior to construction. Accordingly, Transco's actions to date are consistent with regulatory requirements.

6. Flooding

73. Commenters claim that the project would result in increased flooding and would affect sensitive environmental resources that act as flood mitigation.[198] The Watershed Institute states that New Jersey DEP has revised its Stormwater Management Rules and New Jersey has amended the Flood Hazard Area Control Act since issuance of the Certificate Order.[199] On May 30, 2025, Transco submitted an updated application to New Jersey DEP's Land Use Regulation Program for its Flood Hazard Area Individual Permit.[200] Transco states that it will submit updated plans and reports to reflect the state's new amendments to its state's stormwater management rules.[201] Therefore, we

[195] Transco June 11, 2025 Response to Information Request at 1.

[196] Transco June 6, 2025 Supplemental Filing.

[197] New York State Department of Environmental Conservation June 23, 2025 Comment at 1.

[198] Sameer Raibagi June 16, 2025 Comment; Angela P McGlynn June 16, 2025 Comment; Jennifer B Lindsay June 16, 2025 Intervention; Manasvini Nor June 23, 2025 Intervention.

[199] The Watershed Institute, June 24, 2025 Intervention.

[200] Transco June 11, 2025, Supplemental Response to FERC's June 6, 2025, Environmental Information Request at 5.

[201] Transco June 6, 2025 Supplemental Filing at 8.

conclude that stormwater management and flooding concerns would be appropriately addressed during the state permitting process.

7. Wildlife and Vegetation Impacts

74. Commenters state that the project could result in effects on wildlife and vegetation, including habitat degradation and fragmentation.[202] The final EIS discusses the project effects on vegetation and wildlife[203] and concludes that implementation of the measures outlined in Transco's Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan, Agricultural Construction and Monitoring Plan, and Noxious Weed and Invasive Plant Management Plan, would adequately minimize impacts on upland vegetation resources.[204] The final EIS also finds that forest fragmentation associated with the onshore pipeline loops would be minor as about 97% of the Quarryville Loop and 100% of the Madison Loop would be collocated with Transco's existing, cleared and permanently maintained right-of-way, and because only 2.6 acres of upland forest would be permanently affected along the 13.4 miles of pipeline looping.[205] Further, the final EIS concludes that constructing and operating the project would not significantly affect common wildlife species at population levels.[206] We agree with these conclusions.

8. Population and Traffic

75. Commenters assert that there is increased population density in the project area and that the project could result in impacts on local traffic.[207] The final EIS discusses the project effects on local traffic and states that Transco would utilize shuttle buses if necessary and encourage workers to carpool to limit traffic impacts to the local communities.[208] Additionally, Transco has committed to provide a Traffic and

[202] Jwalah Vankataramanan June 20, 2025 Intervention; South Brunswick Township June 24, 2025 Intervention at 3.

[203] Final EIS at 4-68 & 4-75.

[204] *Id.* at 5-8.

[205] Final EIS at 5-9.

[206] *Id.* at 5-10.

[207] *See, e.g.*, Kirkman Frost June 4, 2025 Comment at 5.

[208] Final EIS at 4-268.

Transportation Management Plan prior to construction.[209] Further, there is no evidence that the increased population density and traffic will be an issue. The final EIS concludes that Transco's proposed mitigation measures adequately reduce the effects of the project on roadways and traffic in the project area.[210] We agree with this conclusion.

9. Property Values

76. Commenters express concern about the effects the project, specifically Compressor Station 206, could potentially have on their residential property values.[211] The final EIS determines that there was no conclusive evidence indicating that compressor stations have a significant negative impact on property values.[212] Accordingly, we conclude here, as we have in other cases, that the proposed project is not likely to significantly impact property values in the project area.[213]

10. Air Quality

77. Commenters assert that compressor stations emit air pollutants through routine operations and blowdowns that may cause or worsen respiratory, cardiovascular, and neurological issues, cancer, and birth defects in surrounding populations.[214] Multiple commenters request that a health impact assessment be conducted with input from the U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT) Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA).[215]

---

[209] *Id.* at 4-271.

[210] *Id.* at 4-271.

[211] *See, e.g.*, Archana Dhulla June 16, 2025 Intervention; Chimnay Dipanker June17, 2025 Intervention; and Lawrence M Greenberg June 20, 2025 Comment.

[212] Final EIS at 4-274.

[213] *See Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC*, 158 FERC ¶ 61,125, at P 106 (2017); *see also Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC*, 161 FERC ¶ 61,043, at P 228 (2017).

[214] *See, e.g.*, Soundharrajan Muralidharan June 20, 2025, Intervention; Krishma Nori June 23, 2025, Comment; Hairpriya Bhamidpaty June 23, 2025 Comment.

[215] Environmental Commission of Milltown New Jersey, June 24, 2025 Intervention; Lawrence Brook Watershed Partnership June 24, 2025 Intervention; Kalyan Akula June 25, 2025 Comment.

78. Several commenters state that Compressor Station 206 would not meet current air standards, with some commenters specifying that hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions exceed reporting thresholds.[216] Sierra Club and Mr. Frost note that New Jersey has issued tighter controls for its Title V stationary air permits with reduced emission reporting thresholds for HAPs which should be addressed in a new NEPA analysis.[217] Mr. Frost also explains that without more recent background air quality measurements, it is not possible to assess air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions from the project and the Commission cannot rely on its prior analysis as if nothing has changed since 2017.[218] Ms. Paula Zevin states that existing air quality in the area, models and calculations for emission estimates, and environmental conditions (e.g., wind speeds) have changed since the original application.[219] Mr. Robert Farrauto questions how the Commission will ensure that air pollutant emissions from Compressor Station 206 comply with local emission standards, what technologies will be used to control emissions and their design, how often measurements will be taken by experts, and what actions will occur if standards are not met.[220]

79. The final EIS explains that ambient air quality is protected by federal and state regulations. Under the Clean Air Act (CAA), the EPA established the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) to protect human health and public welfare.[221] These

[216] *See, e.g.*, Silpa Venkata, June 23, 2025 Intervention, Tamar Brill, June 23, 2025 Comment, Sowmya Vangara, June 24, 2025 Intervention.

[217] Kirkman Frost June 4, 2025 Comment at 2; Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 5.

[218] Kirkman Frost June 4, 2025 Comment at 2; *see also* Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 5 (stating that ambient concentrations of particulate matter and sulfur dioxide in New Jersey have increased).

[219] Paula Zevin, June 20, 2025 Comment.

[220] Robert Farrauto, June 20, 2025 Comment.

[221] Final EIS at 4-295. NAAQS are limits on the atmospheric concentration of six pollutants, called criteria pollutants, that are harmful to public health and the environment. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 7409. The six criteria pollutants are: carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter (PM), and sulfur dioxide. *See also* 42 U.S.C. § 7475(a)(3) (generally prohibiting construction of a major emitting facility unless the facility operator demonstrates that emissions from construction or operation of such facility will not cause, or contribute to, air pollution in excess of any: (a) maximum allowable increase or maximum allowable concentration for any pollutant in any area to which Part C of 42 U.S. Code Chapter 85 Subchapter I (Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality) applies more than one time per year, (b) NAAQS in any air

standards incorporate short-term (hourly or daily) levels and long-term (annual) levels to address acute and chronic exposures to pollutants. The NAAQS include primary standards that are designed to protect human health, including the health of sensitive individuals such as children, the elderly, and those with chronic respiratory problems. The EPA has established NAAQS for ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur dioxide, inhalable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) and less than or equal to 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$), and airborne lead. The final EIS explains that although there is no national ambient air quality standard for HAPs, those emissions are limited through air permit thresholds and technology standards.[222] Here, the final EIS determined that Compressor Station 206 had the potential to emit 0.71 tons per year of total combined HAPs, well below HAP major source thresholds of 25 tons or more per year of any combination of HAPs or 10 tons or more per year of a single HAP.[223] The Commission's use of these thresholds for assessing significance of HAPs is consistent with Commission precedent.[224]

80. The final EIS provides an emissions analysis for Compressor 206, including normal operating conditions and blowdown events. The emissions analysis for NAAQS pollutants, greenhouse gases, and HAPs determined that Compressor Station 206 would be a minor source of air emissions under the CAA Title V Operating Permit program, and state operating permit requirements would apply.[225] The New Jersey DEP is the air permitting entity for industrial facilities in New Jersey with authority to issue major and minor source permits and establish and enforce permitting standards, conditions, and compliance. The final EIS states that New Jersey DEP previously issued Transco a permit to construct and operate Compressor Station 206 on September 7, 2017; [226] however, this permit has lapsed. Transco submitted a new Preconstruction Permit to Construct and Operate application to New Jersey DEP on May 30, 2025.[227] Based on Transco's new air permit application, emission estimates for all NAAQS pollutants and

---

quality control region, or (c) any other applicable emission standard or standard of performance under the chapter).

[222] *Id.* at 4-296.

[223] *Id.* at 4-310.

[224] *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC*, 187 FERC ¶ 61,024, P 63 (2024).

[225] Final EIS at 4-299.

[226] *Id.*

[227] Transco Supplemental to Response to FERC Information Request filed June 11, 2025.

total HAPs are now estimated to be less than those presented in the final EIS and still well below the HAPs thresholds.[228]

81. The final EIS also includes the results of an air emission modeling analysis for Compressor Station 206, conducted consistent with EPA guidelines. The modeling analysis used the EPA approved AERMOD dispersion model in screening mode [229] to estimate concentrations from emissions of the compressor station and add those results to background monitored concentrations for comparison to the NAAQS. The conservative results of the modeling analysis demonstrated that Compressor Station 206 would not violate the NAAQS.[230]

82. On March 6, 2024, EPA revised the NAAQS for $PM_{2.5}$, lowering the primary annual standard from 12.0 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$) to 9.0 $\mu g/m^3$. The revised NAAQS became effective May 6, 2024.[231] As described in the final EIS, Transco's modeling estimated the total predicted concentration (background plus compressor station contribution) for the annual $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS to be 10 $\mu g/m^3$.[232] Because the NAAQS has changed and, as noted above, the project's estimated emissions have changed, we reassess the modeling results for $PM_{2.5}$ using updated information as detailed below.

83. The original modeling analysis used a background annual $PM_{2.5}$ concentration of 8.0 ug/m^3 from an EPA-approved monitor located approximately 10.5 miles northeast of the compressor station in New Brunswick, New Jersey, based on the annual average of concentrations from 2013 through 2015. That monitor became inactive after 2015. A new monitor located about 0.8 south-southwest from the prior monitor and approximately 9.9 miles northeast of the compressor station has been in operation since 2015 and appears to be a replacement for the inactive monitor.[233] The 3-year average of

---

[228] *See* Transco May 30, 2025 Preconstruction Permit Application for Compressor Station 206 (Accession No. 20250828-4001) (Air Permit Application). Total HAP emissions in the air permit application are estimated to be 0.69 tons per year. *Id.* at 10.

[229] Final EIS at 4-312. Screening mode produces worst-case concentrations using conservative meteorological data.

[230] Final EIS at 4-312.

[231] 89 Fed. Reg. 16202 (Mar. 6, 2024).

[232] Final EIS at tbl. 4.10.1-7.

[233] Monitor ID 34-023-0011 in East Brunswick, New Jersey was identified using EPA's AirData Map App on its website.

monitoring data from this new monitor from 2022 through 2024 provides a background $PM_{2.5}$ annual concentration of 6.3 $\mu g/m^3$.[234] Based on this information, background concentrations of annual $PM_{2.5}$ have lessened over the past 10 years.

84. As discussed above, Transco's new air permit application indicates that emissions for all NAAQS pollutants are now estimated to be less than those presented in the final EIS. Specifically, for $PM_{2.5}$ the new air permit application estimates $PM_{2.5}$ emissions to be 9.75 tons per year[235], almost half of the 18.94 tons per year of $PM_{2.5}$ emissions originally estimated in the final EIS. Although unmodeled, with these emission reductions, the ultimate worst-case compressor station $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations can reasonably be expected to be reduced from the 2.1 $\mu g/m^3$ identified in the final EIS.

85. An overly conservative analysis using the original compressor station annual $PM_{2.5}$ modeling results of 2.1 $\mu g/m^3$, which was a worst-case concentration and does not account for the additional reductions in emissions in the new air permit application, added to the new background annual $PM_{2.5}$ concentration of 6.3 $\mu g/m^3$ results in a conservative total concentration of 8.4 $\mu g/m^3$. This combined concentration is below the current NAAQS for annual $PM_{2.5}$ of 9.0 $\mu g/m^3$, and thus we conclude would not have a significant air quality impact from annual $PM_{2.5}$.[236]

---

[234] Background monitoring values are from EPA's pre-generated data files of annual summary data for concentrations by monitor for each year. *See* EPA, *Air Data, Pre-Generated Data Files* (Aug. 12, 2025), https://aqs.epa.gov/aqsweb/airdata/download_files.html. The 2023 $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations were notably affected by the 2023 Canadian Wildfires resulting in "exceptional events" where naturally occurring events affect air quality, but are not reasonably controllable. EPA has an Exceptional Events Rule that allows for the exclusion or discounting of air quality monitoring data that was affected by an exceptional event. Therefore, the 2023 concentration selected from EPA's pre-generated data files was the "exceptional events excluded" concentration.

[235] Air Permit Application at 10. The application presents emission estimates for PM_{10}. As with the 2019 final EIS, the Commission has conservatively assumed all PM_{10} emissions to be $PM_{2.5}$ emissions.

[236] *See Tex. LNG Brownsville, LLC*, 192 FERC ¶ 61,170, at PP 33-35 (2025) (explaining the Commission's air impacts analysis, which generally follows an up to three step analysis that concludes with a no significant impact finding if the project's modelled emissions combined with the ambient background emissions of that particular pollutant and averaging period (i.e. 1-hour, 24-hour, annual) is below EPA's NAAQS).

86. The final EIS concludes that operation of the project would not have a significant impact on air quality.[237] Based on the analysis in the final EIS and additional analysis provided above, we continue to agree with this conclusion.

87. Regarding requests for a health impact assessment, the final EIS identifies that the compressor station would result in low amounts of emissions of air pollutants, including less than 1 ton per year of all HAPs combined.[238] The final EIS also demonstrates that the compressor station would not violate any NAAQS, which are established to protect human health.[239] The final EIS explains that for these reasons, and in consideration of Transco's commitment to employ air pollution control measures, that a health impact assessment of Compressor Station 206 is not warranted.[240] We agree with this determination.

88. Last, commenters express concerns about odors and fumes that could occur as a result of emissions and blowdowns at the compressor station.[241] As discussed in the final EIS, Transco would utilize deodorization facilities for planned blowdowns[242] and therefore the compressor station would not result in significant odors during operation, although minor odors could temporarily occur during replacement and maintenance activities. We agree with this conclusion.

11. General Conformity

89. In addition to the final EIS to satisfy NEPA, the Commission is required to perform a General Conformity Determination (GCD) review under the CAA for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project because portions of the project are located in

[237] Final EIS at 4-315.

[238] *Id.* at 4-310. EPA has concluded that the NAAQS are appropriate and designed to ensure public safety by setting acceptable concentration limits that minimize health risks and to protect sensitive populations, such as at-risk populations of people with asthma, older adults, and children. EPA, *Review of the Primary Nat'l Ambient Air Quality Standards for Oxides of Nitrogen*, 83 Fed. Reg. 17226, 17230-17274 (Apr. 18, 2018) (codified at 40 C.F.R. §§ 50 *et seq.* (2024)).

[239] *Id.* at 4-312.

[240] *Id.* at 4-313.

[241] Gabriel G Spiler June 16, 2025 Intervention; Ellen M Wijesinghe June 17, 2025 Intervention; Brigitte Wopenka June 13, 2025 intervention

[242] Final EIS at 4-311.

nonattainment and/or maintenance areas and construction emissions are anticipated to exceed applicability thresholds, requiring a more rigorous review and mitigation.[243] The General Conformity Rule ensures that emissions from a federal action do not cause or contribute to new violations of any NAAQS, increase the frequency or severity of any existing NAAQS violations, or delay timely attainment of any NAAQS. The Commission previously issued a Final GCD on January 25, 2019, concurrent with the final EIS. However, the 2019 Final GCD expired on January 25, 2024, pursuant to the General Conformity regulations.[244] Transco provided updated construction emissions[245] for the project with its petition, as supplemented in a June 12, 2025 Response to Commission staff's information request. The updated emission estimates reflect the latest EPA approved methodology for estimated emissions and were updated to reflect recent wind speeds in the project area. Project construction emissions for the Madison Loop, Compressor Station 206, and Raritan Bay Loop are still expected to exceed the General Conformity applicability threshold in the NJ-NY-CT Interstate Air Quality Control Region, requiring the Commission to reevaluate General Conformity for the project. The Commission issued a Draft GCD Reevaluation on June 24, 2025, opening a 30-day public comment period. The Draft GCD Reevaluation was based on the updated construction emission estimates, the most current designations and classifications of nonattainment or maintenance, and Transco's proposed method to demonstrate conformity. Per the regulations, Commission staff provided the Draft GCD Reevaluation to EPA Region 2, New Jersey DEP, New York State DEC, and federally recognized Tribes within the affected nonattainment and/or maintenance areas.[246]

90. In its petition, Transco revised its method of conformance from the combination of purchasing offset credits and sponsoring direct mitigation projects as set forth in the 2019 Final GCD, to solely purchasing offset credits. In response, Ms. Paula Zevin contends that Transco's change to only purchasing emission offset credits means that the

[243] Final EIS at 4-303 to 4-307, final EIS at app. I. 40 C.F.R. 93 Subpart B (2024).

[244] A conformity determination automatically lapses five years from the date of final conformity determination, unless the federal action has been subject to a continuous program to implement the action. 40 C.F.R. § 93.157(b) (2024).

[245] As explained in the Final GCD Reevaluation, operational air emissions from sources that are subject to a state or federal New Source Review air permitting program (major or minor) are exempt from the General Conformity Rule, which is the case, here, with respect to Compressor Station 206. Final GCD Reevaluation at 5 (noting that Compressor Station 206 is subject to minor source air permitting with New Jersey DEP, and thus exempt).

[246] 40 C.F.R. 93.155(a) (2024).

negative health effects from air emissions would be borne by the residents close to the construction/operation areas.[247] Ms. Zevin further claims that those emissions would now be higher locally than if mitigation projects were still part of the plan and would expose the public and the environment to greater and longer negative impacts from those emissions. This claim reflects a misunderstanding of the nature of sponsoring direct mitigation projects; to clarify, both sponsoring mitigation projects and purchasing emission credits are forms of offsetting the emissions of the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project.[248] "Sponsoring mitigation projects" would entail Transco funding other entities to directly mitigate non-project emission sources in the same nonattainment area, which would generate an offset amount for Transco to apply to the project. Likewise, emission offset credits represent actual reductions in emissions of non-project facilities or emission sources in the same nonattainment area as the project that have already occurred and are certified by a state for use as offsets in general conformity and air permitting programs. In either case, the reductions occur within the nonattainment area.

91. New Jersey DEP submitted comments in response to the Draft GCD Reevaluation. It identified that the marine vessel emission factors used in the Draft GCD Reevaluation were taken from the 2009 EPA Current Methodologies in Preparing Mobile Source Port-Related Emission Inventories document and should have instead used EPA's most recent, April 2022 methodology.[249] In response, on July 31, 2025, as supplemented on August 5, 2025, Transco provided a revised Air Quality Technical Report that updated its construction emission estimates to use the EPA's April 2022 methodology for estimating emissions from marine vessels.[250]

92. The Commission issued a Final GCD Reevaluation on August 12, 2025. The Final GCD Reevaluation reflects the revised emission estimates per New Jersey DEP's comments. In the Final GCD Reevaluation, the Commission continues to find that the project can achieve conformity with the New Jersey and New York State Implementation Plans through Transco's acquisition of emission credits to offset its project construction emissions. The Final GCD Reevaluation explains that there are several outstanding permitting decisions to be made by the USACE and New York State DEC which may

[247] Paula Zevin June 16, 2025 Comment at 1 and 2.

[248] Draft GCD Reevaluation at 18, Final GCD Reevaluation at 18.

[249] New Jersey DEP July 22, 2025 Draft GCD Reevaluation Comment at 2 (citing EPA, Port Emissions Inventory Guidance: Methodologies for Estimating Port-Related and Goods Movement Mobile Source Emissions (April 2022), https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockey=P1014J1S.pdf).

[250] Transco July 31, 2025 Air Quality Technical Report.

affect the total amount of emissions that could occur for construction of the Raritan Bay Loop. The determination considers four potential scenarios, including a worst-case emission scenario. Under the worst-case scenario, Transco will need to acquire 393.7 tons of NOx offsets, and the determination explains that there are sufficient offsets available.

93. Per the regulations, Commission staff provided the Draft GCD Reevaluation to EPA Region 2, New Jersey DEP, New York State DEC, and federally recognized Tribes within the affected nonattainment and/or maintenance areas.

94. Environmental Conditions 23 through 26 of the Certificate Order, incorporated by reference by Ordering Paragraph (B), include requirements for Transco to satisfy responsibilities under the 2019 Final GCD. With the updated emissions estimates, revised method of conformance, and new Final GCD Reevaluation, those environmental conditions are no longer applicable and are replaced with new Environmental Conditions 1, 2, and 3, appended to this order. The new environmental conditions are similar to the prior conditions, requiring Transco to finalize the emission scenario that is permitted by the USACE and New York State DEC, develop a Construction Emissions Tracking Plan that includes vibratory/diesel pile driving hammers and EPA engine tier ratings for marine vessels and construction equipment, and provide the tracking data on a monthly basis to EPA and the applicable state agencies. The new environmental conditions also continue to require Transco to file documentation confirming the purchase of emission credits with certification from the applicable state(s).

12. Noise

95. Commenters express concern regarding noise from operation of Compressor Station 206, some noting its close proximity to residential areas and a Buddhist temple that attracts visitors for meditation.[251] South Brunswick Township states that the Commission's noise standard, 55 decibels on the A-weighted scale (dBA), exceeds the limit of a maximum 50 dBA set by New Jersey State and local municipal code for nighttime noise at residential properties, and that even 55 dBA can be disturbing when continuous.[252]

96. Compressor Station 206 would occupy about 16.1 acres within a 52.1-acre parcel that Transco has acquired to provide a buffer from surrounding land uses. The compressor building (which would house the compressor units and be the primary source

[251] *See, e.g.*, Bart N Dandrea June 13, 2025, Intervention; Mona Desai June 16, 2025 Intervention; Joseph Colabraro June 16, 2025 Comment; Ellen M Wijesinghe June 17, 2025 Intervention.

[252] South Brunswick Township June 24, 2025 Intervention at 3-4.

of noise emissions) would be about 0.5 mile away in all directions from the nearest noise sensitive areas (NSA).[253] Specifically, the compressor building would be 2,500 feet from the nearest residence, 2,530 feet from the nearest place of worship (the New Jersey Buddhist Vihara Meditation Center (Meditation Center)), 6,300 feet from the nearest school or daycare center. Ambient noise measurements were added to modeled compressor station noise contributions to estimate the noise that would result from normal operation of the compressor station. Based on modeling, the estimated noise contribution from Compressor Station 206 would be below a day-night sound level (L_{dn}) of 40 dBA and result in a combined ambient plus compressor station noise contribution of 48.6 dBA or less.[254] The compressor station would result in an increase in noise of less than 1 dBA (well below the 3 dBA threshold of perception for the human ear) at the nearest NSAs, including the Meditation Center.

97. The estimated operational noise from Compressor Station 206 would comply with our operating noise limitation requirement at NSAs of 55 dBA L_{dn}.[255] Nonetheless, to verify predicted operating noise levels, Environmental Condition 29 of the Certificate Order, incorporated by reference in Ordering Paragraph (B), requires that Transco file a noise survey after placing Compressor Station 206 in service. Moreover, Environmental Condition 29 mandates that if the noise attributable to the operation of all of the equipment at the station under interim or full horsepower load exceeds 55 dBA L_{dn} at any nearby NSA, Transco will be required to install additional noise controls to meet the level.

98. The Commission uses a day-night weighted sound level criterion that penalizes nighttime noise levels by adding 10 dBA to noise exposures at night to account for people's greater sensitivity to sound during nighttime hours. The Commission developed its criterion based on an EPA study that indicates that an L_{dn} of 55 dBA protects the public from indoor and outdoor activity interference.[256] The Commission's 55 dBA L_{dn} criterion is equivalent to a constant noise of 48.6 dBA, which is below the New Jersey and local municipal code that limits outdoor noise during nighttime hours to 50 dBA.

99. Noise will also occur during occasional venting (blowdown) of natural gas for annual emergency shut-down system testing and during maintenance activities. Venting

[253] Final EIS at 4-323.

[254] Ambient noise was measured at the Samadhi Buddha statue and was combined with the estimated station operating noise. Final EIS at 4-323 to 4-324.

[255] Final EIS at 4-325.

[256] *Id.* at 4-316.

could also occur in the unlikely event of an emergency at the compressor station.[257] Transco will install unit blowdown silencers that would result in estimated blowdown noise levels of 45 dBA at the Meditation Center, although the blowdown associated with required annual testing may not be silenced.[258] Although certain blowdown events may be audible in proximity to the compressor station, the noise would be periodic and short-term, and will diminish with distance from the station, and in nearly all cases, area landowners will have advance notice of the event.[259]

100. Based on the above information, the final EIS concludes that operation of Compressor Station 206 will not result in significant noise impacts at nearby NSAs.[260] We agree with this conclusion.

101. Commenters also reiterate concerns expressed during the original review of the project about the potential for Compressor Station 206 to emit low frequency noise that will affect sleep and human health.[261] The final EIS explains that we are aware that induced vibration, or a low frequency sound from pipelines, has occurred at a limited number of natural gas facilities in the over 300,000 miles of transmission pipeline in the United States. However, we have observed no wide-scale evidence of low frequency noise from natural gas transmission pipelines inducing noise effects on local residences. Commission staff address these issues through our landowner helpline as they arise. With no proposed changes to the project compression equipment, we continue to find this concern has been adequately addressed in the final EIS.

13. Public Safety

102. Some commenters raise concerns regarding the potential for blasting-induced vibrations from the Trap Rock Quarry damaging Compressor Station 206 as well as whether local fire departments would have sufficient resources to protect the public in the event of a fire at the compressor station.[262] Mr. Drew Cuthbert claims that blasting

[257] *Id.* at ES-7.

[258] *Id.* at 4-325.

[259] *Id.* at ES-7.

[260] *Id.* at ES-7.

[261] *See, e.g.*, Soundharrajan Muralidharan June 20, 2025, Intervention; Krishma Nori June 23, 2025, Comment; Hairpriya Bhamidpaty June 23, 2025 Comment.

[262] *See, e.g.*, Robert Wonsor June 16, 2025, Intervention, Carol A. Winshbow June 16, 2025, Intervention, Amit R Bhave June 20, 2025 Comment.

activities at Trap Rock Quarry will now occur closer to Compressor Station 206 compared to the location analyzed in the final EIS.[263]

103. The final EIS states that the nearest face of the quarry to the proposed compressor building is 2,100 feet away and, based on the Franklin Township zoning map, the quarry is not expected to expand toward the compressor station site.[264] Commission staff reviewed recent aerial imagery mapping of the Trap Rock Quarry and did not identify conditions that would alter the conclusion in the final EIS.[265] The final EIS also explains that Transco conducted vibration monitoring during scheduled blasting events at the quarry to support an analysis and foundation design for the compressor station.[266] Transco committed to incorporate safety factors in the final foundation designs, including a vibration monitoring system featuring 16 vibration monitors that would shut the unit down in the event of excessive vibration, to prevent displacement if future blast intensity increases.[267] Environmental Condition 30 requires that Transco file its final foundation designs prior to construction. The final EIS concludes that Compressor Station 206 would be adequately protected from blasting at Trap Rock Quarry, and that such blasting does not pose a safety concern to Transco's existing pipeline system. We agree with this conclusion.

104. Commenters express concerns about fires and explosions resulting from potential gas leaks at Compressor Station 206.[268] The final EIS addresses reliability and safety of the project, including compressor station incidents. The number of significant incidents distributed over the more than 300,000 miles of natural gas transmission pipelines and infrastructure indicates the risk of an incident is low.[269] To deal with a potential fire, Compressor Station 206 will include safety features including an automated system to quickly isolate gas piping, stop equipment, and safely vent station gas.[270] Transco states that its automated emergency shutdown system would provide the most effective way to

[263] Drew Cuthbert June 23, 2025 Comment at 2.

[264] Final EIS at ES-4.

[265] Google Earth April 1, 2025 Airbus Imagery.

[266] Final EIS at ES4-338.

[267] *Id.* at ES-4 – ES-5; 4-338.

[268] Jwalah Venkataramanan June 20, 2025 Intervention.

[269] Final EIS at 4-336.

[270] *Id.* at 4-337.

address an emergency. Transco will also plan for emergency response with local fire, police, and public officials in accordance with DOT requirements.[271] PHMSA is responsible for ensuring the safe operation of interstate natural gas pipeline facilities through its regulations under Part 192 of the Code of Federal Regulations.[272] Also, Transco has stated that it would design, install, inspect, test, construct, operate, replace, and maintain the project facilities in accordance with modern engineering practices that meet or exceed the DOT's Minimum Federal Safety Standards.[273] The final EIS concludes that Transco's compliance with applicable design, construction and maintenance standards and DOT safety regulations would be protective of public safety. [274] We agree with this conclusion.

14. Cumulative Impacts

105. Commenters state that the project may result in potential cumulative effects on public health, wildlife habitat, vegetation, and wetlands.[275] The final EIS identified seven types of present and reasonably foreseeable actions that could cause a cumulative impact when considered with the project, including non-jurisdictional facilities associated with the project, energy projects (including Commission-jurisdictional projects), transportation projects, residential projects, commercial and industrial projects, beach and shoreline management projects, and dredging projects.[276] In reviewing the current petition, Commission staff conducted a search of new projects that might occur within the cumulative geographic scope for the project and identified only projects similar to those addressed and analyzed in the final EIS.[277] Specifically, staff searched for other projects

[271] *Id.* at 5-24.

[272] 49 C.F.R. pt. 192 (2024).

[273] Final EIS at 4-326.

[274] *Id.* at 5-24.

[275] The Watershed Institute, June 24, 2025 Intervention at 2, Hayagreev Shankar June 24, 2025 Intervention, and Nareshkumar N Nandola June 24, 2025 Intervention.

[276] Final EIS at 4-341 to 4-343; detailed descriptions of the project types are described in the final EIS at 4-355 to 4-358.

[277] Sources Commission staff searched include: USACE Regulatory Public Notice Archive, New York District, https://www.nan.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Regulatory-Public-Notices/Year/2025/?Page=4; Baltimore District https://www.nab.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Public-Notices; EPA Superfund Search https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-sites-where-you-live;

in the area on a county level. Staff identified multiple road improvement projects, dredging projects, energy projects, and residential projects in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, Middlesex and Monmouth New Jersey, and Queens and Richmond New York. These projects were of a similar magnitude and would have similar effects as those addressed in the final EIS. No new potential environmental cumulative effects were identified. Accordingly, the potential impacts associated with projects which might occur within the geographic scope for the project are consistent with the analysis in the final EIS and do not lead us to alter our prior conclusions. Moreover, other projects in the area would have to comply with state and federal laws such as the CWA, CAA, the Endangered Species Act, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Therefore, we conclude that any cumulative impacts from other projects that may have occurred or been planned since the final EIS would be taken into consideration during the appropriate permitting processes.

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Projects in District 8, https://www.pa.gov/agencies/penndot/projects-near-you/district-8-projects%23f-copapwpcounty=Lancaster%20County; Lancaster Counting Planning Website Upcoming Projects and the Transportation Improvement Program, https://lancastercountyplanning.org/311/Upcoming-Projects-The-TIP; Lancaster County, Pennsylvania Current Construction Projects, https://co.lancaster.pa.us/1528/Current-Construction-Projects; Lancaster City Current Construction Projects, https://lancaster-pa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=15153f6e98bb4c38906c65e3a2fb21fe; New Jersey Department of Transportation, Route 18 East Brunswick Drainage and Pavement Rehabilitation, https://dot.nj.gov/transportation; Middlesex County, New Jersey, Current Intersection Design/Construction Projects, https://www.middlesexcountynj.gov/government/departments/department-of-transportation/office-of-engineering/transportation-traffic; Monmouth County Division of Engineering, Bridge and Road Projects Engineering Bridge & Road Projects; Middlesex County, New Jersey Community, Innovation, and Opportunity Strategic Investment Plan, https://www.middlesexcountynj.gov/discover-our-community/cio-strategic-investment-plan; Monmouth County Park System, Park Improvement Projects, https://www.monmouthcountyparks.com/page.aspx?ID=4690; New York State Department of Transportation, Projects in Your Neighborhood, https://www.dot.ny.gov/projects; New York State Department of Public Service, Article VII Major Electric and Gas Transmission Facilities, https://dps.ny.gov/article-vii-major-electric-and-gas-transmission-facilities; New York State Department of Public Service, Projects Under Review, https://dps.ny.gov/projects-under-review; and New York City Parks, Capital Project Tracker, https://www.nycgovparks.org/planning-and-building/capital-project-tracker.

106. The final EIS concludes that most cumulative impacts would be temporary and minor when considered in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable activities.[278] Based on the final EIS and the information provided above, we agree.

15. Climate Change

107. Commenters argue that the project will exacerbate climate change by furthering the region's dependency on fossil fuels and from direct methane emissions through pipeline leaks.[279] They claim that the project conflicts with New York State's Climate Act (Climate Act), which, as discussed above, sets limits to achieve statewide net zero GHG emissions by 2050.[280] Sierra Club asserts that Transco has submitted a new greenhouse gas emissions analysis to the New York State DEC which may change even further, as Transco states that it may adopt yet-to-be-identified mitigation measures.[281]

108. The Climate Act sets a limit of statewide GHG emissions of 15% of 1990 levels by 2050 and directs the state's Climate Action Council to prepare recommendations to achieve additional reductions beyond the Act's 15% limit towards a net zero emissions goal in all sectors of the state's economy.[282] The final EIS acknowledges that climate change is a global concern and describes the potential effects of climate change in the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project areas.[283] The final EIS finds that the project would improve air quality and offset the use of alternative carbon-intensive liquid fuels through supporting the conversion of building heating systems from fuel oil to natural gas in New York City.[284] As discussed above, New York's clean energy laws are complex

[278] Final EIS at 4-389.

[279] *See, e.g.,* New Jersey League of Conservation Voters June 20, 2025 Comment; June Hampson June 24, 2025 Comment; Christina Francis July 14, 2025 Intervention; Jessie B Lindsay June 16, 2025 Intervention; Bernadette Maher June 24, 2025 Comment.

[280] *See supra* P 38.

[281] Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 5.

[282] S. Con. Res. S6599, 2019 Leg., 8429 (N.Y. 2019).

[283] Final EIS at 4-387.

[284] *Id.* at 4-389; *see also* Certificate Order, 167 FERC ¶ 61,110 at P 90; Case 24-G-0248, *In the Matter of a Review of the Long-Term Gas System Plans of The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid*, at 34 (The Northeast Supply Enhancement Project "will enable approximately

statutory frameworks, and are not inherently inconsistent with the project just because it is supplying natural gas to the New York City area.[285] Moreover, we note that the Supreme Court subsequently held that NEPA does not require the Commission to consider downstream GHG emissions from the end use of transported gas as those are effects over which the Commission does not exercise regulatory authority.[286]

109. The final EIS includes estimates of GHG emissions from the project's operation, expressed as carbon dioxide equivalent emissions, including fugitive emissions of 7.0 tons per year (tpy) from the pipeline facilities and operating emissions from Compressor Station 206 of 140,935 tpy.[287] The final EIS acknowledges that construction and operation of the project facilities would increase the atmospheric concentration of GHGs and contribute to climate change.[288] Finally, the EIS also states that there is no widely accepted standard to determine the significance of the project's GHG emissions.[289] We agree with this conclusion.[290]

16. STOP Act

110. Commenters assert that the New Jersey Shore Tourism and Ocean Protection Act (STOP Act) of 2018[291] would prohibit construction of the project.[292] The STOP Act

---

13,400 additional customers to convert from high-emission heating oil to cleaner-burning natural gas.").

[285] *See supra* P 39.

[286] *Seven Cnty. Coal v. Eagle Cnty., Colo.*, 145 S. Ct. at 1516-18 (explaining that "NEPA calls for the agency to focus on the environmental effects of the project itself;" and that agencies "are not required to analyze the effects of projects over which they do not exercise regulatory authority."); *see also E. Tenn. Nat. Gas, LLC*, 192 FERC ¶ 61,153, at PP 23, 28 (2025).

[287] Final EIS at 4-310.

[288] *Id.* at 4-389.

[289] *Id.* at 4-389.

[290] To the extent that Transco provides state permitting agencies more refined estimates, those changes would not alter our conclusions.

[291] P.L. 2018, c.07 (A839 2R) (N.J. 2018).

[292] Linda Powell June 24, 2025 Comment at 1.

prohibits offshore oil and natural gas exploration, development,[293] and production in New Jersey state waters. The project does not include the development or production of natural gas produced in offshore waters; therefore, we conclude that the STOP Act is not applicable to the project.

17. Future Use of the Project Facilities

111. Sierra Club claims that in a filing with the New York State DEC, Transco has indicated that the project would be converted to carry 76% clean hydrogen by 2050.[294] It argues that the risks and potential environmental harms of that proposal, upon which Transco bases its greenhouse gas calculations, have never been assessed.[295] Should Transco seek to abandon natural gas transportation capacity in the future, it would be required to obtain prior Commission authorization.[296] In that proceeding, the Commission would assess issues related to the abandonment.

VI. Conclusion

112. We find that Transco has demonstrated a need for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, that the project will not have adverse impacts on existing customers, or existing pipelines and their existing customers, and that it will have minimal impacts on the interests of landowners and surrounding communities. We continue to agree with the conclusions of Certificate Order that the project, if constructed and operated as described in the final EIS and Certificate Order, as amended, is an environmentally acceptable action. Based on the discussion above, we grant Transco's petition and reissue a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of the NGA, subject to the conditions in this order and the Certificate Order, as amended.

113. Compliance with the environmental conditions appended to our orders is integral to ensuring that the environmental impacts of approved projects are consistent with those anticipated by our environmental analyses. Thus, Commission staff carefully reviews all

---

[293] "As used in this section, "development" means, but is not necessarily limited to, any pipeline or other infrastructure that transports oil or natural gas from production facilities located in federal waters or other coastal state waters in the Atlantic Ocean through New Jersey State waters, and any land-based support facilities for offshore oil or natural gas production facilities located in the Atlantic Ocean." P.L. 2018, c.07 (A839 2R) (N.J. 2018).

[294] Sierra Club Aug. 20, 2025 Answer at 5.

[295] *Id.*

[296] 15 U.S.C. § 717f(b).

information submitted. Only when satisfied that the applicant has complied with all applicable conditions will a notice to proceed with the activity to which the conditions are relevant be issued. We also note that the Commission has the authority to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure the protection of environmental resources during construction and operation of the project, including authority to impose any additional measures deemed necessary to ensure continued compliance with the intent of the conditions of the order, as well as the avoidance or mitigation of unforeseen adverse environmental impacts resulting from project construction and operation.

114. Any state or local permits issued with respect to the jurisdictional facilities authorized herein must be consistent with the conditions of this certificate. The Commission encourages cooperation between interstate pipelines and local authorities. However, this does not mean that state and local agencies, through application of state or local laws, may prohibit or unreasonably delay the construction or operation of facilities approved by this Commission.[297]

115. The Commission on its own motion received and made a part of the record in this proceeding all evidence, including the application, and exhibits thereto, and all comments, and upon consideration of the record,

The Commission orders:

(A) A certificate of public convenience and necessity is issued to Transco, authorizing it to construct and operate the proposed Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, as described and conditioned here, and as more fully described in Transco's March 27, 2017 application, January 31, 2020 application, May 29, 2025 petition, and other filings by the applicant, including any commitments made therein.

(B) The certificate issued in Ordering Paragraph (A) is condition on:

(1) Transco's completion of construction of the proposed facilities and making them available for service within three years of the date of

[297] *See* 15 U.S.C. § 717r(d) (state or federal agency's failure to act on a permit considered to be inconsistent with Federal law); *see also Schneidewind v. ANR Pipeline Co*., 485 U.S. 293, 310 (1988) (state regulation that interferes with FERC's regulatory authority over the transportation of natural gas is preempted) *and Dominion Transmission, Inc. v. Summers*, 723 F.3d 238, 245 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (noting that state and local regulation is preempted by the NGA to the extent it conflicts with federal regulation, or would delay the construction and operation of facilities approved by the Commission).

this order pursuant to section 157.20(b) of the Commission's regulations;

(2) Transco's compliance with all applicable Commission regulations under the NGA including, but not limited to, Parts 154, 157, and 284, and paragraphs (a), (c), (e), and (f) of section 157.20 of the Commission's regulations;

(3) Transco's compliance with the environmental conditions listed in the appendix to the Certificate Order, as amended by the Amendment Order, and the environmental conditions in the appendix to this order; and

(4) Transco's filing a written statement affirming that it has executed firm service agreements for volumes and service terms equivalent to those in its precedent agreements, prior to commencing construction.

(C) The certificate issued in Ordering Paragraph (A) is conditioned on Transco's compliance with Ordering Paragraphs (C) through (F) of the 2019 Certificate Order.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

Debbie-Anne A. Reese,
Secretary.

Appendix – Environmental Conditions

1. **Prior to construction** of the facilities which require emission offsets under the Final General Conformity Determination Reevaluation, Transco shall file with the Secretary of the Commission (Secretary), for review and written approval by the Director of the Office of Energy Projects (OEP), or the Director's designee, a final Construction Emissions Tracking Plan (CETP). The final CETP shall:

    a. request specifically address the final General Conformity emissions scenario based on USACE and New York State DEC authorizations;

    b. include emissions associated with the vibratory/diesel pile driving hammers and any other emission sources that may ultimately be used onsite during construction that are not currently anticipated; and

    c. include the EPA engine tier rating for marine vessels and construction equipment.

2. Transco shall provide the CETP and the emissions tracking data outlined in its CETP directly to contacts at the EPA, New York State DEC, and New Jersey DEP **on a monthly basis during construction**.

3. **Prior to construction** of the facilities which require emission offsets under the Final General Conformity Determination Reevaluation, Transco shall file with the Secretary documentation confirming that Transco has purchased Emission Reduction Credits, Creditable Emissions Reductions, or Continuous Emission Reduction Credits to offset all estimated construction emissions of NOx within the NJ-NY-CT Interstate nonattainment area. The documentation shall confirm that the credits have been certified and approved by the state(s). Transco shall provide New Jersey DEP the documentation of certified purchased offset credits.

4. **Within 5 days of receipt of water quality certifications issued by New York State DEC, New Jersey DEP, and Pennsylvania DEP**, Transco shall file the complete certification, including all conditions. All conditions attached to the water quality certifications constitute mandatory conditions of the Certificate Order. **Prior to construction**, Transco shall file, for review and written approval of the Director of OEP, or the Director's designee, any revisions to its project design necessary to comply with the water quality certifications conditions.

EXHIBIT B

STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE 24-G-0248 - In the Matter of a Review of the Long-Term Gas System Plans of The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid.

ORDER REGARDING LONG-TERM NATURAL GAS PLAN AND REQUIRING FURTHER ACTIONS

Issued and Effective: September 18, 2025

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1
BACKGROUND 4
DESCRIPTION OF LONG-TERM PLAN 7
Upstate Final LTP 10
Downstate Final LTP and Supplement 15
CONSULTANT REPORTS 29
PA Analysis of Upstate 31
PA Analysis of Downstate 37
NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING 44
LEGAL AUTHORITY 45
DISCUSSION 46
Demand Forecast 49
Supply Forecast 52
1. Northeast Supply Enhancement Project 55
2. Greenpoint LNG Facility 83
Low Carbon Fuels 92
1. Renewable Natural Gas 92
2. Hydrogen 95
Peaking Services 97
Demand Response Programs 98
Energy Efficiency 99
Reliability Standards and Hydraulic Modeling 102
No Infrastructure Option and Non-Pipe Alternatives 105
Leak-Prone Pipe 109
Impacts on Low- and Moderate-Income Customers and Disadvantaged Communities 111
Comparison of Alternatives 113
1. Benefit Cost Analysis 113
2. Estimated Bill Impacts and Net Present Value of Costs of Each Alternative 115
3. Emissions Impacts 119
Heat Pump Adoption/Pace of Electrification 124
Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act 126
Motion to Strike and Request for Additional Analysis 129
CONCLUSION 136
SCHEDULE OF PROCEEDING ..... APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ..... APPENDIX B

STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

At a session of the Public Service Commission held in the City of Albany on September 18, 2025

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Rory M. Christian, Chair
James S. Alesi
David J. Valesky
John B. Maggiore, dissenting
Uchenna S. Bright
Denise M. Sheehan
Radina R. Valova

CASE 24-G-0248 - In the Matter of a Review of the Long-Term Gas System Plans of The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid.

ORDER REGARDING LONG-TERM NATURAL GAS PLAN AND REQUIRING FURTHER ACTIONS

(Issued and Effective September 18, 2025)

BY THE COMMISSION:

INTRODUCTION

In our Order Adopting the Gas System Planning Process, we required each gas local distribution company (LDC or utility) to file a long-term plan for its gas system for consideration through a stakeholder process.[1] This Order addresses the long-term plan (LTP) filed in response to that order by Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY (KEDNY), KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid (KEDLI), and Niagara Mohawk

[1] Case 20-G-0131, Proceeding on Motion of the Commission in Regard to Gas Planning Procedures, Order Adopting Gas System Planning Process (issued May 12, 2022) (Planning Order) (Gas Planning Proceeding).

Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid (NMPC) (collectively, National Grid or the Company). The Company engaged with Department of Public Service staff (Staff), a consultant, and stakeholders regarding the LTP through technical conferences and comments on the Company's initial LTP (Initial LTP), revised LTP (Revised LTP), final LTP (Final LTP), and an addendum that includes a supplemental report by National Grid (Supplement) and its appended study by Levitan & Associates, Inc. (LAI Study). The consultant, PA Consulting (PA), assisted Staff in reviewing the Company's three iterations of its LTP. PA provided an Initial Report, a Preliminary Report, and a Final Report regarding the Company's LTP filings and stakeholders' feedback. PA also filed a report concerning the Supplement (Report on the Supplement).

In addition to addressing the requirements of the Planning Order, National Grid's Long-Term Plan includes a chapter discussing the need for and potential decommissioning of the Greenpoint liquified natural gas (LNG) plant (Greenpoint). This reflects the agreement of the parties to the joint proposal the Commission adopted in the most recent rate order for KEDNY and KEDLI.[2] Further, as noted above, National Grid filed the Supplement in July 2025. The Supplement includes a discussion of a renewed proposal by Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (Transco) for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project (NESE or NESE project), which would deliver an additional 400,000 dekatherms (dt) per day of firm transportation capacity to National Grid's Downstate service territory. In the Supplement, National Grid assessed the benefits and costs of NESE and

[2] Cases 23-G-0225 et al., KEDNY and KEDLI – Rates, Order Approving Terms of Joint Proposal and Establishing Gas Rate Plans, with Minor Modification and Corrections (issued August 15, 2024) (2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order), p. 76, Attachment 1 (Joint Proposal), pp. 27-29.

posited that NESE would cost effectively address significant reliability and resilience challenges facing the New York City and Long Island region.

As discussed below, the Commission finds that, although the Company's Final LTP and Supplement have many positive elements, several others could be improved. Accordingly, by this Order, the Commission considers National Grid's Final LTP and Supplement, and directs the Company to take a number of further actions, including providing additional information in the coming months related to the Company's demand forecasting, providing updates on LPP mileage remaining, analyzing and "right-sizing' its supply stack, including the potential to decommission Greenpoint if the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project receives the necessary permits and is constructed, as well as providing customer bill impact updates.

These actions reflect the analysis performed by PA and Staff, as well as the significant stakeholder feedback. The actions directed in this Order constitute important steps in the process of maintaining safe and adequate service while decarbonizing National Grid's systems and toward achieving the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets established in the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act (CLCPA).

With regard to the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, as explained herein, the Commission has no formal role in approving or permitting the construction of NESE. However, in the context of the LTP, this Order considers the benefits and costs of the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project and concludes that the additional firm capacity and other aspects of the Project would materially improve the reliability and resilience of the Downstate gas system. We acknowledge there is a need for the more reliable source of supply that NESE will provide if it receives all required approvals and is constructed. Further,

the cost to the Company's customers associated with the Project, while arguably justified based on the reliability and resilience benefits it provides, would be significantly offset by several economic benefits, including the discontinuance of less reliable and more expensive supply alternatives. Finally, we note that the capacity provided by NESE would create an opportunity to further consider the potential for decommissioning the Greenpoint LNG plant and right-sizing National Grid's supply stack in the coming years.

BACKGROUND

In the Planning Order, the Commission adopted a long-term natural gas planning process to ensure that the State, customers, stakeholders, and other interested entities have the opportunity to understand and engage in the discussion regarding the future of natural gas service and infrastructure in the State. We explained that the intent of the gas system planning process is to "ensure that the Commission has the necessary information to consider the [LDCs] long-term plans and alternative solutions to ensure that New York's residents can continue to have safe, adequate, and reliable gas service as we transition to alternative energy sources to reduce GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions" and the process would be transparent with significant stakeholder participation.[3]

To effectuate this intent, the Planning Order required each of the State's major local delivery companies (LDCs) to file long-term gas system plans over a 20-year horizon, including annual and peak day load and any peak hour considerations, and to examine the impact of their plans on disadvantaged communities. The Commission also directed the

[3] Planning Order, pp. 17-18.

LDCs to include adjustments to demand forecast scenarios that incorporate energy efficiency, electrification, demand response, non-pipes alternatives (NPAs), and other external impacts.[4] The Commission directed Staff to engage a consultant to work at the direction of Staff and to participate in stakeholder meetings, make requests of the LDCs and stakeholders participating in the long-term planning process, help evaluate the economic and environmental tradeoffs associated with different pathways, and work with the LDC to run a reasonable number of versions of the hydraulic modeling.[5] For this proceeding, Staff engaged PA.

The Commission has since opened separate dockets related to each of the major utilities' LTPs. This proceeding began with National Grid conducting an informational session on May 8, 2024, and the Company filed its Initial LTP on June 3, 2024. National Grid's long-term plan addressed the needs of all three of its operating companies, NMPC, KEDNY, and KEDLI. NMPC's system can also be referred to as the "Upstate" system, and KEDNY and KEDLI's systems can be collectively considered the "Downstate" system.

Following National Grid's initial filing, this proceeding included multiple reports by PA and several rounds of comments and multiple technical conferences to ensure ample opportunity for stakeholder participation. PA filed its Initial Report on September 27, 2024, which was followed by stakeholder comments on the Initial LTP. National Grid filed its Revised LTP on October 23, 2024, followed by PA's Preliminary Findings Report on January 30, 2025. Stakeholders provided written comments on the Revised LTP on December 13, 2024, and submitted

[4] Planning Order, p. 29.

[5] Planning Order, pp. 26-27.

written comments on PA's Preliminary Findings Report on February 21, 2025.

Staff convened several technical conferences during the course of the proceeding, at which attendees discussed and attempted to reconcile differences among the Company and the stakeholders regarding the LTP and addressed other issues related to National Grid's long-term plan. National Grid filed its Final LTP on March 7, 2025. Written comments on the Company's Final LTP were received on April 3, 2025. Further, six virtual public statement hearings on the Final LTP were held. The public statement hearings were held at 1:00 pm and 6:00 pm on April 10, 2025, April 16, 2025, and April 17, 2025, respectively. PA submitted its Final Report on May 19, 2025.

On June 2, 2025, the Company filed a request to update its LTP to reflect Transco's May 29, 2025, petition to FERC requesting reissuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct and operate the NESE Project.[6] National Grid filed its Supplement on July 2, 2025. The Supplement to its Final LTP analyzes the impact NESE would have on the Downstate system, but "does not alter the content of the LTP itself or its recommendations."[7] On July 18, 2025, several stakeholders[8] jointly filed a motion to strike National Grid's Supplement. PA filed its Report on the Supplement on August 6, 2025.[9] Stakeholders provided comments addressing the Final LTP,

[6] In the June 2, 2025, letter, National Grid requested that the Commission allow it to file a supplement to its Final LTP and that the Secretary issue a notice soliciting comments on the Final LTP after it filed the supplemental report.

[7] Supplement, pp. 5-6.

[8] Environmental Defense Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council, New Yorkers for Clean Power, and Sierra Club.

[9] PA's August 6, 2025, Report on National Grid's Supplement was itself a supplement to its May 19, 2025, Final Report.

Supplement, Final Report, and PA Report on the Supplement by September 5, 2025. Appendix A provides a summary and timing of the key events in this proceeding.

DESCRIPTION OF LONG-TERM PLAN

According to National Grid, the Final LTP sets forth detailed analyses of the Company's "demand, supply, reliability infrastructure plans and alternatives" under three different planning scenarios.[10] The Supplement focuses on a discrete analysis of the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project's reliability impact and its overall costs and benefits. In the Final LTP, the Company provides an assessment of the potential bill impacts, benefit cost analysis (BCA) of the three scenarios and provided recommendations regarding policy and regulatory changes to achieve the CLCPA'S goals. The Company further states that the Final LTP "provides National Grid's recommended path forward to be at the heart of a clean, fair and affordable energy future."[11]

National Grid evaluated three pathways that represent potential end states, referring to them as the Reference Case, Clean Energy Vision (CEV), and Accelerated Electrification (AE) scenarios. The Company makes clear that these scenarios are not supposed to be predictive of the future. The Company states that the Reference Case reflects the current trajectory, reflecting the existing legal and policy framework and would not achieve New York's climate goals or National Grid's goal of a "fossil free gas network by 2050."[12] Further, National Grid states that the CEV represents its vision of the future and

[10] Final LTP, p. 1.

[11] Final LTP, p. 1.

[12] Final LTP, p. 16.

provides the best cost benefit ratio at the lowest consumer cost, while seeking to decarbonize the gas system. CEV is a hybrid approach that relies on a combination of electrification, energy efficiency, and low carbon fuels (LCFs). Also, the Company states that the AE scenario incorporates higher levels of electrification, but lower levels of LCFs than the CEV. The AE scenario is modeled on the Climate Action Council's (CAC) Scenario 3 from their integration Analysis. The Company states that the AE scenario contains a lower cost benefit ratio and a higher cost than the CEV.

National Grid's Final LTP anticipated a slowdown of the recent economic growth trend in its Downstate service territories.[13] The Company's preliminary analysis of the 2025 Gas Load Forecast showed lower demand than in its original analysis, indicating that a slowdown has occurred. However, the Company explains that it has received inquiries from large commercial and industrial customers who are interested in potentially seeking gas service. National Grid states that proposals from potential commercial and industrial customers would increase daily demand by approximately 16,000 dt/day.[14] The Company's Reference Case forecasts that its number of meters in KEDNY and KEDLI's service territories will grow from 1.910 million to 2.035 million. National Grid also forecasts an increase in annual retail volumes for the Downstate service territories, from 295 million Dt in 2023 to 380 million Dt in 2050.[15]

[13] Final LTP, p. 37.

[14] Supplement, p. 14. The value here represents a daily load value whereas National Grid had provided an hourly load value in its Supplement.

[15] Final LTP, p.43.

For its Upstate service territory, National Grid anticipates stronger economic growth, based in part on the semiconductor and nanotech industries. In the Reference Case, National Grid's historical meter count rose from 578,682 meters at the end of 2008 to 638,814 meters at the end of 2023, growing at a rate of 4,009 meters, or 0.66 percent, per year. National Grid forecasts the meter count to rise from 638,814 meters at the end of 2023 to 712,042 meters at the end of 2050, growing at a lower rate of 2,712 meters, or 0.40 percent, per year.

National Grid states that in New York City, 44 percent of census tracts and 59 percent of households are either in a disadvantaged community or low-income. Further, on Long Island, 14 percent of census tracts and 26 percent of households are either in a disadvantaged community or low-income. In its Upstate service territory, 35 percent of the census tracts and 47 percent of households in Central New York are either located in a disadvantaged community or are low income. KEDLI serves approximately 100,000 customers located within disadvantaged communities, while KEDNY and NMPC each serve approximately 400,000 customers located in disadvantaged communities.[16]

National Grid states that its draft Equity and Environmental Justice Stakeholder Engagement Framework indicates its commitment to work together with stakeholders on New York's clean energy transition. Furthermore, as part of the Commission's rate plans for National Grid's Upstate and Downstate service territories, National Grid must file an annual Disadvantaged Communities Report including data regarding its

[16] Final LTP, p. 7.

energy efficiency spending, demand response, and workforce development efforts in disadvantaged communities.[17]

Regarding bill impacts, the Company produced analysis of the average overall monthly bill increases averaged over the three service territories for the three scenarios. The Reference Case features an increase from $136 in 2023 to $302 in 2050, whereas bills increase to $442 in the CEV scenario and $4,691 in the AE scenario over the same time period.[18] The Company also estimated slightly lower increases in the delivery bill of $257, $368, and $4,460 for the three scenarios. The AE scenario features larger reductions in customer numbers, according to the Company, leading to its cost of service being spread over fewer customers.

For both Upstate and Downstate, the Company states that it believes:

> the balanced approach of the CEV is the 'preferred' scenario, while recognizing the policies necessary to put this into practice are not currently in place. Our analysis finds that overall benefits and costs are essentially the same for either the CEV or the AE scenario. However, a balanced approach like the CEV significantly mitigates the cost and equity risks of the transition for remaining gas customers compared to a high electrification approach like the AE scenario.[19]

Upstate Final LTP

The majority of gas supplies for the NMPC service territory are delivered by Eastern Gas Transmission & Storage

[17] 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order, Attachment 1 (Joint Proposal), pp. 46-51; Cases 24-E-0322 and 24-G-0323, NMPC – Electric and Gas Rates, Order Adopting Terms of Joint Proposal and Establishing Rate Plans (issued August 14, 2025) (2025 NMPC Rate Order), Appendix A (Joint Proposal), pp. 122-123.

[18] Final LTP, p. 147.

[19] Final LTP, p. 187.

(Eastern) and interconnects with Empire Pipeline (Empire), Iroquois Gas Transmission System (Iroquois), and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Tennessee). The Company has one compressed natural gas (CNG) facility located in Moreau, NY. The Upstate NY gas system is divided into an eastern division, often referred to as the East Gate, serving the Albany, Troy, and Schenectady areas, and a central division, often referred to as the West Gate, serving the Syracuse, Watertown, and Utica areas.

NMPC has a number of firm non-core customers for whom it ensures sufficient facilities exist on its distribution system to provide reliable service, but for whom it does not acquire gas capacity or supplies. Also, NMPC has about 2,300 customers enrolled in its Energy Affordability Program and estimates that 37 percent of its customers are considered low- to moderate-income.[20] NMPC states its service territory is located in an area where incremental sources of gas are not readily available.

National Grid models its Upstate gas supply and distribution requirements based upon a Design Day average temperature of -10°F at Albany and Syracuse airports (i.e., 75 Heating Degree Days). The Company states that it creates econometric forecasts for the meter counts and average use-per-customer of different customer rate groups within the East Gate and West Gate regions of the Upstate service territory and adjusts those forecasts for funded demand-side management (DSM) savings, enacted local laws and legislation, and market saturation limits. National Grid states that following "a few tough years" in the aftermath of the pandemic, the Upstate New York economy is making solid gains again and growth in the semiconductor and nanotechnology industries will add jobs and

[20] Final LTP, pp. 11-12.

revitalize local manufacturing.[21] National Grid asserts that there is more demand for housing Upstate than the supply of available units and that commodity price forecasts indicate that natural gas will maintain a cost advantage over other energy sources.[22]

At the time the Company created the demand forecast, it assumed that annual energy efficiency savings will continue to grow slightly through 2040 and annual incremental energy efficiency will occur at a slower rate later in its forecast because there are not presently approved energy efficiency programs or goals after 2030.[23] NMPC states that the Reference Case models three kinds of heat pump installations: full electrification, full electrification of space heating, and partial electrification of space heating. The Reference Case also assumes the addition of about 2,700 meters per year Upstate, with retail demand growing about 0.45 percent per year.[24] The Company estimates that wholesale demand will grow about 0.9 percent per year. The CEV forecasts an average decrease of 8,624 meters per year or a 1.67 percent annual decrease predicated on the assumption that some gas customers will fully electrify or switch to pure hydrogen usage, and the AE forecasts an average decrease of 22,370 meters per year or a 10.21 percent annual decrease. NMPC projects that retail demand will decrease under the CEV by 2.4 percent per year through 2050 and by just over nine percent per year under the AE scenario.

NMPC states that Upstate NY had declining demand entering the 2013-14 winter season due to lingering impacts from

[21] Final LTP, p. 38.

[22] Final LTP, p. 38.

[23] Final LTP, p. 39.

[24] Final LTP, pp. 44-45.

the 2008 financial crisis. However, the East Gate, largely served by Eastern, had design hour constraints that have since been addressed by the ETS2 CNG facility and ensuring that large customers demonstrate access to firm capacity on very cold days. Since then, Upstate NY Design Day and design hour requirements have increased. The Company states that NMPC has many firm non-core customers and there continues to be a supply demand imbalance, which could be exacerbated by expanding the SC-8 D1 service,[25] considered a stand-by service for large industrial customers.

NMPC states that it is pursuing support for development of renewable natural gas (RNG) interconnections in the service territory totaling about 2,200 Dt/day and is interested in hydrogen supply demonstration projects.[26] NMPC has a CNG facility in Moreau through which BNOC can inject up to 2,200 Dt/hour for four hours, twice per day. NMPC plans to construct a second CNG site, located near Troy and referred to as Energy Transfer Site Number 2 (ETS2), with the same 2,200 Dt/hr decompression capability. ETS2 is needed to meet Design Day demand in the 2027/28 winter but is currently scheduled to be operational for winter 2026/27.

NMPC states that a supply-demand gap of 0.06 MDt/day is expected in Upstate NY in 2030/31 because of growing demand in the East Gate region without additional infrastructure investments, which reaches 83.4 MDt/day in winter 2049/50. The Company states that this gap reflects the expiration of 20,000

[25] Final LTP, p. 60. Service Classification 8 is named "Gas Sales and Transportation Service with Standby Sales Service" and applies to eligible customers consuming at least 100,000 Dt annually. A D1 election in this service classification is the maximum daily quantity of standby sales gas that a customer may use.

[26] Final LTP, pp. 62 and 75.

Dt/day of city gate peaking capacity after winter 2026/27 but otherwise assumes that all other contracts in the portfolio will be maintained or renewed. Also, the Company contends that it may need a moratorium on new or expanded gas service, without continued investment in the gas network, to ensure safe and reliable service to existing gas customers. However, supply-demand gaps do not appear under the CEV and AE scenarios. NMPC adds that additional capacity is available on the Empire Pipeline but that does not help with constraints at East Gate. Additional capacity may be available on Tennessee in the future to benefit the East Gate but National Grid would require additional infrastructure on NMPC's system to facilitate the transportation of this supply from the city gate. NMPC proposes to conduct an East Gate Reliability Assessment to determine how to alleviate the need for additional supply.[27] NMPC identifies a number of vulnerable locations in both the East and West Gate regions and states it is evaluating options to address incremental gas demand.[28] The 2025 NMPC Rate Order permits the Company to defer up to $7.7 million of costs associated with the assessment if the Commission directs the Company to perform it in another proceeding, including but not limited to the gas planning proceeding or this proceeding.[29]

In addition to the energy efficiency program offerings National Grid provides, which are subject to Commission oversight in the energy efficiency and building electrification

[27] Final LTP, p. 81.

[28] Final LTP, p. 86.

[29] 2025 NMPC Rate Order, p. 58.

proceedings,[30] National Grid also offers firm customer demand response programs, including load shedding and load shifting programs for large non-residential customers and behavioral demand response and bring-your-own-thermostat programs for residential customers. The Company states that it pursues three types of NPAs, including new connection, leak prone pipe, and reliability and reinforcement. NMPC has also proposed two pilot utility thermal energy network (UTEN) projects, located in Syracuse and Troy, that are under review in Case 22-M-0429.[31]

The Company calculated BCA ratios for the Upstate service territory of 0.69 for the Reference Case, 0.70 for the CEV, and 0.76 for the AE.[32] NMPC also estimated emissions reductions for the three scenarios at 64 million metric tons CO2e for the Reference Case, 339 million metric tons for the CEV, and 370 million for the AE.

Downstate Final LTP and Supplement

The Company's Downstate system receives supply at different city gates for the KEDNY and KEDLI service territories. KEDNY receives supply from the Tetco-Goethals, Transco-Narrows and Transco-Rockaway city gates, while KEDLI receives supply from the Transco-Long Beach and Iroquois-South Commack city gates. Additionally, the Company has a contract to

[30] Case 18-M-0084, In the Matter of a Comprehensive Energy Efficiency Initiative; Case 25-M-0248, In the Matter of the 2026-2030 Non-Low- to Moderate-Income Energy Efficiency and Building Electrification Portfolios; and Case 25-M-0249, In the Matter of the 2026-2030 Low- to Moderate-Income Energy Efficiency and Building Electrification Portfolio.

[31] Case 22-M-0429, Proceeding on Motion of the Commission to Implement the Requirements of the Utility Thermal Energy Network and Jobs Act, Syracuse UTEN Pilot Stage 2 Filing – Final (filed July 9, 2025) and Troy UTEN Pilot Stage 2 Filing and Appendices (filed July 10, 2025).

[32] Final LTP, p. 156.

receive supply from the White Plains gate station operated by Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Con Edison). The Company has two LNG plants on its Downstate system, at Greenpoint and Holtsville, which together can provide up to 394,500 Dt/day. Also, National Grid has five CNG injection sites on its Downstate system. The CNG injection sites are located on Long Island at Glenwood, Inwood, Barrett, Farmingdale, and Riverhead.[33]

KEDNY and KEDLI interconnect with infrastructure jointly owned and operated with Con Edison called the New York Facilities System (NYFS) pursuant to the New York Facilities Agreement. The NYFS enables Con Edison and KEDNY/KEDLI to exchange a limited amount of supply from various pipelines. While the NYFS allows for supply to flow between both Con Edison and KEDNY/KEDLI, on a design day KEDNY/KEDLI are net takers and depend on Con Edison to transfer supply.[34]

The Company states that its Downstate energy efficiency programs have annual energy savings of approximately 13.6 million Dt.[35] These savings result from Company program offerings targeting different customer segments including, commercial and industrial, multifamily, and residential. National Grid also provides incentives for weatherization to both residential and non-residential customers. The Company focuses on its low-to-moderate incomes customers by setting aside 20 percent of its energy efficiency funding for income-eligible customers. Further, National Grid established a statewide multi-family program called the Affordable Multifamily Energy Efficiency Program (AMEEP). AMEEP focuses on encouraging

[33] Final LTP, p. 55.

[34] PA Final Report, p. 53.

[35] Final LTP, p. 91.

customers to pursue comprehensive upgrades. As National Grid does not provide electric service in its Downstate service territories, the Company does not offer a heat pump program in those areas. However, it supports the electrification efforts of the local electric utilities – primarily Con Edison and the Long Island Power Authority/PSEG LI – by providing heat pump information to customers who request a new or upgraded gas connection.[36]

National Grid offers four firm demand response programs in its Downstate service territories, including a load shedding program, a load shifting program, a bring your own thermostat program that utilizes Wi-Fi connected thermostats to remotely lower the customer's temperature, and a behavioral demand response program. Additionally, the Company offers a non-firm demand response program to commercial and industrial customers. In the Downstate service territories National Grid initiates demand response events based on certain temperature thresholds. Across its KEDNY and KEDLI service territories, National Grid has over 2,000 non-firm demand response customers and their cumulative demand reduction can lower design day usage by approximately 140,000 dt/day.[37]

The Company's Final LTP indicated that the Downstate economy would see a decline in growth expectations, dipping to 1.3 percent growth in 2025. National Grid cited rising interest rates as one of the key factors impacting economic and job growth. National Grid also stated that Long Island's medical services sector would provide a positive impact on the economy. Under the Downstate Reference Case, National Grid forecasted meter counts increasing from 1.910 million meters in 2023 to

[36] Final LTP, p. 96.

[37] Final LTP, p. 104.

2.035 million meters in 2050. This represents a growth of 4,656 meters, or 0.24 percent, per year.[38] The Company's Reference Case showed a similar increase for retail volumes. Forecasted retail volumes increase from 295 million Dt in 2023 to 380 million Dt in 2050. This represents a growth of 3.15 million Dt per year or 0.94 percent each year.[39] Further, the Reference Case forecasts wholesale Design Day volumes of 1,094 MDt/day by 2050.

The CEV Scenario projects a meter count of 1.518 million customers in 2050. This represents a decrease of 14,507 meters each year or a 0.85 percent decrease each year from the Reference Case. Additionally, the Company's CEV scenario projects that the retail volumes will be 119 million Dt in 2050. This equates to a decrease of 6,530 Dt each year or a decline of 3.31 percent each year from the Reference Case. National Grid forecasts its wholesale Design Day volumes for the CEV Scenario to be 515 MDt/day by 2050, which is a decrease of 16.8 MDt/day each year or a 2.34 percent annual decrease.[40]

National Grid's DSNY AE Scenario projects a meter count of 98,448 meters in 2050. This represents a decrease of 67,085 meters each year which equals a 10.40 percent decrease each year. Also, the Company's DSNY AE Scenario projects that retail volumes will be 8.52 million Dt in 2050. This represents a decline of 10.61 million Dt each year or a decrease of 12.30 percent each year.[41] National Grid projects that the wholesale Design Day volumes for the AE Scenario will be 77.3 MDt/day by 2050. This represents a decrease of 33.6 MDt/day each year or an annual decrease of 9.20 percent.

---

[38] Final LTP, p. 42.

[39] Final LTP, p. 43.

[40] Final LTP, p. 50.

[41] Final LTP, p. 47.

National Grid also provided its DSNY forecasted wholesale Design Day volumes for the Reference Case, CEV and AE scenarios. The Reference Case forecasted Design Day volume is 3,551 MDt/day by 2050. Under the CEV Scenario this decreases to 1,880 MDt/day by 2050, which equals a decrease of 37.1 MDt/day for each year or a 1.58 annual decrease. For the AE Scenario National Grid projects wholesale Design Day volumes to decrease to 143 MDt/day by 2050. This equals a decrease of 103.9 MDt/day each year or an annual decrease of 10.86 percent.[42]

Regarding its Greenpoint LNG facility, National Grid stated that the facility is needed to ensure the reliability of the Downstate gas system. Greenpoint contains two LNG storage tanks that help to meet periods of peak demand. Natural gas is liquified during off-peak periods and stored in the storage tanks. National Grid can then vaporize this LNG during periods of peak demand and inject it into the gas system. The Greenpoint storage tanks have a capacity of 1.6 billion cubic feet (equivalent to 1.6 million Dt). National Grid states that Greenpoint can supply up to 291,000 Dt/day.[43]

The Company states that the Greenpoint facility provides the ability to fill a short-term (i.e., a few days or less) supply gap in the event of interruptions at upstream pipelines. Greenpoint is capable of providing natural gas to 291,000 customers on a Design Day. Additionally, National Grid contends that the absence of Greenpoint and its supply could impact its ability to meet its Design Day demand. The Company argues that the inability to meet its Design Day demand would lead to customer curtailments (i.e., customer service gas

[42] Final LTP, p. 48.

[43] Final LTP, p. 118.

outages), and it would take a significant amount of time for National Grid to restore service to customers.[44]

National Grid's Supplement includes the Company's analysis concerning the projected impact of Transco's May 29, 2025, petition to FERC to revive its application for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project.[45] On August 28, 2025 FERC approved Transco's petition and reissued the certificate of public convenience and necessity for NESE.[46] National Grid requested that the Commission: 1) recognize the changed circumstances that are explained in its Supplement; 2) take notice of the Supplement's findings and conclusions; 3) confirm that the Supplement complies with the Commission's directives in the Planning Order and comprises a component of the Company's LTP; and 4) confirm that it is reasonable for National Grid to secure rights in the NESE project.[47]

National Grid contends that NESE will benefit its Downstate service territory by improving reliability and relieving supply constraints. The Company states that NESE would provide up to 400,000 Dt/day of firm supply to be delivered to the Rockaway Transfer Point, then into Transco's Rockaway Delivery Lateral where Transco interconnects with National Grid's gas distribution system at Floyd Bennett Field. In preparing the Supplement, National Grid considered reports from the Northeast Power Coordinating Council and from the New

---

[44] Final LTP, p. 120.

[45] FERC Docket No. CP17-101-007 et al., Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, Petition of Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Company, LLC for Expedited Reissuance of Certificate of Authority (filed May 29, 2025).

[46] FERC Docket No. CP17-101-007 et al., Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, Order Issuing Certificate, (issued August 28, 2025).

[47] National Grid Letter (filed July 2, 2025).

York Independent System Operator (NYISO) regarding current and future electric sector reliability risks. Further, the Company considered known delays in offshore wind development and increased demand for electricity from multiple initiatives, which increase the need for gas-fired electric generation that provides electricity to residential and commercial customers.[48]

National Grid explains that the Downstate gas distribution system faces reliability challenges in the absence of additional supply. The Company states that the "gas network operates without a contingency margin, with no excess capacity reserved for emergencies like unexpected demand spikes or supply disruptions."[49] National Grid describes its current reliance on CNG as a temporary solution that is not scalable beyond current operations. High-demand conditions can require up to 240 CNG truck deliveries per day during adverse weather conditions. The Company observes that this may require CNG trucks to traverse "ice- and snow-covered roads, an approach that is logistically complex, weather dependent, and inherently risk-intensive."[50]

National Grid explains that Winter Storm Elliot, in December 2022, nearly led to disruptions in the Downstate gas system. The Company referenced comments by the CEO of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation who stated that warming weather on Christmas Day likely prevented disruptions in natural gas service in New York City.[51] Service disruptions would have left customers without natural gas for an extended period of time because National Grid would have had to visit

[48] Supplement, p. 7.

[49] Supplement, p. 8.

[50] Supplement, p. 8.

[51] Supplement, p. 8.

each service location to manually restart gas service to ensure safety.[52]

Beyond addressing reliability concerns, the Company explains that NESE's additional supply will support New York's economic growth. National Grid references a study by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis that states that New York's economy is growing faster than any state in the Northeast, notwithstanding the reduced demand forecast in the Supplement. This growth is driven by investments in energy-intensive sectors such as artificial intelligence, cloud datacenters, and advanced manufacturing.[53]

National Grid states that while the Iroquois ExC Project is expected to provide critical deliverability and reliability to the eastern end of KEDLI's service territory, NESE offers similar benefits to the western end of the system. National Grid offers the following benefits of the NESE project with the potential to generate net societal benefits of approximately $4 billion or more between 2028 and 2043:[54]

1. NESE would increase the resilience and reliability of Transco's critical gas transmission system by adding compression and pipeline loops.
2. NESE would reduce the risk of supply shortfalls during peak demand by increasing firm supply by about 13

[52] Supplement, p. 8. The submission referenced a report and analysis published by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation concerning Winter Storm Elliott (in December 2022) as well as reports on the loss of gas service and system recovery efforts on Aquidneck Island in Rhode Island (in January 2019). See, e.g., Supplement, pp. 8 and 19-20, nn. 24-27, 74-75, 79-82.

[53] U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, (March 28, 2025). Gross Domestic Product by State and Personal Income by State, 4th Quarter 2024 and Preliminary 2024. https://www.bea.gov/sites/default/files/2025-03/stgdppi4q24-a2024.pdf

[54] Supplement, pp. 9-11.

percent relative to current Downstate New York contracted capacity while reducing reliance on trucked gas.

3. NESE would enable additional gas supplies to be made available to generators during periods when firm gas customers do not require them, which would enhance fuel security and support electric system reliability.
4. NESE would help lower electricity bills for New Yorkers by as much as $6 billion with $2.75 billion in savings flowing directly to Downstate residents (Zones J-K).
5. NESE would also allow National Grid to avoid procuring supplies for three of its CNG sites, avoiding approximately $48.3 million in annual gas supply costs.
6. NESE's project construction would support 3,186 direct and indirect job-years in the tri-state area and generate approximately $22.7 million in state and local tax revenue and an estimated contribution of $23.7 million to New York State's GDP.
7. NESE could reduce GHG emissions by approximately 13,000 tons from 2025-2042, the equivalent of taking 2,811 internal combustion cars off the road for a year, by enabling conversions from higher-emitting fuels like residual and distillate heating oil, and by reducing diesel fuel consumed by CNG delivery trucks, as well as reductions in air pollution.

As NESE is owned by Transco, not National Grid, its costs would not be recovered through National Grid's delivery rates. However, Transco would charge National Grid a demand charge for NESE, which would be part of the gas costs National Grid recovers from customers on the commodity portion of their bills. Additionally, National Grid has identified two capital projects it states it would need to construct to make full use of the capacity and supply provided by NESE. National Grid states that it would seek to include the costs of those two projects in its rate base, which would be recovered through delivery rates, if the Commission authorizes cost recovery in a future rate case. Although National Grid states NESE is expected to increase total bills for gas customers, it expects

NESE will result in cost savings for electric customers. National Grid states that NESE will result in the average National Grid residential gas customer's total bill increasing by about 3.5 percent, or about $7.50 per month. However, National Grid states that NESE will provide significant wholesale electric cost savings, which will benefit all New York electric customers.[55] The Company goes on to explain that these savings will benefit electric customers who are also National Grid gas customers.

The Company also states that NESE does not alter National Grid's long-term plan for a cleaner energy future. It adds that NESE does not change the recommendations of the Company's Final LTP or its commitment to energy efficiency and non-pipe alternatives but rather addresses immediate reliability risks while aligning with long-term decarbonization goals. Further, National Grid explains that the NESE project complements its CEV scenario. The Company states that NESE will not "hinder progress toward CLCPA targets" and it "supports emissions reductions and air quality improvements by facilitating fuel-switching and avoiding the use of diesel trucks for CNG supply."[56]

National Grid states that its design day forecasts exclude gas used for electricity generation because most generators take interruptible service from National Grid, and these generators are capable of switching to alternate fuels, mainly distillate fuel or residual oil which have higher full fuel-cycle emissions using the fuel-cycle CO2e emission factors published by NYSERDA.[57] National Grid adds that a preliminary

[55] Final LTP, p. 11.

[56] Supplement, p. 11.

[57] LAI Report, p. 37.

analysis of its 2025 demand forecast suggests a slower rate of demand growth compared to its earlier forecasting, which may delay any supply gap until the winter of 2041/42. National Grid states that two major drivers for the change in the preliminary 2025 forecast are assumptions of lower regional economic growth rates and the impact of declining oil prices on fuel-switching behavior. Further, the Company adds that the most recent baseline demand scenario continues to show growth in design day demand, with a compound annual growth rate of 0.55 percent between 2025 and 2035 and 0.35 percent between 2025 and 2050.[58]

In spite of the lower demand forecast, National Grid states that it continues to receive inquiries from large commercial and industrial customers seeking new gas service for potential economic development initiatives. These proposals would increase demand by a total of approximately 700 Dt per hour, which is equivalent to 16,800 Dt/day.[59] Also, National Grid is aware of more projects under consideration, with over a dozen other large-scale project developers looking for significant quantities of natural gas to support various applications. These projects include data centers, advanced manufacturing, civil infrastructure, transportation hubs, biomedical research facilities, hotels, casinos, convention centers, shopping malls, and large residential complexes.

National Grid explains that limitations affecting the natural gas system can also negatively impact the electric system. Natural gas powers several electric generation units, which means that negative impacts on gas supply into Downstate New York can threaten the reliability of the electric grid.[60]

[58] Supplement, p. 13.

[59] Supplement, p. 14.

[60] Supplement, p. 20.

Further, National Grid points out that the NYISO projects winter electric demand will grow by between 6,700 MW and 14,000 MW by 2040, primarily due to building electrification initiatives and trends.[61]

National Grid also explains that gas-fired electric generation plays a role in supporting the promulgation of renewable generation in New York. The NYISO expects the capability of gas-fired units to be dispatched to compensate for the variability of wind and solar to become even more critical as the share of intermittent renewables grows.[62] National Grid states that, in New York, electric market prices are strongly influenced by daily city gate spot gas prices, particularly during winter months, when solar output is reduced and natural gas units often set the marginal price. National Grid adds that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project will reduce the need for generators to switch to oil and interrupting other non-firm gas customers.[63]

As an appendix to its Supplement, National Grid provided the LAI Study, which quantifies benefits to electric customers. The LAI Study projects that NESE's delivery of 400,000 Dt/day would result in nominal average wholesale energy market cost savings for New York retail electric customers of approximately $670 million per year from 2028 through 2042, with

[61] New York Independent System Operator, (2025, April), 2025 Load & Capacity Data Report: Lower Demand Scenario Tables I-3B-L. Retrieved from https://www.nyiso.com/documents/20142/51231901/2025-Gold-Book-LowerDemand-Scenario-Tables.xlsx/32aa010a-b43f-f5b4-fde7-789f7b79a689 and 2025 Power Trends, The New York ISO Annual Grid and Markets Report (2025 Power Trends Report), p. 10.

[62] Supplement, p. 21.

[63] Supplement, p. 30.

45 percent of those benefits expected to accrue to electric customers in New York City and Long Island.

National Grid adds that, in addition to increasing total supply, the proposed Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would provide critical reliability benefits, including improved redundancy through a second delivery path between New Jersey and the Transco Rockaway Delivery Lateral, pressure support, and operational optionality by allowing for tank maintenance at Holtsville and extended pipeline maintenance windows. Each pipeline segment would be capable of transporting more than half of the total daily volume, reducing exposure to single-point failures along the Lower New York Bay Lateral. The NESE Project includes looping of existing pipeline, which adds a second path acting as a reinforcement, and providing additional compression, with no greenfield construction in New York State. The Company estimates avoided gas supply costs associated with CNG of approximately $48.3 million per year, and the LAI Study notes there would be an additional $1.7 million in operating savings per CNG site.[64] National Grid states that it will release capacity and/or engage in off-system sales transactions when possible and this will result in most revenues being returned to customers.[65]

The Company contends that NESE will provide both cost and reliability benefits to customers. National Grid projects that wholesale electric cost benefits and savings from avoided CNG will outweigh what customers will pay for the project. The Company forecasts that NESE will generate net benefits of between $4 billion and $4.5 billion and a benefit-cost ratio between 2.5 and 3. Also, National Grid states that NESE would

[64] Supplement, LAI Study, p. 50.

[65] Supplement, p. 31.

have improved system reliability if it had been in service during Winter Storm Elliott because the additional miles of pipeline and line pack would have improved pressure stability.[66] In addition, National Grid states that NESE will assist the Company's efforts to conduct maintenance at the Greenpoint LNG facility.

National Grid states that NESE will require National Grid to make two gas distribution infrastructure capital upgrades to ensure that it can deliver the full complement of incremental gas supply to customers. Specifically, National Grid identifies the Marine Park regulator station and additional flow control at the Lake Success metering facility infrastructure projects.[67] According to National Grid, the Marine Park regulator station will allow National Grid to increase the operating pressure on the Brooklyn Queens Interconnect so it may accept the additional supply from NESE. National Grid states that the upgrade to provide additional flow control at the Lake Success Metering facility will enable transportation of the additional NESE supply and ensure compliance with the New York Facilities Agreement flow limitations. National Grid projects the aggregate cost for both projects to be between $50 and $55 million and would propose them for consideration in a future rate case.[68]

Regarding compliance with the CLCPA, National Grid states that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project helps to facilitate progress towards New York's emissions reduction targets. According to National Grid, NESE's cost would not meaningfully affect the benefit-cost ratio of either the AE or

[66] Supplement, p. 30.

[67] Supplement, p. 36.

[68] Supplement, pp. 36-37.

CEV scenario, and the project would likely lower the net societal costs to achieve emission reduction goals.[69]

CONSULTANT REPORTS

After the Company filed its Initial LTP on June 3, 2024, PA filed an initial report on September 27, 2024. The Company's Revised LTP, filed on October 23, 2024, was followed by PA's Preliminary Findings Report on January 30, 2025, and PA's Final Report on May 19, 2025, followed the filing of the Company's Final LTP on March 7, 2025. PA submitted its Report concerning the Supplement on August 6, 2025, following National Grid's submission of its Supplement on July 2, 2025.

In the Initial Report, PA notes that National Grid stated it was unnecessary to select a preferred scenario. Instead, National Grid encouraged a recognition that the "barriers to scenarios are the same over 'false choices between affordability and emissions reductions, or electrification and alternative fuels.'"[70] PA also committed itself to working with the Company, the Department and stakeholders to analyze the Company's scenarios and their impacts, as well as provide recommendations and opportunities for improvement.

In its Preliminary Findings Report, PA notes that the Company discusses potential supply-demand shortfalls for Upstate and Downstate but when the Company's CEV and AE cases' design day demand forecasts are applied, no shortfall exists at any point in the study period for Upstate or Downstate.[71] Further, PA stated that it was important for the Company to explain how different factors impact the supply shortfall for the Company's

[69] Supplement, p. 34.

[70] PA Initial Report, p. 12.

[71] PA Initial Report, p. 15.

Reference Case.[72] PA points to "slowing to negative population growth," legislation prohibiting certain fossil gas fueled equipment and building systems, and federal and state incentives for electrification as reasons that National Grid may have over-stated its annual retail volumes and design day demand forecasts.[73] PA adds that it is important to select a preferred case because of the potential that the Reference Case could result in short term supply shortfalls that could lead to investments in resources that could ultimately become stranded or, in the alternative, a moratorium on new connections for some period of time.

PA's Final Report contained several findings and recommendations, and includes additional observations focused on its final analyses, conversations with the Company and stakeholders. Further, PA's Final Report includes an assessment of filed comments and review of the Company's Final LTP, and updates some of its recommendations to reflect the Final LTP.

Concerning disadvantaged communities, PA encourages the Company to develop targeted analyses to consider the similarities and differences between disadvantaged community customers and other customers. The analysis should also consider barriers that prevent disadvantaged community customers from decarbonization, best practices to support disadvantaged communities in the energy transition, existing information gaps, and the funding required to support them. Further, PA recommends the Company develop programs and solutions to help disadvantaged communities and mitigate bill impacts.[74]

[72] PA Initial Report, p. 19.

[73] PA Initial Report, p. 12.

[74] PA Final Report, p. 31.

PA's analysis of LCFs indicates that they are unlikely to comprise a significant portion of National Grid's supply portfolio. Also, any forecasting of LCF costs contains a high level of uncertainty. PA states that it is likely National Grid is underestimating RNG and hydrogen costs because of the uncertainty surrounding them. In order to reduce capital costs, PA recommends that National Grid deploy LCFs in a targeted manner aimed at hard-to-electrify customers and promote electrification and NPAs.[75]

PA has made specific recommendations that aim to boost the development and deployment of NPAs in National Grid's service territories. PA recommended that National Grid consider instituting minimum investment thresholds for NPAs, which would require an NPA assessment if a proposed capital project reaches a specific financial and timeline threshold.[76] PA also recommends that National Grid develop an NPA solicitation guideline. Based on its analysis, PA contends National Grid does not envision the possibility of materially scaling NPAs to the point where the Company can avoid replacing substantial miles of Leak Prone Pipe (LPP).[77]

PA Analysis of Upstate

PA's analysis indicates that the potential for a supply-demand shortfall is influenced by a variety of factors. PA notes that the Company states it may experience a supply-demand shortfall in Upstate in the winter of 2030/31. PA's analysis of the Company's Reference Case for NMPC demonstrates that a possible supply/demand gap exists in either the winter of 2030/31 or 2040/41. The emergence of this gap depends on the

[75] PA Final Report, p. 148.

[76] PA Final Report, p. 148.

[77] PA Final Report, p. 137.

timing of the ETS2 CNG project and the addition of incremental capacity on the Empire pipeline. Further, PA's adjustments to the Company's Reference Case Design Day demand forecast demonstrate that a shortfall is possible in the winter of 2032/33 if only ETS2 is present. However, the additional incremental capacity from Empire may mitigate the shortfall.[78]

Due to the potential shortfall in the winter of 2030/31, PA suggests how National Grid should analyze and address that risk. PA states that the Company should identify the elements of its portfolio that may be at risk and how it can alleviate that risk, including capacity contract expiration dates.

PA's review identified uncertainty in the volumetric forecast. While the Company's projected immediate increase in volumes is not supported by PA's own analysis of customer counts and use per customer, PA explains that this could change due to expected economic expansion.[79] GlobalFoundries and Micron have published plans to expand operations, which could impact the demand for natural gas. Additionally, PA states that although sales volumes may increase in the short term, they could begin to decrease by 2035 and decrease more rapidly in the early 2040s. Finally, the 2050 level of annual demand, at 147,770 MDt, is just under two percent below PA's estimate of the weather normalized level in 2023.

PA states that its adjustment for the Company's Upstate Reference Case Design Day forecast results in six percent lower demand of 1,028 MDt/day in 2050, compared to the Company's forecast of 1,096 MDt/day. Similarly, for the CEV scenario, PA's adjustments to the Company's Design Day demand

[78] PA Final Report, p. 21.

[79] PA Final Report, p. 27.

forecast for 2050 is six percent lower at 435 MDt/day, compared to the Company's forecast of 464 MDt/day.[80] PA points to a number of factors that will influence future gas demand, including New York's energy policies, likely higher costs for RNG and hydrogen than projected by National Grid, and the combination of lower volumes and higher commodity costs contributing to rate and bill increases.

PA identified an inconsistency concerning projects regarding heat pump installation. The Company's Reference Case indicates that it projects the majority of heat pump installations will be partial-heat units, resulting in just 7.2 percent or roughly 7,100 meters being decommissioned by 2050.[81] However, PA explains that this projection contrasts with National Grid's filings for its Upstate Clean Heat Program. In those filings, made from January 2023 through September 2024, National Grid indicates that 11.8 percent of heat pump installations will lead to decommissioning by the end of 2024. This amounts to a decrease of over 500 residential customers. By comparison, National Grid's Reference Case forecast indicates that level of decommissioning will not occur until 2037. PA's projections show that over 72,000 customers will decommission gas service by 2050. Additionally, PA expects fewer fuel oil, coal, and wood space heating customers to convert to natural gas than National Grid. Likewise, PA expects similar effects on commercial customer demand with the growing impact of electrification.[82]

The Company proposed an East Gate Reliability Assessment (EGRA) in Case 24-G-0323. Although the Company's

[80] PA Final Report, p. 28.

[81] PA Final Report, p. 102.

[82] PA Final Report, pp. 105-107.

Initial and Preliminary Long-Term Plans referenced its request for funding for the EGRA in the rate case, its Final LTP indicates it is seeking Commission authorization to conduct the EGRA in this proceeding. Additionally, PA states that the Joint Proposal in the rate case, which the Commission has since adopted, provides the opportunity for approval of the EGRA in another proceeding (including, but not limited to, this proceeding). As part of its analysis in this proceeding, PA has reviewed the Upstate supply situation. Based on its analysis, PA finds that there is sufficient supply until the winter of 2032/33 with the installation of the ETS2 facility.[83]

National Grid's East Gate is divided into two primary distribution systems and smaller systems. The eastern part of the East Gate system contains the Albany Loop pipeline, which serves significant customer demand in the Albany and Troy areas.[84] Eastern and Tennessee provide gas to the Albany Loop. Further, the western portion of the East Gate system provides service from the Schenectady area, north towards Moreau. The eastern and western transmission laterals within the East Gate are not connected by the Company's pipe, which precludes the Company from moving gas between these two distribution systems. While PA's design day demand forecast is lower than National Grid's for the East Gate, PA's analysis still supports the need for the ETS2 CNG facility and the associated timing.[85] PA points out that that the Albany Loop receives gas from Tennessee and Eastern in the southern part of the system and delivers it north to the Albany local distribution system and around the loop to Troy. The ETS2 CNG facility located in Troy will reduce stress

[83] PA Final Report, p. 32.

[84] PA Final Report, p. 68.

[85] PA Final Report, p. 69.

on three of the Eastern citygates (Wolf Road, Normanskill, and Troy) while providing adequate pressure throughout the Albany Loop on a Design Day based on the hydraulic models provided to PA through the 2029/30 winter season.[86]

PA provided numerous recommendations to address discrete areas of National Grid's LTP in order to improve future updates. For the Company's Upstate service territory, PA recommends that the Company provide the specific impact, if any, of new non-residential customers on its use per customer, sales, and design day demand forecasts in its annual updates. Also, PA recommends that the Company include updated hydraulic models reflecting any incremental demand related to new nonresidential customers in the annual updates. To reduce capital expenses, PA recommends that National Grid develop a targeted deployment of LCFs for hard-to-electrify customers, which will also help to promote electrification and NPAs.

Concerning electrification, PA provided suggestions to help the Company increase the adoption of NPAs and customer electrification. PA suggested that the Company consider enacting minimum investment thresholds for NPAs by requiring an NPA assessment if a capital project exceeds a certain financial and timeline threshold. Also, PA recommends that the Company develop strategies to identify and overcome barriers to the deployment of electrification across the service territories. Further, PA recommends that the Company should rapidly scale its deployment of NPAs to minimize system cost and ensure that rates and bills stay manageable for all customers.[87]

PA provided some recommendations that will enable the Company to gain more insight concerning the issue of

[86] PA Final Report, p. 68.

[87] PA Final Report, p. 33.

affordability. Regarding disadvantaged communities, PA recommends that National Grid estimate a forecast of customers in disadvantaged communities and determine the level of low-income assistance funding needed to support customers if rates increase as projected under the AE and CEV cases. Also, concerning space heating in residential and small commercial buildings, PA recommends that National Grid determine the price point where blending RNG or hydrogen becomes more expensive than heat pumps.[88]

Regarding the East Gate reliability issue, PA recommends that the Company include an update regarding East Gate reliability in its annual LTP update and the next long-term plan filing. This update should include the implication of load growth impacts on the East Gate and the hydraulic modeling results.[89]

PA highlights the risk of cross subsidization among customer classes due to the possibility that certain customer classes may have no customers left in the future to pay that rate class's revenue requirement. PA states this topic needs further evaluation given economic and fairness implications. PA believes there are mechanisms that can be utilized to lower the bill impacts for all customers, including those who choose to remain on the gas system, including targeted deployment of electrification and LCFs, avoidance of unnecessary investments, and accurate accounting for the potential reduction in gas demand.[90] PA states that the Company needs to more fully incorporate the reduction in demand resulting from legislative

[88] PA Final Report, p. 34.

[89] PA Final Report, p. 34.

[90] PA Final Report, p. 132.

initiatives limiting fossil fuel use in certain applications and warmer winters over the forecast period.

PA suggests that BCA results can be improved by utilizing a collaborative process to refine the inputs. This collaborative process will enable stakeholders to provide input that may enhance the quality of the Company's assumptions that are utilized in its BCAs. PA states that in its BCA analysis, National Grid may not have fully accounted for some benefits or underestimated them or potentially overestimated some costs.[91] Therefore, PA recommends that National Grid conduct additional assessment of certain costs and benefits.

PA Analysis of Downstate

In addition to PA's Final Report's analysis of the LTP's Downstate sections,[92] PA also analyzed National Grid's Supplement, which addressed the potential impacts of Transco's Northeast Supply Enhancement Project.

On August 6, 2025, PA filed its Report on the Supplement. In the Report on the Supplement, PA primarily focused on the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project's impact to National Grid's gas customers and its impact on system reliability. PA's Report on the Supplement also reviewed National Grid's supply forecast, capital expenditures (Capex), demand forecast and the economic and environmental impacts of NESE. Additionally, PA's Report on the Supplement made observations concerning the Supplement's references to NESE's potential impacts on the electric system and electric customers.

In its Final Report, PA provides its analysis concerning the potential demand/supply shortfall and the Greenpoint LNG facility. PA states that its demand forecast

[91] PA Final Report, p. 145.

[92] PA's Final Report was filed on May 19, 2025.

adjustments could delay the demand/supply shortfall date to 2032/33 or beyond.[93] Concerning the Greenpoint facility, PA reviewed specific criteria that National Grid included in its LTP pursuant to the 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order.[94] PA states that Greenpoint's need from a supply perspective is dependent on the specific planning scenario that is pursued. Additionally, PA states that Greenpoint's usefulness must also be considered from a reliability perspective, and the lack of a supply justification alone does not warrant the facility's retirement.[95]

PA identified the need for additional analysis concerning a potential supply shortfall. PA states that National Grid's Reference Case does not adequately account for the limitations on gas appliances in new construction. These limitations include restrictions on gas furnaces in new construction in New York City, and statewide restrictions on the installation of fossil fuel systems or equipment in new construction up to seven stories tall in 2026, and all new buildings in 2029 onwards pursuant to the All Electric Buildings Act.[96]

PA identifies the unique characteristics of the entire New York City and Long Island region gas system which relies on shared resources between Con Edison and National Grid. As discussed above, they jointly operate the New York Facilities System which allows exchange of supply from various pipelines. The NYFS Agreement governs how the shared pipeline system operates, specifies each utility's share of interstate pipeline

---

[93] PA Final Report, p. 12.

[94] 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order, p. 76.

[95] PA Final Report, p. 25.

[96] See generally Laws of 2023, Chapter 56, Part RR; see also NY State Energy Law, Article 11, State Energy Conservation Construction Code Act, Section 11-104.

capacity at each city gate and the maximum hourly volumes of gas that flow from one utility to the other. While gas flow is bidirectional at the Lake Success and Newtown Creek pipeline interconnections, on a design day gas flows from Con Edison to National Grid.[97] Additionally, National Grid relies on CNG, LNG, and delivered services to meet design day load. Further, National Grid has entered into a contract for capacity on the ExC project and would be the only shipper on the NESE project. PA notes that both ExC and NESE have the potential to be in service by November 2027.

Although National Grid and Con Edison work together to direct the flow of natural gas from pipeline interconnections, there are operational limitations on how the gas can flow. Con Edison cannot increase gas volumes to National Grid on a design day without jeopardizing the reliability of Con Edison's own gas system. The NYFS Agreement governs the Company's share of interstate pipeline capacity entitlements at each citygate. Additionally, the NYFS Agreement defines the maximum hourly volume of gas that may flow from one utility to the other. Beyond the limits in the NYFS Agreement, reliability issues, including equipment failures on interstate pipelines, may result in reduced natural gas deliveries. LNG facilities fill the gap by helping to mitigate the impact of a supply interruption on the interstate pipeline system.[98] PA also provided analysis concerning other potential sources of gas supply.

In PA's Report on the Supplement, PA states that under the 2025 Forecast Reference Case Design Day demand forecast the portfolio of available supply is capable of serving demand through the end of the study period. However, PA states that

[97] PA Final Report, p. 53.

[98] PA Final Report, p. 71.

the supply portfolio carries some risk, including heavy reliance on long-distance trucking of CNG and the risk of renewal of contracts for CNG and peaking supplies. National Grid can bid to contract for peaking supplies on a short-term basis in a competitive market. If National Grid is outbid by another entity, it will be unable to resecure the gas supply provided by the peaking arrangement. PA adds that the degree to which there is unutilized capacity over time depends upon whether and when the Company is able to determine whether it can allow certain supply stack components to be eliminated, as well as whether and when design day demand related to power generation (along with organic demand growth) arises – PA states "the amount of unused capacity is subject to being pinched from both directions."[99] This additional need could be met by Greenpoint vaporizers 13&14. However, although National Grid may be able to satisfy the 2025 Reference Case Design Day demand forecast with its existing supply portfolio and Iroquois ExC, operational, deliverability, and market risks remain due to current reliance on CNG.[100] PA adds that firm pipeline capacity projects like Iroquois ExC obviate the re-contracting and expense risks that come with incremental delivered services and the operational risks that are paired with CNG. PA states that incremental vaporization provided at Greenpoint in Vaporizers 13 & 14 would provide incremental reliability while also providing resiliency in the event of unexpected supply disruptions.[101]

As noted by PA, firm pipeline capacity provides reliability benefits that cannot be provided by other incremental supply options like CNG or delivered services.

[99] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 19.

[100] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 19.

[101] PA Final Report, p. 71.

Although CNG and delivered services provide reliability benefits when firm pipeline capacity is not available, reliance on these supply alternatives also present reliability challenges. Incremental firm pipeline capacity benefits include renewal provisions, the ability to be called upon readily during design day conditions, lower delivery risks than incremental supply options such as CNG and delivered services, and the ability to be retained in the supply portfolio until demand subsides.[102] Specifically regarding the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, PA states that benefits include increased resilience, and the potential for a reduction in the reliance on CNG.[103] Further, PA states that the added resilience afforded by NESE could help in instances where pipelines experience operational issues or failures.

PA explains that CNG has risks associated with delivery during design day conditions. These risks include trailer availability and execution issues associated with calling on CNG to supplement the design day portfolio.[104] The number of CNG delivery trucks required to match the firm pipeline capacity of a specific project can be high. For example, PA states that 170 CNG trucks would be required to match the delivery capacity of Iroquois ExC.

Regarding LNG, PA states National Grid has relied upon its LNG facilities to maintain system pressure and provide supply.[105] National Grid's two LNG plants at Greenpoint and Holtsville can provide a total of 394,500 Dt of supply on a design day, which is equal to about 13 percent of design day

[102] PA Final Report, p. 24.

[103] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 8.

[104] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 8.

[105] PA Final Report, p. 83.

supply for the most recent winter.[106] Regarding Greenpoint, PA states core components were installed over 50 years ago and that they require refurbishment. Additionally, PA recognizes that National Grid has made and continues to make significant investments in upgrades and replacements of critical infrastructure at Greenpoint. According to PA, KEDLI invested more than $61 million at Holtsville during fiscal years 2018 through 2024 and is forecasting additional investments of more than $330 million through fiscal year 2033 with the major future item being the Holtsville Plant Modernization Project. While many components of the LNG system have been upgraded or replaced, the projects that are underway and those yet to be started represent significant reinvestment in critical infrastructure that is otherwise nearing the end of its useful life. PA states that the absence of Greenpoint could have dire consequences:

> if an extreme winter event occurs, and LNG is not available to meet peak demand (and no alternative supply sources exist or are available) customers will lose gas service. This could lead to human fatalities, extensive property damage (due to frozen water pipes), and several weeks of efforts by the Company to safely restore service to customers whose service was lost.[107]

National Grid revised its demand forecast significantly between its Final LTP and its Supplement. In its Final Report, PA states that portions of the Company's forecast were inconsistent with PA's understanding of "certain impactful meter count dynamics, recent trends, and intrinsic market phenomena such as falling use per customer due to improving appliance efficiency and other energy efficiency measures."[108] PA

[106] PA Final Report, p. 24.

[107] PA Final Report, p. 81.

[108] PA Final Report, p. 26.

determined that demand forecast was on the high side. PA recommended that the Company revisit its forecast analysis based on a more thorough assessment of macroeconomic factors and electrification and reflect these changes in the annual updates provided on May 31, 2026, and May 31, 2027. PA's proposed adjustments to the Reference Case design day forecast resulted in a significant reduction of approximately 14 percent to 3,101 MDt/day in 2050 as compared to the Company's forecast of 3,551 MDt/day. In the Supplement, National Grid revised its demand forecast based on lower regional economic growth rates and declining oil prices.[109] In the PA Report on the Supplement, PA also recommends that National Grid develop the Reference Case forecast for 20 years rather than the current 10 years, which would enable the forecast to reflect longer-term impacts.[110]

PA evaluated the BCA calculations contained in National Grid's LTP and provided recommendations to improve them. The BCA ratio for the three scenarios for the two Downstate service territories are as follows:

Scenario	**KEDNY**	**KEDLI**
Reference	0.36	0.49
AE	0.48	0.65
CEV	0.50	0.68

Regarding bill impacts, PA states that National Grid projects commodity costs will increase at least 37 percent over the 20-year forecast period, driven in part by blending RNG and hydrogen.

PA states that National Grid forecasts KEDNY and KEDLI GHG emissions will decrease by about 85 million metric tons of CO2e and 75 million metric tons of CO2e, respectively, by 2050

[109] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 28.

[110] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 43.

under the Reference Case, and by greater amounts for the AE and CEV scenarios.[111] PA recommends that National Grid conduct an analysis to determine the price point where blending RNG or hydrogen exceeds the cost of using heat pumps in both residential and small commercial buildings.[112]

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

Pursuant to the State Administrative Procedure Act (SAPA) §202(1), a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was published in the State Register on June 18, 2024 [SAPA No. 24-G-0248SP1]. The time for submission of comments pursuant to the Notice expired on August 19, 2024. Moreover, the Secretary to the Commission issued Notices Establishing Comment Deadlines regarding various filings in this proceeding. On June 4, 2024, the Secretary issued a notice establishing a deadline of August 19, 2024, for stakeholders to submit initial comments on National Grid's Initial LTP and September 3, 2024, for reply comments. By notice dated July 24, 2024, the Secretary extended those deadlines to September 18, 2024, and October 3, 2024, respectively. On November 21, 2024, the Secretary issued a notice establishing a comment deadline on the Revised LT of December 13, 2024. On February 4, 2025, the Secretary issued a notice establishing a comment deadline on PA's Preliminary Findings report of February 21, 2025. On March 12, 2025, the Secretary issued a notice establishing a comment deadline on the Company's Final LTP of April 3, 2025. Additionally, on March 19, 2025, the Secretary issued a notice of Public Statement Hearings and Soliciting Comments announcing virtual public statement hearings at 1:00 pm and 6:00pm on April 10,

[111] PA Final Report, p. 20.

[112] PA Final Report, p. 34.

2025, April 16, 2025, and April 17, 2025. That notice also invited members of the public to file written comments on National Grid's Final LTP by April 18, 2025. Finally, on July 25, 2025, the Secretary issued a notice establishing a deadline of September 5, 2025, for comments on the Final LTP, Supplement, PA's Final Report and PA's Report on the Supplement. Comments were filed in this proceeding by numerous stakeholders. In addition, the Commission received over 3,700 comments from members of the public, which included both support for and opposition to the Company's filing. The comments are summarized in Appendix B to this Order, and particular comments are discussed as applicable in the Discussion section below.

LEGAL AUTHORITY

Public Service Law (PSL) §5(1)(b) provides the Commission with broad authority over "the manufacture, conveying, transportation, sale or distribution of gas ... for light, heat or power, to gas plants ... and to the persons or corporations owning, leasing or operating the same." Of particular importance to the Commission's action in this Order, PSL §5(2) also provides that "[t]he commission shall encourage all persons and corporations subject to its jurisdiction to formulate and carry out long-range programs, individually or cooperatively, for the performance of their public service responsibilities with economy, efficiency, and care for the public safety, the preservation of environmental values and the conservation of natural resources." PSL §65 requires that LDCs provide "service, instrumentalities and facilities as shall be safe and adequate and in all respects just and reasonable." Furthermore, PSL §66(1) states that the Commission has general supervision of all gas corporations. Additionally, PSL §66(1-a) provides that the Commission may order "such improvement in the

manufacture, conveying, transportation, distribution or supply of gas… or in the methods employed by such corporation as in the commission's judgment is adequate, just and reasonable."

DISCUSSION

The Commission has considered long-term gas plan filings made by other of the State's LDCs in previous orders.[113] As we noted in the Con Edison/O&R LTP Order, the Commission's core responsibility at this time remains to ensure that the utilities provide safe and adequate gas service at just and reasonable rates. We also reminded stakeholders that no state laws require that existing customers and buildings discontinue using natural gas and disconnect from the gas distribution network.[114] We also recognized that gas planning will be an iterative process, with the Companies filing annual updates to this LTP and a new long-term plan in three years.[115] We recognize that this long-term plan represents significant differences from others we have considered, including potential capacity additions from new supply enhancement pipeline projects and consideration of the future of the Greenpoint LNG facility,

[113] 22-G-0610, National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation – Gas System Long-Term Plan, Order Implementing Long-Term Natural Gas Plan with Modifications (issued December 14, 2023); Case 23-G-0147, Con Edison and O&R Gas System Long-Term Plan, Order Regarding Long-Term Natural Gas Plan and Requiring Further Actions (issued September 20, 2024) (Con Edison/O&R LTP Order); Case 23-G-0437, NYSEG/RG&E – Gas System Long-Term Plan, Order Regarding Long-Term Natural Gas Plan and Directing Further Actions (issued January 23, 2025) (NYSEG/RG&E LTP Order); 23-G-0676, Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation – Gas System Long-Term Plan, Order Regarding Long-Term Natural Gas Plan and Directing Further Actions (issued July 17, 2025) (Central Hudson LTP Order).

[114] Con Edison/O&R LTP Order), p. 31.

[115] Con Edison/O&R LTP Order, p. 32.

which are discussed in more detail below. Importantly, the Commission's core responsibility, the legal framework, and iterative planning process established in our other LTP orders are reflected here.

Unlike Con Edison and O&R, but similar to NYSEG and RG&E, National Grid chose a preferred scenario, the CEV.[116] National Grid stated in its Initial LTP that it believed the CEV scenario to be the best path forward, but that it did not seek "approval" of the CEV or for the CEV to be enabled to the exclusion of the AE scenario. National Grid added that "(p)icking a preferred scenario is unnecessary."[117] National Grid filed its Initial LTP on June 3, 2024, before the Commission issued its Order on the Con Edison/O&R LTP on September 20, 2024, wherein we disagreed with a "no preference" approach.[118] Thereafter, in its Final LTP, National Grid stated that the CEV scenario represents National Grid's preferred pathway but "the policies necessary to put this into practice are not currently in place."[119]

National Grid is required to implement robust NPA education and outreach efforts as part of their currently effective rate plans.[120] The Commission recognizes that joint community and utility support and cooperation can create an opportunity to fully evaluate decarbonization strategies. The Commission remains optimistic that the right mix of community support, utility expertise, outreach and education, and funding

---

[116] NYSEG/RG&E LTP Order, p. 13; Final LTP, p. 17.

[117] Initial LTP, p. 163.

[118] Con Edison/ORU LTP Order, p. 29.

[119] Final LTP, p. 187.

[120] 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order, Attachment 1 (Joint Proposal), p. 44 and 2025 NMPC Rate Order, Attachment 1 (Joint Proposal), pp. 108-109.

for alternatives can produce desirable NPA outcomes. We note that, although customers are funding certain authorized energy efficiency and electrification programs, utility ratepayer funding alone may not be sufficient; as such, it will be important to identify all available funding sources.

While the Planning Order indicated that the Commission "could adopt, reject, or modify the revised plan, in whole or in part," experience with other gas utilities demonstrates that it is not necessary or appropriate to approve a plan with this level of detail and a 20-year horizon this far in advance. Instead, as we have in orders regarding other utilities' long-term plans, we focus on actions the Company must take in the near future to advance the decarbonization of its systems and that are necessary to continue providing safe, adequate, and reliable service to customers. We will consider recovery of costs for specific proposals and actions associated with this LTP in the Company's rate filings, or when addressing specific filings as required as part of this proceeding. We note that if a rate case proposal relates to an element of the Company's LTP, such proposal will be subject to thorough review through the traditional rate case process, without any presumption as to the outcome.

In issuing this Order, the Commission has considered the comments received. We discuss specific issues below, including the further actions we direct the Company to take regarding the Final LTP. We note that the Commission has no role in the permitting of interstate pipeline projects. The role of the Commission is to ensure transparency in long-term planning by gas utilities, including how they ensure reliability, and this order provides that transparency.

Demand Forecast

The Planning Order requires LDCs to include adjustments to demand forecast scenarios that include energy efficiency, electrification, demand response, NPAs and other external impacts, and directed the LDCs to provide estimates of the expected sources of growth and/or reduction in peak demand resulting from demand-side investments, clarifying that qualitative discussion is not sufficient. We note that the Company serves some customers, including gas fueled electric generation units, through interruptible service classifications in all three service territories and peak day forecasts do not include these customers' demand.

Regarding the NMPC service territory, the Company forecasts relatively stable growth over the planning period for the Reference Case. Demand is projected by the Company to be lower in both the CEV and AE scenarios at the end of the forecast period. The demand forecast for the Downstate service territories changed significantly between the 2024 demand forecast used in the Final LTP and the 2025 demand forecast presented in the Supplement. The Company had projected that demand, in terms of retail volumes, would increase from 295 million Dt in calendar year 2023 to 380 million Dt in calendar year 2050, growing at a rate of 3.15 million Dt, or 0.94 percent, per year.[121] In the Supplement, the Company states that "the most recent baseline demand scenario continues to show growth in design day demand, with a compound annual growth rate of 0.55 [percent] between 2025 and 2035 and 0.35 [percent] between 2025 and 2050."[122]

[121] Note that these values have been converted to Dt from therms as provided by the Company.

[122] Supplement, p. 13.

Senator Julia Salazar submitted a letter stating that multiple independent analysts found National Grid's demand forecasts to be inflated and unsupported.[123] That comment was echoed by Brooklyn Community Board No. 1. The City of New York (CNY) states that it "recognizes that forecasting demand is not a perfect science, but considering the importance of the demand forecast's role in determining capital investment and moratorium decisions, it is critical for stakeholders to have confidence in the chosen forecast."[124]

In its Final Report, PA recognized the Company's demand forecast appeared higher than PA thought warranted, and recommended adjustments that delay or eliminate the supply/demand gap. Further, PA stated that its adjustments would delay the NMPC shortfall to 2032/33 or later and delay the Downstate shortfall date to 2032/33 or later, with the inclusion of Iroquois ExC in the supply stack. In its Report on the Supplement, PA states that the updated 2025 sales volume forecast is significantly lower than the 2024 Forecast.[125] National Grid attributed the downward shift to lower regional economic growth and the impact of declining oil prices on fuel-switching behavior. PA states that there are several factors, excluding the Covid pandemic, impacting gas usage and causing a structural change in the market. To improve its forecasting methodology, PA recommends that National Grid incorporate insights from observable near-term historical trends and standard macroeconomic drivers.[126]

[123] Senator Salazar Comments (filed April 21, 2025), p. 2.

[124] CNY Comments (filed April 3, 2025), p. 4.

[125] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 28.

[126] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 42.

The Commission finds that National Grid's demand forecasts in the Final LTP contain some questionable results. The updated demand forecast contained in the Supplement appears to represent an improvement in forward-looking projections. The updated 2025 demand forecast in the Supplement provides a more accurate projection of the Downstate gas system's supply needs, and, as a result, the Commission will rely on the updated demand forecast in this Order. However, the Company needs to take further steps to improve its demand forecasting. Among other things, these improvements need to include reviewing three years of data, instead of relying on the most recent year's data, to identify positive and negative trends in demand growth. Moreover, PA provided recommendations to improve the demand forecasting methodology and processes pertaining to macroeconomic, fuel conversions, and electrification assumptions. Accordingly, we direct National Grid to file a report within 90 days of the date of this Order describing the improvements it is making to its methodologies and processes for demand forecasting and estimating use per customer on a design day that incorporate the use of three years of data and PA's recommendations for the Company's use in future LTP and rate case filings. The report shall explain the Company's methodologies and processes for demand forecasting and for estimating use per customer on design day in full. Additionally, the report shall explicitly list and describe the improvements the Company is making to these methodologies and processes. Together with this report, National Grid shall file updated design day and annual demand forecasts for each of KEDNY, KEDLI, and NMPC that reflect the improvements and using the data available through the end of November 2025.

Supply Forecast

Supply forecasts include the various assets used to meet design day load, including pipeline and storage capacity and peaking assets. In the Planning Order, the Commission accepted Staff's proposal that the LDCs' supply forecasts must align with the demand forecast, and emphasized that they "must be explicit regarding the level of demand-side programs included and must contain demand response programs."[127] Furthermore, the Commission encouraged LDCs to explore novel approaches to meeting demand, such as using innovative rate design to reduce or shift demand through seasonal or peak day rates rather than simply acquiring more gas to meet the initial forecast of demand.[128]

The Company provided several options to address the projected growth in the NMPC service territory and its identified 2030/31 supply gap. The first involves incremental capacity on Empire, which connects to a portion of National Grid's West Gate. However, Empire will not address the constraints on NMPC's East Gate because it does not connect to that portion of NMPC's system.[129] The second option involves securing capacity on Tennessee, which could be available in November 2042. The Tennessee option would require that National Grid construct additional infrastructure on its Upstate system to transport this supply from the city gate. As a third option National Grid proposes to undertake an East Gate Reliability Assessment, by which National Grid would assess how to alleviate the need for additional supply. National Grid proposes that it

[127] Planning Order, pp. 30-31.

[128] Planning Order, p. 31.

[129] Final LTP, p. 81.

would evaluate the use of NPAs that could alleviate the need for additional pipeline capacity.[130]

NMPC's Reference Case shows the possibility of a supply gap on a cumulative basis for its entire service territory existing for either 2030/31 or 2040/41. This supply gap is dependent on when the Energy Transfer Station #2 (ETS2) CNG project begins operation and the addition of incremental capacity on the Empire pipeline, respectively. Based on PA's proposed adjustments to the Company's Reference Case Design Day demand forecast, a shortfall is possible in 2032/33 in a scenario where only ETS2 is present, but a shortfall may be mitigated across the study period if incremental Empire capacity is acquired.

For its Downstate service territories, the Company anticipates the addition of supply from the ExC project, which would provide 62,500 Dt/day, and also notes the possibility of the NESE project, which would provide 400,000 Dt/day. Both ExC and NESE have received certificates of public convenience and necessity from FERC and require state permits before the respective interstate pipeline companies can begin construction. Further, the Company recently increased its CNG injection capacity. National Grid completed its "fifth and final CNG injection site on [Long Island]" in June 2023.[131]

Several stakeholders have submitted comments opposing the expansion of National Grid's supply portfolio. Community Board No. 1 opposes the Iroquois ExC project. Sane Energy Project (Sane) states that the abrupt reintroduction of NESE should not be accepted without a fully reopened proceeding, including new stakeholder input, rigorous modeling, and third-

[130] Final LTP, p. 81.

[131] Final LTP, p. 83.

party oversight. Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) states that by "adopting a Reference Case that shows continued gas demand growth through 2050, the [Supplement] disregards statutory mandates to reduce emissions and electrify building heat", which undermines the credibility of the Supplement's demand projections and its case for NESE.[132]

PA indicates the inclusion of NESE and ExC will provide National Grid with a sizeable amount of capacity to meet potential growth and increase the resiliency of the Downstate gas system. NESE's additional capacity has the potential to enable the Company to reduce its reliance on CNG, which is a "risk-prone and expensive supply component."[133] If both ExC and NESE are constructed, National Grid may be able to reduce its reliance on, and potentially retire, three CNG injection sites.

PA states that firm pipeline capacity should increase the resiliency of the Downstate gas system by providing it with greater flexibility to address potential outages from older pipelines or potential failures.[134] ExC serves a different need, which NESE is unable to meet, by providing supply to the eastern Long Island portion of the Downstate gas system. With NESE and ExC in service, under the 2025 Forecast Reference Case, National Grid is able to meet is design day demand through the study period.

The Commission recognizes that some stakeholders note that New York State and especially New York City have decarbonization goals that emphasize the need for electrification of space heating in buildings. At this time, homeowners still have a choice of heating fuels, and the need to

[132] NRDC Comments on Supplement, p. 13.

[133] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 21.

[134] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 21.

ensure reliability and safety requires that a gas utility plan for current reasonable forecasts of demand growth until such time as there is confidence in forecasts of demand growth ending. The following sections specifically address the Greenpoint LNG facility and Northeast Supply Enhancement project.

1. Northeast Supply Enhancement Project

Richmond, New York, Kings, Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties are situated on islands. Various submarine pipelines supply natural gas to the distribution system serving residential and commercial customers in those counties. For example, the Lower New York Bay Lateral pipeline conveys gas from Morgan, New Jersey, under Raritan Bay and Lower New York Bay, on to Long Beach, New York. Other submarine pipelines traverse the Arthur Kill, the Narrows, the Hudson River, the East River, and Long Island Sound.[135]

Following construction of the Lower New York Bay Lateral, Transco developed, constructed, and completed the Rockaway Delivery Lateral in December 2015, which enabled Transco to make deliveries into National Grid's New York City distribution system at a new delivery point on the Rockaway Peninsula in Queens County, New York.[136] The project included

[135] See U.S. Dept. of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Ocean Service Coast Survey, Map 12327, New York Harbor, 109th Edition, January 2020 (last correction August 16, 2023); id. Map 12350, Jamaica Bay and Rockaway Inlet, 62nd Edition, February 2019 (last correction August 9, 2023); id., Map 12352, Shinnecock Bay to East Rockaway Inlet, 36th Edition, May 2020, Page "H" (last correction July 25, 2023); see also, N.Y. Dept. of State, Geographic Information Gateway, Natural Gas Interstate and Intrastate Pipelines (accessed Sept. 9, 2025).

[136] See generally, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New York District, Public Notice, NAN-2012-00582-EHA, issued October 4, 2013), at 3 (describing Rockaway Delivery Lateral Project).

the addition of the offshore Rockaway Transfer Point connecting the Lower New York Bay Lateral and the Rockaway Delivery Lateral. The Rockaway Delivery Lateral takes gas from the Lower New York Bay Lateral on the Transco system, which as noted begins in New Jersey and ends at Long Beach on Long Island's south shore. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) issued a section 401(c) water quality permit for the Rockaway Delivery Lateral on May 19, 2014, and determined the project met all New York State water quality standards.[137] In addition, the U.S. Congress passed the "New York City Natural Gas Supply Enhancement Act." That legislation, signed into law by President Barack Obama, allowed construction and operation of natural gas pipeline facilities in the Gateway National Recreation Area, thereby permitting the construction of the Rockaway Delivery Lateral.[138]

As noted above, Transco renewed its request for authorization to construct the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, which would add compression to an existing station and reinforce existing pipe in Pennsylvania, construct a compressor station and reinforce pipe in New Jersey, and add pipe to loop the already-existing Lower New York Bay Lateral, which would reinforce Transco's connection from New Jersey to New York. NESE would provide 400,000 Dt/day of firm pipeline supply into the Downstate natural gas system via the Rockaway Transfer Point. The proposed offshore segment would include 23 miles of submarine pipe running from Morgan, New Jersey, under Raritan Bay and Lower New York Bay, and connecting with the existing

[137] NYSDEC Section 401 Water Quality Certification, Permit ID #2-6309-00115 (effective date May 19, 2014).

[138] Public Law 112-197 (112th Congress), 126 Stat. 1461 (November 27, 2012).

Rockaway Transfer Point.[139] Williams, Transco's owner, represents that it is "answering the call for energy reliability, security, and affordability, both domestically and internationally, while setting near-term goals for decarbonization that promote accuracy, transparency, and accountability."[140]

FERC granted the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project a certificate of public convenience and necessity on August 28, 2025.[141] In doing so, FERC noted that NESE would help ease supply shortfalls and pipeline capacity constraints in the New York City area. NESE also requires permits from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, and an Article 15 permit and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the NYSDEC for potential impacts to the State's waters. NYSDEC provided a public comment period regarding the New York permit applications that ended on August 16, 2025. In its Supplement, National Grid provided analysis explaining that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project will benefit New York by improving the reliability of the Downstate natural gas system and reducing wholesale electric costs.

The Commission does not have a formal regulatory permitting role to grant authority to construct the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project in Lower New York Bay. The Commission's primary statutory duty is to ensure that utilities, including gas corporations, operating in New York State are able to and do provide safe, adequate, and reliable utility service to their customers. We discuss this imperative throughout this

---

[139] FERC, Order Issuing Certificate, 192 FERC ¶61,184, at P 4 (August 28, 2025).

[140] https://www.williams.com/sustainability/climate-commitment/

[141] 192 FERC ¶61,184.

Order and find it appropriate to consider the NESE project in that context. As explained further below, we observe that the proposed Northeast Supply Enhancement Project is needed to ensure the continued provision of safe, adequate, and reliable gas service to customers in New York City and on Long Island.

The New York City and Long Island natural gas system has reliability concerns due to supply constraints. These constraints are due to inadequate pipeline capacity.[142] The constraints result in limited supply, which poses challenges during extreme winter conditions.[143] The need for natural gas is at its highest during the winter which exacerbates this challenge. Currently, National Grid relies on LNG, CNG, delivered services, and peaking supplies to meet any supply shortfall during the winter season. Additionally, although Con Edison and National Grid are able to exchange supply through the NYFS, there are limits to this arrangement. Con Edison cannot increase gas volumes to National Grid on a design day without jeopardizing Con Edison's own gas system and customers.[144]

National Grid and Con Edison have undertaken years-long efforts to address reliability concerns including, but not limited to, meeting forecasted design day demand through a number of programs to reduce demand on their distribution systems and through working with interstate pipeline companies to increase firm capacity into the Downstate gas system. These efforts have included the Texas Eastern delivery lateral into lower Manhattan in 2013; the Tennessee upgrade project in Pennsylvania and New Jersey in 2023, which brings firm gas supply into Westchester and allowed Con Edison to retire its CNG

[142] PA Final Report, p. 70.

[143] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 13.

[144] PA Final Report, p. 71.

facility in Yonkers; and the Iroquois Expansion by Compression project that would benefit both National Grid and Con Edison in 2027.

In 2017, Transco first submitted a Water Quality Certification application to NYSDEC for a permit necessary to construct NESE. NYSDEC denied that application without prejudice in April 2018. Transco submitted a new application in May 2018, which NYSDEC also denied without prejudice on May 15, 2019.[145] That same day, National Grid announced a moratorium on new gas service installations in its KEDNY and KEDLI service territories, as National Grid asserted it had no other options to serve the anticipated increased demand for gas supply.[146] Transco submitted a third application on May 17, 2019, which NYSDEC denied in May 2020.[147]

The Commission instituted a proceeding, Case 19-G-0678, to investigate National Grid's denials of service requests pursuant to this moratorium, which resulted in a negotiated settlement whereby National Grid agreed to lift the moratorium and to submit a Long-Term Capacity Report (2020 Report) in which the Company would analyze, "all reasonable available options, including pipeline construction, Liquefied Natural Gas and CNG facilities, renewable energy resources, and conservation strategies."[148] National Grid's 2020 Report included all these

[145] NYSDEC ID 2-9902-00109/00006, Notice of Denial of Water Quality Certification (issued May 15, 2020).

[146] Case 19-G-0678, Investigation of Denials of Service Requests by National Grid USA, KEDNY, and KEDLI, Order Instituting Proceeding and to Show Cause (issued October 11, 2019), p. 1.

[147] NYSDEC ID 2-9902-00109/00006, Notice of Denial of Water Quality Certification (issued May 15, 2020).

[148] Case 19-G-0678, supra, Order Adopting and Approving Settlement (issued November 26, 2019), p. 5. The Order provided for an Independent Monitor to review National Grid's actions.

elements and was reviewed by an Independent Monitor appointed by the Department for the purpose of evaluating National Grid's compliance with the negotiated settlement.[149] National Grid's 2020 Report included descriptions of its previous use of CNG and indicated that the Company sought to expand this use to additional locations.[150] The Company now has five CNG sites Downstate.

Overlapping with these events, National Grid had filed rate cases for its KEDNY and KEDLI service territories in late April 2019. These cases culminated in a joint proposal that the Commission adopted in August 2021.[151] The Commission's 2021 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order required National Grid to pursue significant demand response, electrification opportunities, and NPAs encapsulated in the "Capacity Demand Metrics" in an effort to offset demand and forestall the need for certain "Capacity Demand Projects."[152] By Rate Year 2 of that rate plan, the 12 months that ended March 31, 2022, National Grid had met or exceeded the annual targets for all five metrics demonstrating its efforts to address reliability concerns through mitigating demand.[153] Additionally, we note that the spread of the Covid pandemic beginning in 2020 dampened design day demand growth in National Grid's service territory.

---

[149] Case 19-G-0678, supra, National Grid Monitorship: Closing Report (filed September 14, 2021), pp. 2-18.

[150] Case 19-G-0678, supra, Natural Gas Long Term Capacity Report (filed February 24, 2020), p. 104.

[151] Cases 19-G-0309 et al., supra, Order Approving Joint Proposal, as Modified, and Imposing Additional Requirements (issued August 12, 2021) (2021 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order).

[152] 2021 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order, pp. 113-116.

[153] Cases 19-G-0309 et al., supra, Greenpoint Vaporizers 13 & 14 Long Term Capacity Project Report (filed August 29, 2022), p. 40.

Despite National Grid's pursuit of non-pipeline supply solutions, such as CNG, and demand mitigation efforts, and despite the impact of external forces such as the Covid pandemic, the Independent Monitor found in his 2021 final report that:

> Despite substantive improvements on multiple fronts by National Grid, the alarming possibility nonetheless remains that National Grid's plans and projects underway toward meeting forecasted demand with sufficient supply capacity will fall short.[154]

Now almost four years since the Independent Monitor's final report, we see that, despite National Grid advancing several supply-side and demand-side options for alleviating anticipated concerns, these solutions have yet to provide the reliability benefits for gas customers in the Downstate service territories that would have been provided by the Northeast Enhancement Supply Project.

Indeed, in the intervening time, the experience with Winter Storm Elliot in late December 2022 further demonstrated the critical importance of ensuring the reliability of the gas system in New York City and Long Island and the New York residential and commercial customers that depend on that system. In FERC's 2023 report on Winter Storm Elliott (FERC Report), FERC found that the storm primarily affected natural gas production in the Marcellus and Utica Shale formations. FERC observed that:

(1) Marcellus Shale production volumes reached a low of 21,856 MDt/day on December 24, 2022 (a 23 percent decrease compared to maximum production on December 19);

(2) Utica Shale production volumes reached a low of 3,017 MDt/day on December 26, 2022 (a 54 percent

[154] Case 19-G-0678, supra, National Grid Monitorship: Closing Report (filed September 14, 2021), p. 1.

decrease compared to maximum production on December 19); and

(3) the largest natural gas production decreases in the Event Area occurred in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia – whereas Louisiana production remained relatively unaffected.[155]

FERC also stated that Con Edison faced low pressures that threatened reliability and had Con Edison not activated its LNG facility and taken other emergency measures, or had the cold weather lasted longer, it could have faced large scale outages.[156] At a session of the Public Service Commission held on October 12, 2023, Staff reported to the Commission that the New York City and Long Island region experienced the greatest impact of the supply cuts during Winter Storm Elliott.[157] The presentation addressed the steps National Grid and Con Edison took to maintain system reliability. As a result of the cold temperatures National Grid and Con Edison required their interruptible customers – including power generators - to transition to alternate fuels. Additionally, National Grid and Con Edison had developed contingency plans, which they implemented before and during the event. These contingency plans entailed calling on available gas supply from other pipelines, running LNG plants, and taking the extraordinary step of coordinating a public appeal for the reduced use of natural gas.[158] Had the supply reductions continued, National Grid and Con Edison's final available action would have been to curtail – meaning shut off – firm customers.

[155] FERC, Winter Storm Elliott Report, p. 110.

[156] FERC, Winter Storm Elliott Report, p. 12.

[157] Commission Session, October 12, 2023, Transcript, pp. 168-172, 223-224.

[158] Commission Session, October 12, 2023, Transcript, p. 169.

Even though, ultimately, these efforts to curb demand and fully utilizing available resources enabled National Grid and Con Edison to maintain service to their customers during Elliot, it is important to stress just how close the New York City and Long Island gas system came in December 2022 to suffering a catastrophic disruption that could have led to significant customer curtailments. The critical significance of this close call is further underscored by the fact that the system and weather were not near a design day. During the event, National Grid was less than 30 minutes from initiating curtailments of natural gas to an initial group of 30,000 customers, a first step in a series of actions that could have left many of the over 5 million households in New York City and Long Island without natural gas – potentially for months.[159] Once pressure from the pipelines began increasing, the company was able to avoid this action.

Unlike restoring service on the electric system after an outage, reinstating natural gas service after curtailment is a complex process involving visiting every location with gas service to ensure service is safely shut off prior to the reintroduction of natural gas to prevent accidental leakage, and revisiting every location to re-light the appliances when service is restored.[160] This process can take days, weeks, or months depending on how many customers were impacted, may require importing workers from other utilities, requires coordination with law enforcement and locksmiths to access unoccupied homes and businesses, and will impose significant financial costs on the utility, its customers, and the local

[159] Ross Turrini, Chief Operating Officer of New York Gas, National Grid, presentation to New York State Energy Planning Board, May 27, 2025.

[160] Commission Session, October 12, 2023, Transcript, p. 170.

economy. Extended outages and time-consuming restart efforts can potentially lead to property damage from frozen pipes, and hypothermia or other threats to human health and safety in very cold weather.

Multiple examples exist of the time consuming and costly ordeal of restoring gas service after a system outage. Recently, on February 19, 2025, Con Edison had to curtail gas service to 1,077 customers in the Williamsbridge neighborhood in the Bronx following a water main break that impacted gas mains. It took eight days to restore service to those 1,077 customers. One customer reported that it felt warmer outside than inside his home.[161] Fortunately, while it was below freezing at the start of the outage, temperatures in New York City over the eight-day period gradually rose to a high of approximately 57 degrees. By luck, this was an inconvenient but not dangerous heating outage.[162]

Additionally, during the winter of 2019, Aquidneck Island in southeast Rhode Island experienced a natural gas outage because of a low-pressure condition, which caused customers to lose service. The outage lasted seven days, causing the governor to declare a state of emergency.[163] It was

[161] News 12 the Bronx, 'It's Warmer Outside than Inside.' Williamsbridge Residents Without Heat After Water Main Break (February 20, 2025), available at: https://bronx.news12.com/its-warmer-outside-than-inside-williamsbridge-residents-without-heat-after-water-main-break.

[162] National Weather Service daily temperatures in Central Park for February 2025, available at https://www.weather.gov/wrh/Climate?wfo=okx.

[163] State of R.I. Div of Publ. Utilities and Carriers, Investigative Report: Summary Investigation into the Aquidneck Island Gas Service Interruption of January 21, 2019 (issued October 30, 2019) (Rhode Island Investigative Report), p. 4.

reported that 7,455 customers lost service due to the outage.[164] The curtailments were the result of low pressure caused by three related issues: (1) high demand due to the extreme cold weather; (2) shutdown of an LNG facility; and (3) the malfunction of a metering valve.[165] The LNG facility is a peak shaving facility that the utility used to maintain pressure on the system. Restoration of service required requests for mutual aid to assist in the gas relighting process, a laborious house-by-house endeavor. The Rhode Island Investigative Report recognized the danger to citizens and property that would occur from the "sudden return of flow into pilot-driven appliances that lost gas" and observed that a "virtual army of technicians and staff descended on the Newport area to complete the restoration process meter by meter in difficult conditions."[166] The Aquidneck Island outage lasted seven days.[167] The cost to restore customers exceeded $25 million, or an average cost of approximately $3,350 per customer.[168]

In January 2019 there was an outage near Keuka Lake in the Finger Lakes region that started on January 21 and ended on January 23 and impacted over 600 customers. Complicating the relights of impacted services was cold weather and snowpack. The wintertime restoration process, which took three days to complete, required over one hundred experienced personnel working on the effort to reestablish heating for those customers.

[164] Rhode Island Investigative Report, p. 4.

[165] Rhode Island Investigative Report, p. 37.

[166] Rhode Island Investigative Report, pp. 33, 67.

[167] Rhode Island Investigative Report, p. 4.

[168] Rhode Island Investigative Report, p. 70.

Using the experience from the Aquidneck Island incident and considering inflation and relatively high costs in the Downstate New York service territories, if National Grid had to curtail 30,000 customers during Winter Storm Elliott, the costs to retore those customers would likely have exceeded $100 million. In addition to the restoration costs, the loss of heat to this many households during very cold weather would potentially prolong the relighting process experienced in the Rhode Island and Bronx examples by several weeks depending on the number of utility workers, locksmiths, and law enforcement officers available for the restoration.

Thus, the Commission cannot emphasize enough the importance of maintaining the reliability of gas service in the Downstate New York service territories. As proposed, the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would address natural gas system supply constraints and reliability concerns facing the Downstate natural gas system. NESE would alleviate these constraints by providing incremental supply into Brooklyn and, thereby, enhance the reliability of the system for customers.

In the event of a future Elliot-like event, NESE would provide National Grid with additional flexibility, and more time to stabilize the gas system before the Company would have to curtail firm customers. The NESE project would increase reliability by delivering a diverse supply source, which would limit the impact of a disruption to a single supply source. Additionally, as FERC explains in the FERC Report regarding Winter Storm Elliott, line pack is the volume of gas maintained or held within a pipeline system, and the more gas that is "packed" into the pipeline, the higher the pressure. FERC adds that system operators continually manage the amount of gas in their pipelines to ensure that customer demands can be met while

staying within safe and reliable pressure ranges, which vary from pipeline to pipeline.[169]

In its comments, Sane states that NESE will not provide supply diversity because it will "only draw gas from the same supply basin that failed during [Winter Storm Elliott]."[170] Similarly, NRDC states that NESE is a "redundant delivery lateral" that does not address the "real drivers of stress during Winter Storm Elliott … upstream freeze-offs and local distributions limits."[171] Such Stakeholder views, however, do not take into consideration the fact that NESE will facilitate access to supply sources throughout the country. Transco's transmission system extends from Texas, Louisiana, and the offshore Gulf of Mexico area, through Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, to its termini in the metropolitan New York City area. Because of this, the natural gas flowing on Transco's system can be sourced from several production regions in the United States, including the Marcellus and Utica shale plays in Appalachia but also production areas onshore and offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. The benefit of this diverse supply source is illustrated in FERC's analysis on Winter Storm Elliott, where FERC points out that the Appalachian production region was significantly affected.[172]

The additional capacity provided by the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would have partially mitigated the adverse operating effects during Winter Storm Elliott resulting from supply cuts. When Transco administers curtailments under

[169] FERC Report, p. 74.

[170] Sane Comments (filed September 8, 2025), p. 5.

[171] NRDC Comments (filed September 8, 2025), p. 13.

[172] FERC Report, p. 19.

conditions of force majeure, such as extreme weather, it does so on an equiproportional basis across the affected supply chain. The additional 400,000 Dt/day provided by NESE would have increased both pressure and supply into the NYFS, all other things being the same.

Additionally, the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would add compression on the Transco system upstream of New York State, which would improve overall system reliability. There have been instances over the years where outages at compressor stations on the interstate pipeline system have reduced natural gas deliveries to parts of New York State, including New York City and Long Island. The additional compression provided by NESE will dilute the impact to National Grid's supply portfolio if a compressor outage occurs. The additional 23 miles of submarine pipe that NESE provides will increase the available line pack, which essentially serves as in-line gas storage. This benefits the overall gas system by stabilizing pressure during adverse events and assisting with efforts to restore the line to the desired service state because line pack represents parts of the pipe where pressure is higher and gas naturally flows from higher pressure to lower pressure, exactly where it is needed. In addition, NESE would run near the existing pipeline and reinforce it. This, in turn, would ensure more consistent pressure at the Transco facilities interconnected to National Grid's distribution system, resulting in more reliable line pressure during cold weather or other high-demand periods. On a design day, line pack and average pressure are key indicators of supply and system reliability, and NESE would improve both.

The Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, if placed into service, would also reduce National Grid's reliance on CNG supply in its Downstate service territory. As discussed above,

after NESE was previously proposed, but not constructed, National Grid added CNG injection sites across its Downstate service territories. The Company relies upon these to ensure reliability in the absence of additional pipeline capacity. Invariably, National Grid is required to rely on CNG when temperatures drop very low. Additionally, National Grid uses CNG for pressure support in the eastern part of the KEDLI service territory.

Because the natural gas system is constrained, National Grid must obtain CNG from outside the Downstate region. This means that the CNG must be trucked over a long distance from sources outside New York City and New York State. Further complicating matters are restrictions preventing the trucking of tankers over bridges and through tunnels leading into New York City, requiring routes that skirt around New York City. Bridges close for truck traffic under windy and icy conditions.[173] National Grid must also request CNG ahead of time, with some requiring two hours' notice and others requiring up to 48 hours' notice to allow for preparing assets, bringing in truck drivers, and accounting for the travel time it takes to reach the CNG injection sites. This combination of factors limits the effectiveness of CNG as a viable resource during emergencies. In the 2024/25 winter season, National Grid contracted for 61,500 Dt/day of CNG. National Grid's reliance on CNG presents operational risks such as truck delivery navigating potential extreme winter weather during the coldest days, trailer availability, and scheduling requirements.[174]

[173] David Meyer, Wild Video Shows Verrazzano Bridge Heaving in 60-mph Winds, New York Post, December 2, 2020, available at: https://nypost.com/2020/12/02/wild-video-shows-verrazzano-bridge-heaving-in-60-mph-winds/.

[174] PA's Final Report, pp. 56 and 70.

Firm pipeline capacity is inherently more reliable than CNG incremental supply.[175] Adding the NESE project's 400,000 Dt/day of firm natural gas capacity to the Downstate system would provide continuous availability. This alleviates the risk associated with relying on CNG supply to fill the gap during peak periods and increase the overall reliability of the Downstate natural gas system. National Grid has projected that the additional gas supply provided by the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project will enable it to curtail its reliance on three of the five CNG sites in its Downstate service territory.[176]

If placed into service, the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project will also provide associated benefits to the Con Edison gas distribution system. The New York Facilities Agreement between National Grid and Con Edison is an important mechanism to balance pressures between the two systems.

In conjunction with the NESE project, National Grid explains it would propose to install additional flow control at the existing Lake Success Metering Facility, which is an interconnection point on NYFS between Con Edison and National Grid. According to National Grid, this flow control will facilitate deliverability of incremental NESE gas and is critical to ensuring National Grid can comply with the New York Facilities Agreement flow limitations. As a result, National Grid states, less gas will be needed to flow from the Con Edison system to the National Grid system on design day, which also improves system supply and reliability for Con Edison. In addition, National Grid indicates that it has a distribution regulator that supports the distribution system in and around

[175] PA's Final Report, p. 55.

[176] Supplement, p. 10.

Jamaica, Queens that experiences pressure fluctuations in hydraulic modeling that would benefit from the additional pressure support provided by NESE. Pressure fluctuations at a regulator station can jeopardize reliable delivery to customers.

Further, National Grid asserts that if NESE is placed in service, the Company expects that the additional supply would negate the design day need for the Greenpoint LNG Facility upgrades to Greenpoint Vaporizers 13/14 as described in the Greenpoint LNG Facility section of this order. The Company adds that if the Greenpoint LNG Facility were taken offline for maintenance, there would be no alternate local source of supply for the KEDNY network and NESE could serve as a partial contingency in that context.[177] For the Holtsville LNG plant the Company can utilize CNG as a backup to "offset a portion of daily output during non-peak periods or in the event of delays," however this option does not exist for the Greenpoint LNG Facility.[178] In its 2019 rate case filing, National Grid proposed a tank modernization project to empty Tank #2 at the Greenpoint LNG Facility, which was put in service in 1971, to perform a major tank upgrade but added that proceeding with that project was dependent on the NESE project.[179] Thus, NESE, if constructed, would provide more flexibility regarding the future of the Greenpoint LNG Facility. At the same time, we acknowledge that PA states that supply from the Greenpoint LNG Facility is delivered to some customers locally as well as to multiple regulator stations for further distribution to customers and any consideration of decommissioning the

[177] Supplement, p. 30.

[178] Supplement, p. 30.

[179] Cases 19-G-0309 et al., KEDNY and KEDLI - Rates, Direct Testimony of Gas Infrastructure and Operations Panel (filed April 30, 2019), p. 92.

Greenpoint LNG Facility would need to entail detailed hydraulic analysis of how the distribution system operates under a variety of conditions. As discussed in more detail in the next section, if NESE is permitted and constructed, it would allow further consideration of scenarios for decommissioning the Greenpoint LNG Facility.

Of course, we recognize that obtaining these gas system reliability benefits results in costs that would need to be recovered from National Grid's Downstate customers. National Grid estimates that NESE would result in the average National Grid residential gas customer's bill increasing by about 3.5 percent, or about $7.50 per month, after factoring in reduced expenditures for CNG and peaking assets that will be unneeded as soon as NESE begins service.[180] National Grid would recover the costs of NESE capacity through the gas adjustment portion of customers' bills along with all other pipeline demand charges. As noted above, FERC has reissued the certificate of public convenience and necessity for the NESE project. The authorized costs that a developer may recover for interstate gas transmission projects are reviewed and established by the federal government. Consistent with the Natural Gas Act enacted by Congress, the federal government, through FERC regulation, will set the rates that Transco may charge National Grid to recover the costs of constructing the NESE project.

Additionally, National Grid has identified two on-system projects that the Company asserts would enable maximizing the NESE capacity, the Marine Park regulator station and the Lake Success metering facility. National Grid estimates the costs of these two projects at approximately $55 million, and

[180] Supplement, p. 11.

the Company would seek to include these costs in its capital budgets and recover them through base rates.

Based on these cost estimates, CNY comments that the Commission cannot address NESE outside of a proceeding regarding a "major change" in rates pursuant to PSL §66(12). CNY states that the "requirements of PSL §66 are arguably triggered by National Grid's request to recover the costs of the NESE project."[181] However, the CNY misapprehends the import of this Order regarding National Grid's LTP. At this juncture, we are not authorizing cost recovery for either the NESE demand charges or the costs of the two identified on-system capital projects.

Regarding the NESE demand charges, National Grid has negotiated the rate with Transco, and it will be filed with FERC. All charges National Grid incurs for supply and capacity, such as, but not limited to, the NESE demand charges, are reviewed in the annual audit of gas costs, outside of a delivery rate proceeding.[182] In contrast, the costs of the two identified on-system capital projects are discussed here merely for awareness. If National Grid wishes to pursue cost recovery for those projects, it would need to present information about the projects and propose cost recovery in the context of a future rate proceeding. Thus, our action in this Order neither authorizes the Company to recover any costs in rates nor does it prejudge such future proceedings as may consider that issue. This is consistent with our previous orders regarding other utilities' long-term plans as well.

In this Order, we take note of the costs National Grid projects related to its potential use of the additional capacity NESE would provide. On the other side of the ledger, the NESE

[181] CNY Comments (filed September 5, 2025), p. 7.

[182] Case 22-G-0464, In the Matter of the Filing of Annual Reconciliation of Gas Expenses and Gas Cost Recoveries.

project would also provide significant benefits. While it is difficult to calculate the value of reliable natural gas service, the discussion above indicates the significant costs of having to restore and relight a gas system once its reliability is compromised. Recognizing this context, we address whether the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project is needed to ensure the safe and reliable operation of National Grid's Downstate gas system. Considering the significant reliability benefits NESE would provide to National Grid's distribution system and ultimately to the millions of New Yorkers who depend upon it, we conclude that NESE is needed and that a decision by National Grid's to proceed with it would be appropriate.

Further, we note that there are likely sources of savings for National Grid's gas customers to offset at least a portion of the costs associated with NESE. As mentioned above, National Grid included estimated savings of $34 million in reduced CNG costs and $8 million from an avoided peaking service which offset the gas cost impact of NESE's demand charges for customers. Additional savings are possible as National Grid should be able to shed other costly peaking services when the contracts expire. In addition, it is likely that National Grid will receive incremental revenue from capacity release, off-system sales, and sales to electric generators and interruptible customers. Thus, the gas customer bill impacts National Grid presented are likely the ceiling. We require that National Grid carefully assess all potential savings it can provide to customers to mitigate future bill impacts to the greatest extent possible. Sources of potential savings include expensive supply sources that National Grid asserts it would avoid because of NESE. Also, we require National Grid to identify ways to mitigate bill impacts in its next rate case filing.

In addition to the aforementioned benefits for National Grid's gas customers, the Company provided the LAI Study, which identified benefits NESE can provide for the electric system in New York State, both in terms of improved reliability and through reduced wholesale costs.

Regarding reliability, we note that the gas supply constraints into the New York City and Long Island area also impact on electric generation resources and the larger electric system. Several recent reports have highlighted the negative impact of the New York City and Long Island region's constrained natural gas system on the electric system. In the 2025 Power Trends Report, the NYISO explained that it models operations on the presumption that gas generation will be limited during the winter season because of a constrained gas system.[183] Also, a 2025 Northeast Power Coordinating Council report found that natural gas system constraints make oil-fueled generation "critical to ensure the reliability of the electric system in ... New York."[184]

Both FERC and the NYISO have continued to raise concerns about the potential for significant electric system reliability challenges that could be caused by insufficient gas supply.[185] In its 2025 Power Trends Report, the NYISO highlights how gas-fired electric generation remains critically important to New York's electric grid as it provides essential reliability

[183] 2025 Power Trends Report, p. 11.

[184] Northeast Gas/Electric System Study, Levitan & Associates for the Northeast Power Coordinating Council (January 21, 2025), p. 78.

[185] "Natural gas and electric industry coordination continues to be necessary to address the challenges of preparing for and responding to extreme cold weather." https://www.ferc.gov/media/report-january-2025-arctic-events-system-performance-review-ferc-nerc-and-its-regional

services that are not yet fully replaceable by renewable resources or storage technologies.[186]

As the state retires older fossil-fueled plants to meet decarbonization goals, the remaining gas assets — especially dual-fuel units — offer dispatchability, flexibility, and dependable fuel sources, which are vital for balancing the grid during periods of high demand and when intermittent renewables are not reaching their full capacity or are unavailable.[187] Gas-fired electric generation is particularly crucial during winter, when natural gas constraints can threaten reliability, and dual-fuel units can switch to oil to maintain supply.[188] Based on these assessments it is clear that gas-fired resources will continue to play an essential role in preserving grid reliability throughout the transition to a cleaner energy system.

The impact of the New York City and Long Island region's constrained natural gas system on the electric system has been compounded by recent increases in natural gas use for electric generation outside New York State. Demand for natural gas in the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland Interconnection (PJM) system operator region has increased significantly since NESE was initially proposed and the increasing demand for natural gas upstream of New York State has further constrained the availability of supply, a result that was acutely apparent during Winter Storm Elliott in late 2022. In its Order Issuing Certificate for the NESE project, FERC stated that:

> [w]hile it is true that natural gas supply decreased during Winter Storm Elliott, lower 48 state demand for natural gas set new records: December 23, 2022 demand for gas totaled 162.5 Bcf/d, exceeding the previous

[186] 2025 Power Trends Report, p. 22.

[187] 2025 Power Trends Report, pp. 13-14.

[188] 2025 Power Trends Report, p. 11.

> record daily high of 137.4 Bcf/d set on January 1, 2018. The combination of additional "... demand volumes in conjunction with continuing supply shortfalls" led to low pressures on the interstate pipelines in the Northeast and "exacerbating pipelines" integrity issues was that some generators may have flowed in excess amounts over their confirmed nominations.[189]

NYISO projects that electric demand could increase 4,000 megawatts by 2030,[190] which makes the need for reliable electric generation critically important. Electric usage is expected to rise in the winter due to conversions of home heating, which makes it critically important to have additional gas supply during the winter. The NYISO states that as New York becomes a winter-peaking electric system, the gas supply to electric generation plants is expected to be strained.[191]

Referring to proposed large projects such as major manufacturing facilities, data centers, and chip fabrication plants, the NYISO states that since 2018, the number of load-related interconnection requests have grown from just one project with a proposed 500 MW load to more than 20 requests by spring of 2025, totaling nearly 4,200 MW.[192] As an example of this, it was recently announced that Stonybrook University (located in Suffolk County) will receive funding from New York State over the next three years to support artificial intelligence related efforts.[193] In its comments, the Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis (IEEFA) suggests

---

[189] FERC Docket No. CP17-101-007 et al., Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, Order Issuing Certificate (issued August 28, 2025), p. 19.

[190] 2025 Power Trends Report, p. 5.

[191] 2025 Power Trends Report, p. 22.

[192] 2025 Power Trends Report, p. 26.

[193] https://news.stonybrook.edu/university/governor-hochul-announces-5m-investment-in-ai-at-stony-brook/.

that customers may be placed at risk of subsidizing unneeded or speculative electric costs for data centers, contending that electric utilities are likely overbuilding fossil fuel infrastructure to meet the anticipated demand from data centers."[194] However, we need not rely solely on the forecasts of utilities themselves, as the NYISO's projections demonstrate that it expects an increase in the number of data centers built in New York. NYISO states that the "microchip fabrication and data centers are projected to be major drivers of load growth."[195] Further, NYISO notes that interconnection requests from large loads have "grown dramatically in just a few years," and this "increase in forecast demand poses a major challenge to grid reliability in New York."[196] That the NYISO is concerned about the electric grid's ability to meet the expected load growth from large projects, such as data centers, indicates that there is a real need to address growing electric demand.

Additionally, changes in federal policy have made it more critical to have continued access to natural gas. The Draft State Energy Plan released for public comment on July 23, 2025, highlighted these concerns by stating:

> [t]he federal administration's energy and unpredictable tariff policies bring additional political and regulatory uncertainty, which threatens critical federal support for clean energy development and creates barriers to private investment. This includes the rollback of tax credits provided under the Inflation Reduction Act, planned denial of permits for wind generation, and attempts to remove state based clean car and clean truck rules.[197]

---

[194] Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis Comments (IEEFA Comments) (filed September 5, 2025), p. 16.

[195] 2025 Power Trends Report, p. 6.

[196] 2025 Power Trends Report, p. 6.

[197] Draft New York State Energy Plan, Summary for Policy Makers, p. 3.

Recently, the Commission recognized that the change in federal policy will require it to "rethink the combination of reliability measures that will provide cost-effective solutions in the future."[198]

As proposed, the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would help to address these electric reliability concerns by increasing the natural gas supply to fuel dispatchable electric generation in New York City and Long Island region. The increase in natural gas supply will ensure that electric generators have access to a reliable and steady fuel supply. NESE provides additional resilience to the NYFS, which may allow for a lower minimum required oil burn under the New York State Reliability Council's local reliability rules that are meant to ensure reliability during gas-side contingencies.[199] In addition to increased reliability, the LAI Study estimates that adding the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project would avoid power sector emissions, ranging from approximately 23,200 to 88,800 short tons of CO2e, depending on the level of oil displacement in each year.[200]

Based on the LAI Study, National Grid asserts that this increase in natural gas supply will result in costs savings for New York's electric customers. National Grid projects that retail electric customers will save approximately $670 million a year.[201] Staff estimates the NYISO load-weighted statewide savings are projected to be about $2 to $4 per megawatt-hour

[198] Case 22-E-0633, Proposed Public Policy Transmission Needs-2022, Order Withdrawing Public Policy Transmission Need (issued July 17, 2025), p. 15.

[199] Supplement, LAI Study, p. 10.

[200] Supplement, LAI Study, p. 4. These figures do include 36 short tons of CO2e of emission reductions due to reduced CNG trucking.

[201] Supplement, p. 30.

based on figure 16 on page 35 of the LAI Study and this would equate to about $1.20 to $2.40 per month reduction on a typical 600 kWh bill or between $14 and $29 per year.

In its comments, IEEFA asserts that NESE's construction costs could be 17 percent higher than projected, and costs recovered from customers to support NESE would go to support out-of-state entities.[202] The cost of the project included in Transco's application to FERC, which is the basis of the negotiated rate National Grid will pay, has been adjusted for inflation. In the event NESE goes to construction it is our expectation that National Grid should review the actual costs and continuously to exercise appropriate oversight over costs. Additionally, all stakeholders, including the Department of Public Service may participate in FERC's final review of actual cost to determine the final rate. Further, there are additional ways to offset these costs that we require National Grid to explore and report on, including directing off system sales revenue to benefit ratepayers.

In its comments, NRDC maintains that National Grid gas customers would in effect subsidize electric customers statewide by funding the cost of NESE. Further, NRDC contends that National Grid's "affiliate relationships with gas-fired generators on Long Island ... raise conflict-of interest concerns and demand heightened scrutiny."[203] The Commission takes the issue of affiliate transactions seriously as demonstrated by the strict Corporate Structure and Affiliate Rules that were approved in the 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order.[204] Among other requirements, the Affiliate Rules ensure that

[202] IEEFA Comments (filed September 5, 2025), pp. 7, 8,and 10.

[203] NRDC comments, (filed September 8, 2025), p. 17.

[204] 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order, Attachment 1 (Joint Proposal), Appendix 10.

Department Staff have full access to the books, records, and reports of National Grid's United Kingdom Holding Company, United States Holding Company, and its subsidiaries. Moreover, as noted above, the Commission concludes that NESE is necessary based on its contribution to ensuring that National Grid can continue to provide safe, adequate, and reliable gas service. We discuss the potential benefits to the electric system as incremental to those already sufficient gas reliability benefits.

The LAI Study estimates the average savings in wholesale electric energy prices during winter months in New York City and Long Island in the first five years is $207 million per year, with average savings in Downstate New York over the 15-year period of the contract between National Grid and NESE at $305 million. The LAI Study also estimates the average savings in the Capital District and Lower Hudson Valley in the first five years is $97 million per year and the average savings across NYISO in the first five years is $446 million per year. Overall, the LAI Study estimates the average statewide electric savings is $673 million over the 15-year period.

The Real Estate Board of New York states that NESE is a critical enhancement of Transco's existing infrastructure, and "could not come at a more crucial time for New York City, as it continues to experience significant economic and population growth."[205] The Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, Inc., stated that NESE represents a critical investment in the region's energy infrastructure and "it will help address the growing demand from residents, businesses, and emerging sectors such as high-performance data centers designed for artificial

[205] Real Estate Board of New York Comments, p. 1.

intelligence applications."[206] The New York Building Congress states that with NESE in place, gas that lands on Staten Island stays on Staten Island, and this "strengthens year-round reliability, cushions the system against disruptions at other supply points, and keeps essential facilities running smoothly."[207] The Plumbing Foundation City of New York, Inc., states that "NESE aligns with the state's climate goals by reducing our dependency on oil. It is a pragmatic step forward that balances our immediate energy reliability needs with our long-term sustainability objectives."[208]

To conclude this discussion of the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, it is required to ensure the provision of safe, adequate, and reliable gas service to customers in the New York City and Long Island region for both the Con Edison and National Grid service territories. If implemented as proposed, NESE would alleviate the risks inherent in trucking CNG supplies and provide supply diversity as Transco traverses many production areas in the country. Moreover, NESE would provide reliability benefits to natural gas and electric customers if it goes into service and would reduce electricity prices in the winter when natural gas is relied upon to generate electricity, and this dampening of prices should serve to make electrification options more attractive. National Grid is directed to report in its next long-term plan on the more expensive and/or less reliable supply sources that it will avoid as a result of NESE, if it is approved and constructed, and quantify those savings. National Grid will need to right-size its supply stack and consider what supply sources it may not

[206] Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance comments, p. 1.

[207] New York Building Congress comments, p. 1.

[208] Plumbing Foundation City of New York comments, p. 2.

need to retain. In addition, National Grid is directed to provide ways to mitigate bill impacts when it files its next rate case, including potential increased revenues from off-system sales, capacity release, electric generators, and interruptible gas customers. These additional sources of revenue can be used to reduce the bills paid by firm ratepayers. Based on the current state of the record in this proceeding, we conclude it is appropriate for National Grid to seek capacity on NESE. However, as noted above, this Order does not prejudge questions of cost recovery, which can be addressed in the appropriate future proceedings. Further, we note that the NESE project has yet to receive all necessary permits or begin construction. For that reason, National Grid is directed to develop a plan to reduce reliance on its risk prone, less reliable, capacity assets as noted in this Order and file that plan within 120 days of any decision by Transco to abandon the project or by November 1, 2028, whichever comes first.

2. Greenpoint LNG Facility

The 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order required National Grid to include specific information regarding Greenpoint in the LTP, which would "permit a comprehensive review of the necessity of the Greenpoint EC facility to continue to support gas system reliability."[209] The specific information regarding Greenpoint included: demand and supply forecasts justifying the need for the facility; an analysis of the gas supply benefits and costs associated with the facility; an estimate of the reduction in the number of customers who could be served on a peak demand day if the facility is retired; a safety and reliability analysis; and a comparison of alternatives to Greenpoint."[210]

[209] 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order, p. 76.

[210] 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order, p. 76.

PA reviewed the information that National Grid supplied concerning Greenpoint and provided its analysis concerning the need for the facility. In its Report on the Supplement, PA assumed no added capacity from upgrades to the Greenpoint facility and a constant contribution to the design day supply stack using current levels. Based on its analysis, PA states that Greenpoint's benefits as a supply and reliability resource to the New York – Long Island area outweigh the risks associated with the facility's retirement.[211] Under the Reference Case, PA states that the current Greenpoint vaporizers will be required to meet design day needs. While PA states that Greenpoint could be decommissioned by 2034/35 under the AE and CEV scenarios, this only considers how Greenpoint contributes to National Grid's supply needs to meet Design Day demand. Further, PA said that the "Greenpoint LNG facility must also be considered in the context of service reliability."[212]

Although PA's analysis raises questions as to whether current alternatives can fill the need that Greenpoint now meets, the introduction of NESE to National Grid's supply portfolio raises the possibility that Greenpoint could be considered for decommissioning in the future. PA acknowledges that supply-side alternatives such as CNG could provide a buffer to the reliance on the Greenpoint LNG facility but cannot act as a full replacement. With regard to DSM programs replacing (or offsetting the need for) Greenpoint LNG, PA states that the historical trend indicates that these measures are also not feasible replacements and while DSM programs continue to develop, many rely on willing and consistent participation by customers, and thus are outside of the direct control of the

[211] PA Final Report, p. 79.

[212] PA Final Report, p. 25.

Company. Further, DSM programs likely will not be able to offset the natural demand growth that is occurring within the KEDNY service area in the near or even medium term. Regarding the possibility of fully shutting down Greenpoint, PA concludes that is unlikely before 2050 because National Grid is obligated to provide service without interruption.[213] If NESE comes online, its actual impact on the Downstate natural gas system will need further analysis to assess the possibility of retiring the Greenpoint LNG facility.

PA's analysis of Greenpoint also focused on the facility's Capex. Concerning Capex, PA states the Company cannot delay making the forecasted capital investments in Greenpoint's current assets.[214] National Grid's Capex forecast for Greenpoint focuses on projects that will enable the facility to act as both as source of supply and a reliability asset for the Downstate gas system. National Grid's Downstate LNG facilities, Greenpoint and Holtsville, serve as a crucial reliability asset, which provide needed supply and help to maintain system pressure during extreme weather events. The unavailability of these LNG facilities during an extreme weather event, coupled with the lack of suitable replacements, could lead to catastrophic results including, loss of life, personal injury, and extensive property damage.[215]

PA also recommends that National Grid provide a more comprehensive evaluation of Greenpoint's health and environmental impacts on nearby communities in future iterations of the LTP. In this proceeding, the Company limited its analysis of health impacts to a consideration of the impact on

[213] PA Final Report, p. 25.

[214] PA Final Report, p. 79.

[215] PA Final Report, p. 79.

health from the loss of service during an extreme weather event.[216] Regarding environmental impacts, National Grid did indicate that Greenpoint's retirement would lead to a reduction in localized pollutants, but did not provide additional context. Further, the Company provided a limited overview of Greenpoint's land use impacts, but PA indicated that National Grid should provide additional detail concerning Greenpoint's land use impacts on nearby communities in its future LTPs. Also, PA recommended that the Company explain how Greenpoint's operation impacts the average customer's bill and provide a comparison to the impacts of CNG, firm pipeline contracts, and delivered services.

PA had previously completed a report regarding National Grid's proposal to add Vaporizers 13 and 14 to the Greenpoint LNG facility in 2022.[217] In the 2022 Greenpoint Vaporizer Report, PA explained that some of the vaporizers at the Greenpoint LNG facility are connected to the 350 pounds per square inch gas gauge (psig) system, whereas others are connected to the 60 psig system. The distinction is important because the 60 psig system is the local distribution system, which serves the neighborhoods near the Greenpoint facility. The 350 psig system is part of the NYFS, which provides pressure support for the entire New York City and western Long Island gas system, but is also crucial for ensuring reliability in neighborhoods surrounding the Greenpoint LNG Facility in Brooklyn and Queens.

In its Final LTP, the Company listed alternatives to the Greenpoint LNG Facility. On the supply side, these included

[216] PA Final Report, p. 81.

[217] Cases 19-G-0309 et al., KEDNY/KEDLI – Rates, PA Consulting's Review of National Grid's Greenpoint Vaporizer 13 & 14 Report (filed October 27, 2022) (2022 Greenpoint Vaporizer Report).

LNG trailer trucks, CNG injection stations, RNG, and hydrogen. Each of these alternatives face significant hurdles. The Company estimates that it would cost about $850 million dollars to develop enough CNG to replace the Greenpoint LNG Facility. Also, LNG trucking faces significant regulatory hurdles because New York City's transportation regulations prohibit LNG transportation in cargo tanks.[218] The current scale of RNG and hydrogen production is not yet sufficient to replace the need for LNG facilities. As options to reduce demand, the Company identified energy efficiency, demand response programs, and heat pumps.[219] The Company estimates that over 291,000 households would have to fully electrify to replace the design day capacity of the Greenpoint LNG Facility, at an estimated cost of over $9 billion based on costs per customer ranging from about $28,000 to $45,000.[220] In its Final LTP, the Company maintains that its "analyses confirm that the Greenpoint LNG Facility Vaporizer 13 & 14 Project remains the best available solution to address the projected supply-demand gap in the time required and is consistent with New York's Net Zero goals."[221]

PA analyzed the available data concerning substitutes for the LNG supply. While PA's analysis found that supply-side alternatives such as CNG could provide a buffer to the use of LNG from the Greenpoint LNG Facility, they cannot serve as a full replacement.[222] Further, regarding the ability of DSM programs to replace the Greenpoint LNG Facility, PA states that historical trends indicate they are not feasible. DSM programs

[218] Final LTP, P. 141.

[219] Final LTP, p. 131.

[220] Final LTP, P. 135.

[221] Final LTP, p. 85.

[222] PA Final Report, p. 80.

are reliant on the actions of customers and are not controllable by National Grid. However, PA acknowledges that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project's additional supply "will provide National Grid with more peak day operational reliability and market flexibility."[223] PA recommends that, in future LTP filings, the Company better quantify the costs associated with the Greenpoint LNG Facility assets, and ensure that those costs can be compared against potential alternatives on a $/Dt of capacity basis. Further, PA states that quantifying the Greenpoint LNG Facility costs on this basis may help stakeholders understand if the Greenpoint LNG Facility is expensive compared to alternatives.

In the Supplement, National Grid states that its rapid deployment of LNG supplies at the Greenpoint LNG Facility narrowly avoided customer outages from Winter Storm Elliott in December 2022. Although National Grid acknowledges that NESE negates the design day supply need for the Vaporizers 13 and 14 project, the Company contends the vaporizers would still provide system reliability benefits. National Grid also states that NESE could serve as a partial contingency source of supply which would enable the Greenpoint LNG Facility to be taken offline for maintenance.[224] NESE's ability to serve as a partial contingency for the Greenpoint LNG Facility, even if National Grid only identifies it within the limited context of maintenance activities at Greenpoint LNG Facility, does raise the possibility that NESE may be able to support the permanent decommissioning of the Greenpoint LNG facility in the future, which we address in more detail in the following pages. Further, the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, if it is

[223] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 16.

[224] Supplement, p. 30.

constructed, would provide significantly more supply volume than Vaporizers 13 and 14 and provides longer duration resilience benefits to meet demand, which negates the need for Vaporizers 13 and 14 based on the updated 2025 demand forecast.

NESE, if it is constructed, will significantly improve the supply of natural gas to the Downstate gas system and improve the system's reliability, which may address the risks associated with shutting down the Greenpoint LNG Facility based on the data contained in the 2025 demand forecast. National Grid projects that NESE will increase firm gas supply by 13 percent to the Downstate gas system. National Grid explained how the additional supply path provided by NESE would have helped alleviate the reliability concerns caused by Winter Storm Elliott. The Company states that "the existence of a parallel path to the Rockaway Delivery Lateral would have delayed pressure degradation and created additional time to respond to worsening conditions."[225] Based on NESE's projected supply and reliability benefits, and the 2025 Demand forecast it is reasonable to consider whether NESE may be able to serve as a replacement for the Greenpoint LNG Facility in the future.

Several stakeholders submitted comments concerning the Greenpoint LNG Facility. Senator Julia Salazar states that we should be planning to shut down the Greenpoint LNG Facility and remediate the site for public benefit.[226] Community Board No. 1 states that the Commission should reject the Company's claims for prolonging the life of its LNG depot at the Greenpoint LNG Facility.[227] Newtown Creek Alliance expresses concern with the continued existence of the two LNG tanks and states that they

[225] Supplement, p. 30.

[226] Senator Salazar Comments (filed April 21, 2025), p. 2.

[227] Community Board No. 1 Comments (filed April 23, 2025), p. 3.

will impede the efforts to properly remediate the Newtown Creek, a federal Superfund Site for which National Grid is a primary Potentially Responsible Party.[228]

Additionally, Sane requests that the Commission require National Grid to submit a decommissioning plan for the Greenpoint LNG Facility that aligns with the CLCPA and PA's findings. Sane also requests that the Commission disallow all investments in the Greenpoint LNG Facility because they are likely to become stranded.[229] However, Sane's comment is not applicable here because the Commission is not considering or authorizing cost recovery in this Order. That said, for planning purposes, the Commission notes that utilities must consider the risk of stranded assets and right-size their supply stack investments accordingly, while continuing to make the necessary investments for maintaining safe and adequate service. Further, Margot Spindelman proposes that the Commission convene a Community Advisory Group, including neighborhood stakeholders to chart a path forward for the Greenpoint LNG Facility. Also, the Sierra Club comments that the LTP's "are well structured to pilot initial utility efforts to begin to prune the gas system."[230] The Commission agrees that it is reasonable to consider which parts of the gas system may no longer be needed. To that end, it is appropriate to consider whether the addition of NESE, if it is approved, will enable National Grid to decommission the Greenpoint LNG Facility.

PA states that the Greenpoint LNG Facility should be considered in the context of service reliability and also considers it unlikely that the Greenpoint LNG Facility may be

[228] Newtown Creek Alliance comments, p. 4.

[229] Sane Comments (filed September 8, 2025), p. 1.

[230] Sierra Club Comments (filed September 5, 2025), p. 32.

shut down before 2050 due to the Company's obligation to provide service without interruption.[231] However, the addition of NESE to National Grid's supply portfolio would provide supply and reliability benefits that could address the risks associated with decommissioning of the Greenpoint LNG Facility.

The need to assure reliable natural gas service in New York City requires that the Greenpoint LNG Facility continue to function for the near term, however the possibility that NESE may enable the Greenpoint LNG Facility to be decommissioned at some point should be explored. While some stakeholders contend that the Commission should initiate the process to decommission the Greenpoint LNG Facility in this Order, the record in this proceeding demonstrates that the Greenpoint LNG Facility serves a reliability need that cannot be met elsewhere for the time being. There is currently not a viable alternative that can provide a similar level of reliability benefits as the Greenpoint LNG Facility. However, National Grid's annual LTP updates will provide critical information concerning potential changes to the Downstate system's supply, demand, and reliability needs. In that context, we expect National Grid to address whether the future need for the Greenpoint LNG Facility has changed. Additionally, understanding NESE's actual impact on the supply and reliability of the Downstate gas system, if it is approved, will be critical to understanding whether NESE may allow for the decommissioning of the Greenpoint LNG Facility under real world conditions.

The Commission also agrees with commenters that increased interaction between National Grid and community members would provide opportunities to discuss and address local stakeholders' environmental and health concerns and help inform

[231] PA Final Report, p. 25.

National Grid's operations and plans at the Greenpoint LNG Facility. National Grid is directed to contact Community Board No. 1 to determine when and how it can take part in its meetings. Based on its discussions with Community Board No. 1, National Grid shall develop a plan for interaction with it and file the plan with the Secretary within 90 days of the date of this Order. This already established and interested group can provide a conduit for National Grid to hear the community's concerns and attempt to address those concerns. Additionally, National Grid is directed to file a report with the Secretary to the Commission summarizing every Community Board No.1 meeting that it attends within 30 days of the meeting. National Grid is also directed to file information in its first annual update to this LTP on the impact to the environment of the local community from operation of the Greenpoint LNG Facility and information comparing the cost of LNG per Dt compared to other components of the supply stack, such as CNG and delivered services. Finally, in its next LTP filing, the Company is directed to include comprehensive analysis, including demand-side and supply-side alternatives with detailed and verified cost estimates, concerning NESE's ability to serve as a replacement for the Greenpoint LNG Facility and what would be required to ensure that NESE may allow for decommissioning of the Greenpoint LNG Facility, taking into consideration the most recent available forecasts for gas load growth and electrification efforts.

Low Carbon Fuels

1. Renewable Natural Gas

As the Planning Order notes, RNG remains a developing issue, and it should remain in consideration for planning purposes. The Commission also stated that each LDC should identify the potential for use of RNG in its long-term plan and the larger questions of studies or trading programs for RNG

would be deferred to a future phase of the Gas Planning Proceeding.[232] National Grid's CEV scenario features a "100 percent fossil-free gas network" where National Grid asserts it will eliminate fossil fuels from the existing gas network by 2050.[233] The Company anticipates accomplishing this by delivering significant amounts of RNG and green hydrogen to customers. The AE scenario assumes the use of RNG but in a more limited capacity than in the CEV scenario.

National Grid states that it currently receives RNG from the Newtown Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility, and the Company also anticipates the completion of an anaerobic digestion waste-to-energy facility on Long Island. This facility will be owned and operated by American Organic Energy, LLC. The Company states there are four additional RNG projects being developed in its Downstate service territories. These five projects are expected to collectively inject approximately 5,350 Dt/day, along with four RNG projects being developed in the NMPC territory totaling 2,200 Dt/day.

National Grid contracted with Guidehouse to conduct a study of RNG supply potential. Guidehouse found that the Company's share of the eastern United States' RNG supply potential would be 7.2 percent in 2050.[234] This is equal to about 83 million Dt to 158 million Dt (low supply case vs. high supply case).[235] National Grid also projects that the cost of RNG will drop significantly in the future. In 2020, RNG cost about $43.53 per Dt. The Company projects that the cost will

[232] Planning Order, p. 57.

[233] Final LTP, p. 18.

[234] Final LTP, p. 70.

[235] TBtu is trillions of Btus, with 1 dekatherm of natural gas equal to one million Btus, meaning 1 TBtu is 1 million dekatherms.

drop to $13.54 per Dt by 2050.[236] National Grid adds that increasing in-state production of RNG will benefit farmers by providing them an additional revenue stream. Also, the Company claims that municipalities will benefit from the production of RNG from wastewater treatment and landfills.[237]

The stakeholders made several comments about RNG. CNY says that the CEV has unreasonable assumptions regarding the availability of RNG and it may only be a viable alternative to natural gas if it is produced locally and used specifically for hard-to-electrify end uses.[238] AGREE states that if National Grid does not acquire and retire the environmental attributes, then any RNG National Grid purchases and delivers to its customers is not environmentally different from fossil gas because someone else who buys and retires the attributes will be claiming the environmental benefit.[239] New Yorkers for Clean Power states that RNG does not provide the projected emissions reductions due to induced production of methane and fugitive emissions.[240]

PA states that RNG will remain a premium product under the most optimistic scenario where the cost of LCFs declines significantly. Further, PA states the cost of LCFs will still be three to six times more than traditional natural gas.[241] PA recommends that National Grid analyze the practicality of securing its projected RNG market share of 7.2 percent of average potential RNG in the eastern United States. Further, PA

[236] Final LTP, p. 72.

[237] Final LTP, p. 166.

[238] CNY Comments (filed April 3, 2025), p. 2.

[239] AGREE Comments (filed December 13, 2024), p. 2.

[240] New Yorkers for Clean Power Comments (filed September 8, 2025), p. 12.

[241] PA Final Report, p. 131.

recommends that the Company determine the price point at which blending RNG is more expensive than heat pumps for space heating in residential and small commercial buildings.[242]

National Grid is directed to include information on the amount of RNG it purchases on an annual basis in its updates to this LTP and in future LTP filings. National Grid is also directed to calculate the price point at which blending RNG becomes more expensive than heat pumps for residential customers and how that compares the prices National Grid is paying for RNG on a per-dekatherm basis for each source of RNG in its next long-term plan filing, and clearly indicate if that price includes environmental attributes.

2. Hydrogen

The Company is also exploring the use of hydrogen for targeted industries and customers. National Grid also states that it expects RNG and green hydrogen to enable it to eliminate fossil fuels from the existing gas network by 2050. National Grid states that the CEV scenario projects that 11 percent of non-residential customers will switch to 100 percent hydrogen gas service by 2050. Further, the CEV scenario projects that hydrogen blending in pipeline gas will reach seven percent of the total blend (by energy) by 2050.[243] The Company states that it may seek Commission approval for hydrogen projects that will demonstrate their practicality and allow for an evaluation of their cost competitive features.[244] Regarding the cost of hydrogen, National Grid refers to a study that estimates the

[242] PA Final Report, p. 154.

[243] Final LTP, p. 41.

[244] Final LTP, p. 74.

cost of hydrogen will decline from $28.95 per Dt in 2020 to $17.81 per Dt in 2050.[245]

Various stakeholders submitted several comments about hydrogen. By way of example, Margot Spindelman contends the Company has been disingenuous when discussing both RNG and hydrogen. Community Board No. 1 recommends rejecting National Grid's "false solutions such as 'renewable natural' gas and hydrogen as viable alternatives to its fracked gas system."[246] CNY states that hydrogen is not currently a viable alternative to natural gas because of its "high costs and the limited knowledge that we, as a State, have on its safety."[247] The Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) states that hydrogen blending presents significant safety, environmental, and health concerns.[248] New Yorkers for Clean Power states that renewable hydrogen is difficult and expensive to produce, poses safety issues, and is less energy efficient than heat pumps.[249]

PA states that hydrogen will be a premium product over the forecast period and will remain costly.[250] PA also mentions that hydrogen has other limitations on its use, which are dictated by technical considerations, such as the maximum safe level of hydrogen blending. Similar to its recommendation regarding RNG, PA recommends that National Grid conduct an analysis to determine the price point at which blending hydrogen is more expensive than heat pumps.[251]

---

[245] Final LTP, p. 74.

[246] Community Board No. 1 comments (filed April 23, 2025), p. 3.

[247] CNY Comments (filed April 3, 2025), p. 2.

[248] EDF Comments (filed April 2, 2025), p. 3.

[249] New Yorkers for Clean Power Comments (filed September 8, 2025), pp. 9-10.

[250] PA Final Report, p. 131.

[251] PA Final Report, p. 154.

As mentioned above, in its final scoping plan the CAC stated that there is a potential role for low carbon fuels for hard to electrify customer sectors. The Commission acknowledges that RNG is already part of the natural gas supply in New York State. National Grid is directed to calculate the price point at which blending hydrogen becomes more expensive than heat pumps for residential customers and how that compares to the prices National Grid is paying for hydrogen on a per dekatherm basis comparable to the heat content of natural gas in its next long-term plan filing. The Commission will consider hydrogen projects if and when the Company may propose them, but shares the concerns of stakeholders regarding the safety and cost of using hydrogen in place of or blended with natural gas for mass market customers.

Peaking Services

The Company states that its Downstate design day load relies on 153 Mdt/day of short-term peaking and cogenerator contracts and NMPC relies on 20 Mdt/day of citygate peaking and 13 Mdt/day of short-term peaking and cogenerator contracts to meet design day load.[252] National Grid states that reliance on these types of contracts exposes the Company, and thus customers, to high city-gate pricing during peak days. The Company explains that this is because the "commodity costs when the peaking services are called upon are often the most expensive in the portfolio."[253] National Grid states that its

[252] Final LTP, pp. xviii and xix. (Some cogenerators allow National Grid to use their firm pipeline capacity to serve core customers during periods of high heating load in exchange for payment. It should be noted that these agreements are based on the assumption that the cogenerator will switch to an alternate fuel during those periods or not be called upon by the Independent System Operator as the electric system is currently summer peaking, but this may change in the future.)

[253] Final LTP, p. 61.

reliance on peaking contracts "reflects a pragmatic approach to modern energy challenges, balancing immediate needs with long-term sustainability and cost-efficiency."[254]

PA observed in its Final Report that the Company changed its supply forecasts in its Final LTP to reflect increased supply from newly acquired firm pipeline and city-gate peaking sources compared to its Revised LTP.[255] In its Final Report, PA references the limitations and risks associated with relying on delivered services and city gate peaking services.[256] In its Report on the Supplement, PA states that if NESE is constructed, National Grid would likely reduce its reliance on costly peaking services.

The Commission notes that delivered and city gate peaking services are an important component of meeting design day demand but are not assets over which the Company has as much control as its LNG, CNG, pipeline, and storage contracts. In its 2027 annual update to the LTP, the Company is directed to provide information quantifying the cost savings that it can achieve from shedding peaking services and CNG contracts, assuming NESE and ExC enter service as currently scheduled. Further, National Grid shall provide updates to that information in subsequent annual updates and future long-term plans as it actually sheds contracts for peaking assets.

Demand Response Programs

The Commission has recognized that the utilities should continue to consider the utilization of interruptible gas service to minimize the need for new infrastructure, but should

[254] Final LTP, p. 63.

[255] PA Final Report, p. 12.

[256] PA Final Report, p. 21.

give priority to the development of innovative clean demand response programs.[257]

National Grid states that its firm demand response programs are "the largest and most comprehensive of such programs in the country."[258] The Company lists load shedding and load shifting programs for commercial customers, a bring-your-own thermostat program for residential customers, and a behavioral demand response program in its Final LTP and states the programs have seen considerable year-over-year increases in customer adoption. The Company also notes that demand response is a flexible resource that it can also call on to reduce peak load during system emergencies, such as during Winter Storm Elliott in December 2022 when National Grid requested that gas demand response customers provide emergency load reductions.

The Commission notes that National Grid has a robust demand response program for both firm and non-firm customers. National Grid should continue to enroll customers in these programs and include updates on their effectiveness in future long-term plan filings.

Energy Efficiency

In the Planning Order, the Commission required that LDCs adjust their demand forecast scenarios to reflect energy efficiency.[259] In its Final LTP, National Grid identified increased energy efficiency savings, stating that under "the state's New Efficiency: New York (NE:NY) transformation of utility energy efficiency programs, National Grid's total annual gas energy efficiency savings have grown year-over-year since

[257] Planning Order, p. 32.

[258] Final LTP, p. 96.

[259] Planning Order, p. 29.

2021."[260] Additionally, the Company states that its energy efficiency programs have achieved almost 13.6 million Dt of annual energy savings and engaged nearly 315,000 participants across its three gas service territories.[261] National Grid states that it created annual energy efficiency projections based on the Company's expected achievement of NE:NY goals through 2025, and basing the 2026 through 2030 annual savings on the Company's proposal in the Energy Efficiency and Building Electrification filing and NYSERDA's Low- and Moderate-Income state programs.[262] After 2030, the Company assumed that annual energy efficiency savings would continue to grow slightly through 2040 and eventually saturate (meaning that annual incremental energy efficiency still occurs, but at a slower rate) later in the forecast period. National Grid states that the current emphasis on strategic energy efficiency and building electrification measures will result in "a large decrease in the amount of annual gas energy efficiency savings that the Company is able to achieve."[263] The Company states that energy efficiency accounts for 2,361 million Dt of demand reduction in both the CEV and AE scenarios between 2024 and 2050 which is more than 3.5 times greater than what it can achieve through current policies, regulations, and market dynamics as it forecasts in the Reference Case. The Company also discusses the use of energy efficiency in addressing vulnerable locations in its Upstate service territory.

---

[260] Final LTP, p. xii.

[261] Final LTP, p. 91.

[262] Case 18-M-0084, In the Matter of a Comprehensive Energy Efficiency Initiative. Proposals filed originally on November 1, 2023, and further supplemented and corrected between January 16 and 25, 2024.

[263] Final LTP, p. 106.

NYSERDA suggests that National Grid should conduct a sensitivity analysis in which costs for energy efficiency decline over time, as National Grid did not assume cost or efficiency changes over time.[264]

Regarding energy efficiency, PA states that electrification, energy efficiency, and DSM measures result in a reduction of volumes of gas delivered and customer count and puts upward pressure on gas rates but "if done properly (i.e., targeted and coordinated electrification), this pathway has the potential to reduce emissions while maintaining affordability."[265] PA encouraged the Company and stakeholders to explore strategies focused on coordinated electrification that could maximize the value of electrification across the service territories.

The Commission recognizes that National Grid has been directed to take certain actions regarding energy efficiency and building electrification, particularly in the implementation of such programs and portfolios for 2026 through 2030.[266] In the Commission's May Orders within the EE/BE Proceedings, the Commission established EE/BE portfolio budgets for all three of National Grid's New York State service territories. Certain incremental and targeted energy efficiency or building

[264] NYSERDA Comments (filed December 13, 2024), pp. 11-12.

[265] PA Final Report, p. 137.

[266] Case 25-M-0248, In the Matter of the 2026-2030 Non-Low- to Moderate-Income Energy Efficiency and Building Electrification Portfolios, Order Authorizing Non-Low- to Moderate-Income Energy Efficiency and Building Electrification Portfolios for 2026-2030 (issued May 15, 2025); and Case 25-M-0249, In the Matter of the 2026-2030 Low- to Moderate-Income Energy Efficiency and Building Electrification Portfolio, Order Authorizing Low- to Moderate-Income Energy Efficiency and Building Electrification Portfolio for 2026–2030 (issued May 15, 2025) (EE/BE Proceedings).

electrification measures may be considered and undertaken by National Grid as part of NPAs, which are discussed later in this Order.

Reliability Standards and Hydraulic Modeling

In the Planning Order, the Commission adopted Staff's recommendations that long-term plans identify the methodology by which LDCs will forecast and measure reliability, and that design day standards be considered in each long-term plan and revalidated in a frequency proposed by the LDC.[267] The Company models a design day average temperature of 0 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) in Central Park, or 65 heating degree days (HDD), for its Downstate service territories. Additionally, National Grid models a design day average temperature of -10°F at Albany and Syracuse airports, or 75 HDDs, for the Upstate service territory. National Grid projects that Downstate design day gas demand would increase approximately 0.88 percent per year, from 2,829,000 Dt/day in the winter of 2023/24 to 3,551,000 Dt/day in the winter of 2049/50.[268] Further, the Company projects that Upstate design day gas demand will increase approximately 0.53 percent per year from 952,000 Dt/day in winter 2023/24 to 1,094,000 Dt/day in the winter of 2049/50.[269] However, in the Supplement, National Grid revised the design day forecasts for Downstate, stating that the 2025 forecast suggests a slower rate of demand growth, which may delay the projected supply gap until 2041/42. Further, National Grid adds in the Supplement that they still project growth in design day demand, "with a compound

[267] Planning Order, p. 34.

[268] Final LTP, p. XVI.

[269] Final LTP, p. xvii.

annual growth rate of 0.55 percent between 2025 and 2035 and 0.35 percent between 2025 and 2050."[270]

As part of this proceeding, National Grid states that "unlike with the electric system, there is zero allowable contingency or reserve margin to guard against extreme weather or unexpected disruption to gas supply, gas infrastructure, or demand-side resource availability. Zero contingency means that the plans for balancing gas demand and supply have no supply contingency or reserve margin. In other words, the system is designed to balance supply and demand, assuming forecasted peak demand is not exceeded and that all available gas capacity resources will be available with no disruption."[271] Thus, National Grid's downstate gas system as currently configured and supplied is fragile and vulnerable. Additionally, the Company is crucially dependent on CNG, LNG, and peaking services – all of which have finite volume and attendant risks. Moreover, the LNG supply is not replenishable during the winter season, as it must be filled during the summer months when demand for natural gas is lower.

As we observed in the earlier Con Edison/O&R LTP Order, Con Edison also does not have a reserve margin. Similar to National Grid, Con Edison was also relying on CNG and peaking contracts, and had imposed a moratorium on gas connections in parts of its service territory. To reduce this reliability risk, Con Edison's LTP reflected actions that company took to secure additional firm pipeline capacity of 115,000 Dt/day capacity from Tennessee (which came into service in 2023), and identified additional capacity from the Iroquois ExC project, which when placed in-service will provide additional firm

[270] Supplement, p. 13.

[271] Final LTP, p. 15.

pipeline capacity of 62,500 Dt/day.[272] Based on the added firm pipeline capacity, the Commission noted that Con Edison planned to de-risk its supply stack, by phasing out and shedding riskier CNG and peaking contracts.[273] The actions taken by Con Edison to de-risk its supply stack in a near-zero margin operating environment are very similar to those proposed by National Grid.

Margot Spindelman comments that the Company has inflated its design day forecast and "has continued to plan for the Reference Case (business as usual) scenario, despite the fact that both the CEV and AE scenarios can be met without a supply shortfall."[274] Newtown Creek Alliance expresses a concern about using data to determine design day that does not accurately reflect the current/actual climate and cold weather conditions present in New York City. AGREE maintains that in the context of human-induced global warming, it is unreasonable to base the design day on a temperature last observed 90 years ago. NYSERDA recommends that National Grid work with the Commission and potentially other utilities in the State to develop a framework for updating the definition of design day demand conditions to align with empirical data and the latest climate science.

PA also found that National Grid's Reference Case "Design Day (demand) do not fully reflect the expected impacts on usage from accelerated electrification and changes in heating degree days, among other factors."[275] Additionally, PA states

[272] Con Edison/O&R LTP Order, p. 36; FERC Docket No. CP20-48-00, Enhancement by Compression Project, Abbreviated Application of Iroquois Transmission System, L.P. for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (filed January 31, 2020), pp. 8-12.

[273] Con Edison/O&R LTP Order, pp. 36, 45.

[274] Spindelman comments (filed June 3, 2025), p. 1.

[275] PA Final Report, p. 13.

that the total contracted supply stack for the 2025/26 winter season stands at just over 2,992,000 Dt/day of design day capacity Downstate. PA adds that "under the 2025 Forecast Reference Case design day demand forecast, National Grid is able to serve design day demand for the remainder of the study period."[276] In this forecast, capacity exceeds forecasted demand by approximately 195,000 Dt/day in 2025/26, growing to a peak of 559,000 Dt/day in 2029/30 and thereafter shrinking to 391,000 Dt/d by 2049/50.

The Commission has noted in its orders regarding other LDCs' long-term plans that relying on the coldest actual weather experienced in a service territory is a reasonable basis for determining design day load.[277] Use per customer per under design day conditions is an evolving issue, as PA points out, given increased electrification and weatherization, as well as fewer HDDs over the course of a winter. National Grid is directed to include information on how it develops estimates of use per customer in the load forecasting report discussed above.

No Infrastructure Option and Non-Pipe Alternatives

In the Planning Order, the Commission required that LDCs include a no infrastructure scenario but allowed an LDC to assert that a no infrastructure scenario may not be feasible for a particular project or portion of its long-term plan.[278] National Grid states in its Final LTP that a "no infrastructure" scenario is infeasible for any portion of its plan because the magnitude of the supply-demand gap cannot be resolved with demand response measures and other NPAs in time to avoid

[276] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 20.

[277] Central Hudson LTP Order, pp. 55-56.

[278] Planning Order, pp. 35 and 37.

reliability impacts.[279] Also, National Grid states that it continues to seek new supply and demand options including pursuing market solicitations for NPAs. The Company adds that while "we evaluate NPAs to remove LPP segments, we have not to date secured the required level of customer participation necessary to implement such an NPA, underscoring the importance of identifying novel NPA approaches."[280]

The Company states that in its process to identify on-system capital projects, it will evaluate potential NPAs for the identified projects and if an NPA cannot be implemented in time to maintain system reliability in a cost-effective manner, the project will move forward. The Company also states that it will evaluate leak-prone mains identified for removal for NPA feasibility. National Grid pursued an RFP to identify NPA proposals that could alleviate gas demand within the 2nd Ward of Queens. The Company stated that more than 100 entities were contacted as part of an RFI process, but only 12 entities expressed an interest in the RFP, with an additional two entities being added prior to RFP issuance. National Grid received only one bid, which was a combination proposal from several of the bidders that would only have removed 984 Dt of design day usage. This would have achieved only 17.6 percent of the targeted 5,600 Dt of design day usage that was required by the RFP. National Grid decided not to recommend an award for the bid.[281]

The Company states that it will consider NPAs as part of its proposed Upstate East Gate Reliability Assessment.[282]

[279] Final LTP, p. 80.

[280] Final LTP, p. xxi.

[281] Final LTP, p. 82.

[282] Final LTP, p. 86.

Also, National Grid states that it aims to rapidly scale the deployment of NPAs in a cost-effective manner for both society and its customers. National Grid describes three types of NPA programs in its Final LTP. These are programs address leak-prone pipe, reliability and reinforcement, and new connections. The Company states it has completed three leak-prone pipe NPAs in its Upstate service territory and is in active discussions regarding other projects.[283]

CNY states that while National Grid asserts in its LTP that none of the pathways include "no infrastructure" options without "a suite of enabling policies," the Plan's failure to include a concrete strategy and commitments to scale NPA implementation even while the State implements enabling policies is in direct conflict with the Commission's directives in the Planning Order to use NPAs to present "no infrastructure" scenarios.[284] CNY adds that National Grid must be specific as to what sections of its plan require infrastructure upgrades and explain its reasoning.

Sane states that National Grid has refused to perform studies about demand response and NPAs.[285] NYSERDA recommends that National Grid work more proactively to implement all types of NPAs. NYSERDA also references an annual NPA Opportunities and Programmatic Success report and a stakeholder engagement meeting on LPP NPAs, which the Company has committed to in its recent Downstate rate case.[286] The Sierra Club states that "there are cost-effective alternatives to continuing to replace

[283] Final LTP, pp. 101-102.

[284] New York City Comments (filed September 18, 2024), p. 8.

[285] Case 24-G-0248, Sane Energy Response to National Grid Request to Amend GSLTP (filed June 3, 2025) (Request for Additional Analysis), p. 1.

[286] NYSERDA Comments (filed December 13, 2024), p. 2

the thousands of miles of leak prone pipe in New York."[287] NYSERDA expects that these will be useful forums for National Grid to document and improve its evolving NPA planning practices and for stakeholders to provide constructive input on those practices. Katherine Thompson states it would be irresponsible for the Commission to accept National Grid's LTP without redirecting customer resources that National Grid would invest in more soon-to-be-stranded fossil fuel infrastructure toward NPAs.

PA recommends that the Company include plans that aggressively pursue alternatives to adding customers to the gas system. PA states that if a single consumer decides to not connect to the gas system it will avoid the installation of a service line and the purchase of a new meter. Further, "targeted implementation of NPAs for specific parts of the distribution system could eliminate investment in multiple meters."[288] PA also recommends that National Grid consider minimum investment thresholds for NPAs that would trigger an NPA assessment if a capital project exceeds a specific financial and timeline threshold. Further, PA recommends that the Company create guidelines that ensure sufficient time for NPA solicitation and deployment. National Grid states that the Reliability & Reinforcement NPAs already have minimum threshold criteria for cost and timeline, which were filed with the Commission.[289] PA also recommends that National Grid continue to consider solutions that would rapidly scale NPA deployment, minimize overall system cost, and keep rates and bills manageable for customers.

[287] Sierra Club Comments (filed September 5, 2025), p. 35.

[288] PA Final Report, p. 33.

[289] Final LTP, p. 99.

The Commission notes National Grid has had limited success in NPA deployment, despite solicitation attempts, which is similar to the experiences of other gas utilities in the State. As NYSERDA points out, the Company is taking measures to improve its NPA deployment Downstate pursuant to the 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order. Additionally, pursuant to the 2025 NMPC Rate Order, the Company agreed to several measures to improve the rate of NPA deployment in its Upstate service territory including: 1) prioritizing NPA opportunities that have the highest level of customer interest; 2) develop an NPA proposal targeting new gas service installations and service line replacements; 3) conduct an NPA related stakeholder engagement meeting; and 4) an NPA heat pump monthly credit to incentivize customer installation of heat pumps.[290] These rate plan measures should enhance the opportunities for successful NPAs. The Company is directed to provide a thorough update on its NPA deployment in its next long-term plan filing, including listing all solicitations and their results. Regarding NMPC specifically, the Company is directed to include information on the East Gate reliability in its next long-term plan filing, which must be based on the updated demand forecast as described above and include the projected date of any supply-demand gap and a description of all alternatives considered including NPAs.

Leak-Prone Pipe

The Planning Order directs LDCs to provide reporting in furtherance of LPP replacement with NPAs. Specifically, the Commission required the utilities to identify "specific segments of LPP that could be abandoned in favor of NPAs in the annual reports ... and to identify where infrastructure projects may be

[290] 2025 NMPC Rate Order, pp. 98-100.

required to maintain reliability."[291] In its Final LTP, National Grid states that it defines LPP as all 12-inch and smaller diameter pipe that is unprotected bare or coated steel pipe, 12-inch and smaller diameter cast and wrought iron pipe, pre-1985 vintage Aldyl-A plastic pipe, and unprotected steel/wrought iron, copper, vintage HDPE, and Aldyl-A plastic services.[292] National Grid adds that by replacing pipes with high leak rates, such as cast iron and unprotected steel, the LPP Program has reduced GHG emissions by 18.5 percent avoiding 5,538,160 metric tons of CO2e since 2008. National Grid states that it has an NPA program that provides existing customers with an incentive to convert to a non-gas alternative if they receive gas service via leak-prone pipe. Further, the replacement of the LPP can be avoided if all customers on the segment of LPP accept the opportunity to convert to the NPA.[293]

PA notes that NPAs can be used to strategically reduce the need for LPP replacement:

> by optimizing the replacement of LPP, and electrifying where possible, the Company could develop a view on the most crucial segments of pipe that must be replaced from a safety and resiliency perspective, identify segments of LPP that could be potential candidates for electrification, and ultimately limit their capital budget for LPP replacement.[294]

PA states that the cost estimate in the BCA analysis of all scenarios suggests that "the Company is not really envisioning any possibility in scaling NPAs to the point where a substantial portion of the LPP gas network will not be replaced."[295]

---

[291] Planning Order, p. 39.

[292] Final LTP, p. 78.

[293] Final LTP, p. 100.

[294] PA Final Report, p. 137.

[295] PA Final Report, p. 137.

The Commission notes that the 2024 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order and 2025 NMPC Rate Order establish targets for LPP replacement for all three service territories. In addition, the rate orders require the Company to evaluate LPP for opportunities for NPAs. The Company is directed to provide information in the annual updates to this LTP, as well as in its next long-term plan filing, regarding the mileage of LPP remaining in each service territory and the results of solicitations for NPAs issued by the Company focused on retiring LPP.

Impacts on Low- and Moderate-Income Customers and Disadvantaged Communities

The Planning Order directed LDCs to "identify the disadvantaged communities in their service territories, explain the impacts of any proposed projects on disadvantaged communities, and explain how the LDC will ensure that an appropriate portion of the benefits of any proposed NPAs accrue to disadvantaged communities."[296] The Company states that it is:

> working to ensure customers in (disadvantaged communities) benefit from improved infrastructure, expanded outreach to provide accessible, authentic engagement and representation in our processes, expanded participation in energy efficiency and affordability programs that can help customers manage their bills, and specific community economic benefits through programs such as workforce development grants as well as our shareholder-funded community initiatives.[297]

The Company states that 59 percent of the households in New York City either live in a disadvantaged community or are low-income and that 26 percent of households on Long Island either live in a disadvantaged community or are low-income.[298]

[296] Planning Order, p. 40.

[297] Final LTP, p. xv.

[298] Final LTP, p. 7.

For Upstate, National Grid states the percentage of customers that live in a disadvantaged community or are low-income ranges from 35 to 47 percent across the six regions of New York State served by National Grid. Further, National Grid states it is in "active NPA discussions with a community center located in a disadvantaged community in Brooklyn."[299]

Sane suggests that the LTP should include a comprehensive reconsideration of CLCPA-compliant emissions and environmental justice impacts, including the cumulative burden on disadvantaged communities like North Brooklyn.[300] Community Board No. 1 states that prioritizing the maintenance and expansion of its gas business primarily benefits National Grid's corporate shareholders at the expense of our goals and commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect disadvantaged communities.[301] Senator Julia Salazar states that the Greenpoint LNG Facility sits in a disadvantaged community.[302] The Newtown Creek Alliance states that the actual threat of living next to the storage of LNG far outweighs the benefits for local disadvantaged communities including the New York City Housing Authority's Cooper Park Houses.[303]

PA encourages the Company to analyze the similarities and differences between disadvantaged communities and the rest of the customer base. Further, PA suggests that this analysis include barriers to customer decarbonization, best practices to help communities with the energy transition, information gaps,

[299] Final LTP, p. 101.

[300] Sane's Response to National Grid's Request to Amend GSLTP (filed June 3, 2025), p. 1.

[301] Community Board No. 1 Comments (filed April 23, 2025), p. 2.

[302] Senator Salazar Comments (filed April 21, 2025), p. 2.

[303] Newtown Creek Alliance Comments (filed April 2, 2025), p. 5.

and the funding required to help these customers.[304] Information such as annual gas consumption, annual customer bills, and end-uses for gas could help inform how disadvantaged communities would be impacted under the different decarbonization scenarios.

While recognizing the concerns of stakeholders about the long-term impacts of the LTP on disadvantaged communities, the Commission notes that National Grid has implemented programs that benefit disadvantaged communities and low- and moderate-income customers. While some stakeholders expressed concern about the location of some facilities, such as the Greenpoint LNG Facility, being in "environmental justice communities," it should be noted that natural gas infrastructure is omnipresent across New York City and Long Island as it must be to provide a necessary utility service to residents and businesses who depend on it for heating, hot water, and cooking. Staff has provided guidance on the reporting of investments benefitting disadvantaged communities through Clean Energy Guidance Document 12.[305] As discussed above, until National Grid experiences significant reductions in design day demand, existing infrastructure is needed to ensure reliability. The Company is directed to provide updates on its investments benefitting disadvantaged communities in its annual updates to this LTP.

Comparison of Alternatives

1. Benefit Cost Analysis

The Planning Order did not modify previous Commission orders regarding the need for BCAs. Also, the Planning Order provides that the consultant, in this proceeding PA, is expected

[304] PA Final Report, p. 31.

[305] Clean Energy Guidance Document 12 is available on the Commission's website at: https://dps.ny.gov/clean-energy-guidance-documents.

to "help evaluate the economic and environmental tradeoffs associated with different pathways."[306] The Company states that it compared its LTP scenarios through a BCA that utilized the BCA Framework Order's methodology. For NMPC, the ratios that resulted were 0.69 for the Reference Case, 0.70 for CEV, and 0.76 for AE. For KEDNY, the ratios were 0.36 for the Reference Case, 0.50 for CEV and 0.48 for AE. For KEDLI, the ratios were 0.49 for the Reference Case, 0.68 for CEV and 0.65 for AE.[307] National Grid did not update its BCA calculations in the Supplement despite revising the demand forecast for KEDNY and KEDLI.

AGREE states that for a fact-based comparison between scenarios, reasonable assumptions must be used in forecasts, and "if only the production cost of RNG is accounted for, then any BCA comparisons or consumer cost forecasts are a farce."[308] AGREE adds that the health benefit of reduced fossil fuel combustion should be added to the BCA. NYSERDA states that a

> robust BCA, inclusive of health benefits, would provide stakeholders with important context for evaluating the scenarios presented in the LTP. Omitting these benefits understates the benefits of scenarios that reduce the combustion by relying on greater electrification.[309]

PA states that all of the benefit cost ratios are below 1.0, "meaning the present value of costs outweighs the present value of benefits," and that "the BCA is built on a plethora of assumptions, some of which are speculative and uncertain, and therefore have not been monetized and included in

[306] Planning Order, p. 27.

[307] Final LTP, p. 156.

[308] AGREE Comments (filed December 13, 2024), p. 3.

[309] NYSERDA Comments (filed December 13, 2024), p. 10.

the BCA calculation."[310] PA believes that National Grid, stakeholders, and the Department can work collaboratively to refine the BCA inputs and estimates. PA hypothesizes that some benefits may not be fully accounted for or underestimated, or some costs may be overestimated, which warrants additional analysis of the costs and benefits.

The Commission notes that the Company, consistent with the BCA Framework Order, has ultimately produced benefit-cost comparisons of the scenarios within the realm of reasonableness. However, we do recognize stakeholders' expressed concerns regarding some assumptions and values used in the BCA calculations. When it files its next long-term gas plan in 2028, we expect that National Grid will refine its efforts to reflect expectations of reduced natural gas demand resulting from customers' movement toward less carbon intensive space heating options. The Commission also notes that the Avoided Cost of Gas Working Group is addressing potential guidance to gas utilities regarding future gas BCA calculations.[311] National Grid must reflect any resulting guidance from the Commission on that topic in future long-term plan filings.

2. Estimated Bill Impacts and Net Present Value of Costs of Each Alternative

The Planning Order directed the LDCs to present an annual bill impact and net present value for both a traditional solution and any alternatives, and that the analysis address various customer groups. Additionally, the Commission directed that LDCs include an alternative bill impact analysis that assumes the full value of any new gas assets is depreciated by

[310] PA Final Report, p. 30.

[311] Planning Order, pp. 62-63.

2050.[312] The Company estimates bill impacts across the three service territories and three scenarios as follows:[313]

Service Territory	Current Monthly Bill	2050 Monthly Bill, Reference	2050 Monthly Bill, CEV	2050 Monthly Bill, AE
NMPC	$85	$170	$344	$2,280
KEDNY	$168	$413	$513	$6,413
KEDLI	$156	$323	$470	$5,380

The Company states that as the number of gas customers decreases, a smaller number of customers will be responsible for the cost of the operation and maintenance of the system, which will result in increasing per-customer bill impacts.[314] Further, National Grid says that it is "exploring multiple pathways to access additional funding streams in support of delivering benefits to customers at the lowest possible bill impact."[315] The Company states that it does not "anticipate bill impacts of the magnitude forecasted in either scenario will be acceptable to customers, regulators, or policymakers."[316] In the Supplement, the Company states that incrementally over the lifespan of the NESE project, gas heating bills will increase $7.44/month in KEDLI and $7.61/month in KEDNY, a 3.5 percent increase.[317]

CNY states it is essential that the Company take an appropriate path forward that would minimize bill impacts, criteria pollution emissions, and public health impacts in a meaningful way and requests that the Commission direct National

[312] Planning Order, p. 45.

[313] Final LTP, pp. 214-216.

[314] Final LTP, p. 116.

[315] Final LTP, P. 117.

[316] Final LTP, p. 144.

[317] Supplement, p. 11.

Grid to proceed with the AE option after the costs associated with that option are scrutinized and materially reduced to mitigate the bill impacts associated with that pathway, particularly for the most vulnerable customers.[318] CNY adds that National Grid's bill impact analyses currently do not properly include bill mitigation tactics, nor do the analyses include the expected increases to electric bills as customers electrify.[319] NYSERDA states that the Company's bill impacts analysis only presents average gas bills and would be more informative if it reflected projected bills for representative customers with particular configurations of appliances.

PA listed certain assumptions that may have a significant impact on customer's bills. Further, PA states that National Grid "should consider revisiting these assumptions and further test the sensitivity of these assumptions in future long-term plans."[320] PA expects that demand for natural gas will decrease over time with changes in energy policies in New York and technological advancements. PA also believes that National Grid has underestimated the future costs of low-carbon fuels, and the increase in gas bills illustrated above will further improve the economic favorability of heat pumps and result in higher electrification of various end use cases. PA also recommends that future bill impacts could be reduced if the Company and stakeholders "diligently focus on identifying investments that may run the risk of being underutilized over the next several decades and eliminating any unnecessary investments throughout the forecast period."[321]

[318] CNY Comments (filed April 3, 2025), pp. 2-3.

[319] CNY Comments (filed September 18, 2024), p. 28.

[320] PA Final Report, p. 30.

[321] PA Final Report, p. 138.

PA states in its Report on the Supplement that bill impacts presented in the LAI Study did not include improved gas system resilience, avoided GHG emissions, or benefits from the reduction in wholesale electric energy prices.[322] PA also points out that the bill impacts as calculated by National Grid do not include savings per therm (and in absolute dollars) on the customer bill associated with reduced use of CNG, capacity release and AMA revenues, or discontinued delivered services contracts. PA recommends that the Company include a comprehensive analysis of bill impacts in its annual LTP updates and in future LTP proceedings "that consider all dimensions of the potential inclusion of NESE within the supply stack."[323]

The Commission recognizes that the bill impacts the Company calculated under the AE and CEV scenarios are unacceptable, but also acknowledges the concerns brought up by PA and CNY regarding the Company's bill impact analysis. There is significant uncertainty regarding the issues that will impact future natural gas bills. National Grid is directed to provide a bill impact analysis in its next LTP filing that includes a share-of-wallet calculation to reflect increased electric usage by customers choosing to electrify and provide sensitivities in bill impacts to reflect varying levels of electrification by its customers, from no electrification to a majority of customers completely electrifying their residences. In addition, the Company is directed to include impacts from all dimensions of the potential inclusion of NESE, if it is approved, within the supply stack in the bill impact analysis in its next LTP filing and the annual updates to this LTP that are filed after NESE is

[322] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 9.

[323] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 25.

placed into service, if that happens before National Grid's next LTP filing.

3. Emissions Impacts

The Planning Order requires LDCs to report the GHG emissions from all solutions, both supply-side and demand-side. Also, LDCs are required to include a calculation of the GHG emissions from each scenario in their LTP, and include carbon emissions in the BCA analysis as stipulated in the BCA Framework Order.[324] The Company states that the CEV scenario is its preferred pathway to achieve the CLCPA's emissions reduction targets.[325] The Company states that New York City's Local Law 97 imposes greenhouse gas emission limits on large buildings within New York City, requiring building owners to report their energy use and reduce emissions through energy efficiency, fuel switching, and decarbonization of fuels or face penalties for exceeding limits. The Company states that its inclusion of RNG in its system will reduce emissions, as will repairing leaks and replacing LPP.

National Grid utilized the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program referenced in the New York State Oil and Gas Sector Methane Emissions Inventory to calculate GHG emissions.[326] The Company states that its gas energy efficiency and heat pump programs have achieved lifetime GHG emissions reductions of

[324] Planning Order, p. 47.

[325] Final LTP, p. 17.

[326] New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA), "New York State Oil and Gas Sector: Methane Emissions Inventory." Final Report, Report Number 22-38, (November 2022), Section 3.2.7.1 Distribution Pipelines; Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) Global Warming Potential over a 20-year time horizon (GWP20).

approximately 8.7 million metric tons of CO2e since 2016.[327] Additionally, National Grid acknowledges that the electrification of heat through the use of ground-source and air-source heat pumps can lead to significant greenhouse gas emissions reductions. The Company estimates emissions reductions in CO2e from its three scenarios for each service territory as follows:[328]

Service Territory	Reference	CEV	AE
NMPC	64,064,604	338,540,468	369,965,601
KEDNY	84,910,484	464,975,112	496,770,362
KEDLI	74,808,236	333,241,644	372,236,435

In the Supplement, the Company states that the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project could lead to GHG emissions reductions of approximately 13,000 tons from 2025 to 2042. This is equal to taking 2,811 cars off the road for one year. National Grid stats NESE can help to achieve this reduction by facilitating conversions from higher-emitting fuels like residual and distillate heating oil, and the reduction in diesel fuel consumed by CNG trucks.[329] Further, the Company states that oil-to-gas conversions and reduced trucking will help to "reduce air pollution, including emissions of particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, and mercury."[330]

CNY points out that National Grid's findings in its Final LTP note that both the CEV and AE scenarios achieve "substantial emissions reductions" and the incremental net societal cost per ton of said emissions reductions is the same for each scenario.[331] AGREE states that RNG is a foundational

[327] Final LTP, p. 90.

[328] Final LTP, p. 157.

[329] Supplement, p. 10.

[330] Supplement, pp. 10-11.

[331] CNY Comments (filed April 3, 2025), p. 3.

component of the Company's plans to reduce GHG emissions in its CEV scenario and the Company's scenarios include the GHG emission reductions of RNG without paying for the environmental attributes.[332] EDF states that National Grid's Long-Term Plan must be consistent with New York climate policy, which mandates a reduced reliance on fossil energy systems, and with the GHG emission reduction targets established by the CLCPA and the policies articulated in the 2022 Scoping Plan issued by the CAC pursuant to the CLCPA.[333] EDF also states that the Commission should not approve a final long-term plan put forward by National Grid that is inconsistent with the CLCPA emissions reduction targets or the state's Scoping Plan.[334] NYSERDA states that using NPAs to avoid new connections can reduce GHG emissions and avoided criteria air pollutant emissions from reduced combustion generate substantial health benefits.[335] New Yorkers for Clean Power states that the CEV does not decrease or account for fugitive emissions, since the gas distribution network would not decrease in size, and states that fugitive emissions are underestimated.[336]

PA encourages National Grid to use a multivariable optimization process in its next LTP filing. The multivariable optimization process can be used to identify the preferred pathway and examine the highest emissions reductions potential and lowest impact on affordability. PA states that the CEV and AE scenarios appear to be more effective at reducing GHG

[332] AGREE Comments (filed December 13, 2024), pp. 1-2.

[333] EDF Comments (filed December 13, 2024), p. 3.

[334] EDF Comments (filed December 13, 2024), p. 4.

[335] NYSERDA Comments (filed December 13, 2024), pp. 2 and 10.

[336] New Yorkers for Clean Power Comments (filed September 8, 2025), p. 7.

emissions but they "result in significantly higher bills for customers who remain on the gas network."[337]

PA notes it is encouraged that National Grid will conduct additional research concerning the "limited supply and high costs of LCFs and the practicality of achieving large reductions in emissions in an affordable manner throughout the forecast period."[338] Further, PA states that "targeted and strategic deployment of electrification and LCFs will help the Company achieve emission reductions, while keeping the impact to customer bills low."[339]

PA states that the Reference Case is not a reasonable scenario for consideration in the LTP because it does not achieve the emissions reduction goals stipulated in the CLCPA, local laws, as well as New York's decarbonization mandates. Further, PA states that the Reference Case only provides a benchmark to see what the emissions could be in the business-as-usual scenario." PA adds that National Grid will need a collaborative effort to improve emission reductions, including "collaboration with stakeholders from the state agencies, neighboring electric utilities, climate infrastructure and technology companies, and advocates."[340]

In its Report on the Supplement, PA states that service interruptions to generators, who rely on interruptible services due largely to their lower cost, can lead them to use fuel oil, which is carbon-intensive.[341] PA states that incremental gas capacity could limit the degree to which non-

[337] PA Final Report, p. 20.

[338] PA Final Report, p. 31.

[339] PA Final Report, p. 31.

[340] PA Final Report, p. 150.

[341] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 22.

firm customers are interrupted and the amount of fuel oil burned as a replacement, but acknowledges that providing firm service to more and diverse types of customers may be accompanied by a related risk of adding more demand to the Company's design day demand forecast and reducing the potential reserve margin afforded by NESE.[342] PA references Company projections of emissions reductions of 13,000 metric tons of CO2e from 2025 to 2042. Also, PA mentions that the Levitan study estimated emission reductions from the power sector due to NESE of approximately 23,200 to 88,800 short tons of CO2e, dependent on the level of oil displacement per year. PA states that residential heating customers switching from fuel oil heating systems, despite the newly available gas supply, may opt for electric heating.

The Commission finds that National Grid has used acceptable methods for calculating emissions impacts from its scenarios. In addition, it is clear that some programs that result in reduced emissions are costly compared to traditional approaches, as evidenced by the higher costs of the CEV and AE scenarios. The Commission recognizes that the method of accounting for GHG emissions is a topic remaining under consideration in Case 22-M-0149.[343] As recommended by PA, the Commission directs National Grid to produce an optimization model as part of its next LTP filing due October 2, 2028. The optimization model would vary the application of various decarbonization measures and their associated costs to produce

[342] PA Report on the Supplement, p. 22.

[343] Case 22-M-0149, Proceeding on Motion of the Commission Assessing Implementation of and Compliance with the Requirements and Targets of the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act.

scenarios that include various levels of emissions reductions and their associated bill impacts.

Heat Pump Adoption/Pace of Electrification

The Company states that the CEV represents a balanced approach to gas decarbonization by accelerating electrification and the net benefits of the CEV scenario were greater than the net benefits of the AE scenario. The Company states that disadvantaged communities often face greater barriers to electrification and could face greater cost increases due to a transition to cleaner energy. In the Supplement, National Grid states that demand for electric vehicles and heat pumps will increase in the coming decades, straining electric resource adequacy and increasing the need for gas-fired generation.[344] National Grid states that the CEV includes hybrid electric-gas heating systems that pair electric heat pumps with their gas appliance. National Grid further states there is limited data available on the economics of heat pumps, and its heat pump usage assumptions align with an analysis of historical data from the New York State Clean Heat program, as well as the limited studies that have examined samples of customers who have adopted heat pumps. The Company states it will refine its approach as more data becomes available.

Sane recommends that the LTP include a full modeling of accelerated building electrification scenarios, which Sane contends is required by the CLCPA.[345] Margot Spindelman states that hydrogen is expensive compared to heat pumps.[346] Community Board No. 1 urges the Commission to ensure that customers stay warm in winter by promoting alternative solutions such as

[344] Supplement, p. 7.

[345] Sane's Response to National Grid's Request to Amend GSLTP, (filed June 3, 2025), p. 1.

[346] Margot Spindelman Comments (filed June 3, 2025), p. 3.

thermal energy networks, beneficial electrification, and energy efficiency.[347] Senator Julia Salazar states that electrification "will reduce emissions, create good-paying jobs, and lower costs for working families."[348] New York City states that RNG and hydrogen do not reduce in-City combustion and fail to achieve the air quality benefits that electrification and thermal solutions bring to New Yorkers.[349] NYSERDA recommends that National Grid include a sensitivity analysis in which the costs for electrification and energy efficiency decline over time or as the number of completed projects increases, particularly for full-load air source heat pump and ground source heat pump systems.[350]

PA opined that National Grid did not sufficiently reflect certain factors in its Reference Case. PA's Final Report indicated that National Grid's Reference Case does not reflect "evolving policy, macroeconomic and electrification factors in development of the customer count and volume forecasts across customer classes."[351] Also, PA states that the Company's Reference Case use per customer, annual retail volumes, wholesale volumes and Design Day demand, "do not fully reflect the expected impacts on usage from accelerated electrification."[352]

The Commission recognizes that KEDNY and KEDLI are not combination utilities and have limited insight into electrification programs operating in their service territories,

[347] Community Board No. 1 Comments (filed April 23, 2025), p. 3.

[348] Senator Salazar Comments (filed April 21, 2025), p. 2.

[349] New York City Comments (filed April 3, 2025), p. 2.

[350] NYSERDA Comments on Revised LTP (filed December 13, 2024), p. 11.

[351] PA Final Report, p. 13.

[352] PA Final Report, p. 13.

but NMPC is a combination utility and is an administrator of the New York State Clean Heat program pursuant to the energy efficiency proceeding.[353] PA and the stakeholders point out that the Company has not adequately reflected the impact of electrification and heat pumps going forward. The Company is directed to continue to monitor data on its system related to how many customers decommission their natural gas heating systems in favor of either geothermal applications, including thermal energy networks, or air-source heat pumps and how many of those customers terminate gas service completely and report this data as part of each annual update to its LTP, due May 15, 2026, and May 17, 2027, as well as its next LTP filing due October 2, 2028. In addition, the Company must include this data in the development of load forecasts for the planning period in its next LTP filing.

Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act

The CLCPA seeks to reduce GHG emissions, increase renewable energy usage, and protect public health, promote employment, and strengthen the State's economy. To those ends, CLCPA §7(2) requires all State agencies, including the Commission, to take into consideration whether certain specified final agency actions are inconsistent with or will interfere with the attainment of the statewide GHG emission limits established by the DEC under ECL Article 75. Section 7(2) further states that if a decision is deemed to be inconsistent with or interferes with the attainment of the statewide GHG emissions limits, the action agency (or office, authority, or division) must provide a detailed statement of justification as to why such limits may not be met and identify alternatives or

[353] Case 18-M-0084, In the Matter of a Comprehensive Energy Efficiency Initiative.

GHG mitigation measures to be required where such project is located.

The Commission's action in this proceeding, considering the Company's long-term plan and requiring that National Grid take additional actions, is not inconsistent with nor would it interfere with the CLCPA. It is important to note that the Commission is not taking any final agency actions to approve any particular project identified in National Grid's long-term plan, including the construction of the NESE project, in this proceeding; rather, the Commission is acknowledging that there is a need for more reliable sources of capacity that will improve the reliability of the natural gas system, which NESE would provide, if it receives all necessary approvals and is constructed. To underscore that point, the Commission today does not approve, direct, or compel the construction of the NESE project. The intention of the gas planning process we initiated in Case 20-G-0131 is to provide public visibility into the planning for the provision of safe, adequate, and reliable gas service while charting a path forward to attaining the State's climate goals. The actions and directives in the body of this Order provide a framework for National Grid to take steps toward these goals while balancing the need to continue to provide safe and adequate service, which has remained a principal core component of the Public Service Law dating back one hundred years and continues to this day.[354] Accordingly, we determine that our actions in this Order are not inconsistent with CLCPA §7(2).

CLCPA §7(3) requires that in considering and issuing permits, licenses, and other administrative approvals and decisions, the Commission shall not disproportionately burden

[354] PSL §65(1); L. 1921, c. 134.

disadvantaged communities. CLCPA §7(3) also requires that all state agencies prioritize reductions in GHG and co-pollutants in disadvantaged communities. The Climate Justice Working Group adopted final criteria to identify disadvantaged communities, along with an interactive map of disadvantaged communities in the state.[355]

Additionally, while the Commission is not approving or permitting the construction of any projects identified in the long-term plan in this Order, we note that the proposed Northeast Supply Enhancement Project seeks to augment the existing interstate Lower New York Bay Lateral submarine pipeline and the Rockaway Delivery Lateral submarine pipeline. If authorized, Transco will undertake the construction of NESE project under the Atlantic Ocean in Lower New York Bay. The underwater NESE project area is not within a designated disadvantaged community area.

Moreover, while the Company's service territories contain disadvantaged communities, the types of projects and research to be initiated pursuant to the long-term plan and our directives in this Order do not disproportionately burden any specific disadvantaged communities. Energy efficiency, and LPP replacement programs, for example, will primarily benefit the communities in which National Grid implements those programs by improving safety, efficiency, and reducing GHG emissions in those areas, while providing broader safety, reliability, and climate benefits for customers and the State as a whole. In consultation with Staff, the Company shall identify the programs and investments that are intended to benefit disadvantaged communities in its annual updates to this LTP, including an explanation of how these investments benefit disadvantaged

[355] See https://climate.ny.gov/Resources/Disadvantaged-Communities-Criteria.

communities and a quantification of the benefits. Additionally, the projected reduction in reliance on CNG and the trucking required to deliver it will reduce GHG emissions, which will benefit disadvantaged communities. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the action taken in this Order will not disproportionately burden a disadvantaged community.

Motion to Strike and Request for Additional Analysis

On June 3, 2025, Sane submitted a request that any update of the LTP include a reconsideration of the planning obligations in the Planning Order and additional analyses (Request for Additional Analysis). On July 18, 2025, EDF, the Natural Resources Defense Council, New Yorkers for Clean Power, and Sierra Club (collectively, Movants) submitted a motion to strike National Grid's July 2, 2025, Supplement (Motion to Strike) that purported to conform to 16 New York Codes, Rules and Regulations §§ 3.5 and 3.6.[356] For the reasons below, the Commission denies the Request for Additional Analysis and the Motion to Strike.

In the Request for Additional Analysis, Sane requests that any update to the LTP "must trigger a ... reconsideration of all planning obligations outlined in the [Commission's] Planning Order" and "identified in [PA's] review." Sane further claims that the Company's request to supplement its LTP "raises serious procedural, technical, and environmental concerns," which are at odds with the LTP proceeding. Sane also argues that analyzing the impacts of NESE "is not within the scope of this proceeding." Further, Sane contends that NESE's introduction into the LTP "should not be accepted without a

[356] Case 24-G-0248, Joint Letter Motion to Strike National Grid Addendum (filed July 18, 2025) (Motion to Strike).

fully reopened proceeding, including new stakeholder input, rigorous modeling, and third-party oversight."[357]

Sane also requests that any update include a thorough analysis of several subjects. Such subjects and analyses, according to Sane, should include "[f]ull modelling of the accelerated building electrification" and "[d]emand response and [NPA] studies." Further, Sane requests that the Design Day methodology be reevaluated with updated energy usage and weather data. Sane also requests the update include a "[t]ransparent assessment of infrastructure retirement scenarios," including for the Greenpoint LNG Facility. Additionally, Sane states that the update should consider "CLCPA-complaint emissions and environmental justice impacts." Finally, Sane requests that the Company "be required to fully complete the studies and analyses outlined by PA Consulting and DPS staff," and the Commission withhold approval for an updated LTP until it complies with CLCPA mandates and contains "a full environmental and equity review."[358]

In the Motion to Strike, Movants request that the Commission bring this proceeding to a conclusion based only on the Final LTP, PA's Final Report, and comments submitted thereto. In the alternative, the Movants request that the Commission require National Grid to formally revise the Final LTP. In such revision, Movants propose that National Grid integrate the NESE project into its scenarios, forecasts, and infrastructure planning, and include the following: (1) analysis of "all relevant recent events potentially affecting the supply and demand of gas"; (2) analysis describing gas supply or other infrastructure projects that can be avoided or retired if NESE

[357] Request for Additional Analysis, p. 1.

[358] Request for Additional Analysis, pp. 1-2.

is added to National Grid's supply portfolio; and (3) more robust analysis supporting National Grid's assertion that the addition of NESE will reduce gas pricing.

Movants argue that, in the Company's June 2, 2025, letter, the Company requested to "update" the Final LTP. They maintain that National Grid's Supplement, however, "does not alter the recommendations of the Company's [2025] Long-Term Plan."[359] Movants claim that the filing did not update the underlying assumptions or include alternative scenarios. Movants further claim that it acts as a "procedural end-run" and an "advocacy document" which "deprives stakeholders of the opportunity to meaningfully assess how NESE fits within the Company's overall planning framework."[360] Movants state that the process undertaken as a result of the Supplement does not allow for meaningful stakeholder engagement, does not allow for comparisons with NPAs, does not describe the pipeline's implications for emissions trajectories, and does not update the manner in which a preferred scenario can be selected.

National Grid responded to the Motion to Strike on July 28, 2025.[361] In its response, the Company claims that the Supplement's assessment provided necessary analysis regarding NESE's potential benefits and included an updated demand forecast.[362] Likewise, the Company states that the LAI Study provided necessary analysis regarding the reduced gas supply

[359] Motion to Strike, p. 3 (citing Supplement, p. 37, misquoting by omitting "2025").

[360] Motion to Strike, p. 3.

[361] Case 24-G-0248, National Grid's Response to Motion to Strike Addendum to its Gas System Long-Term Plan (filed July 28, 2025) (Response to Motion to Strike).

[362] Response to Motion to Strike, pp. 12-13.

congestion and reliability and resiliency benefits.[363] National Grid argues that the purpose of the Commission's Planning Order is to ensure safe, adequate, and reliable gas service while the State transitions to emission-free energy sources. The Company argues that the process was neither fixed nor static and, instead, was expected to evolve, and that the core principle of the process is that the utility submits a plan, and an independent consultant reviews such plan with an opportunity for stakeholder input.[364]

The Company claims that NESE will help to address gas system resiliency, and due to the timing of the proposed construction of NESE, "consideration must come in this long term planning cycle."[365] National Grid further claims that the Supplement comports with the Planning Order because it provided timely notice of an emerging circumstance that could impact its gas system; filed the Supplement within a month of submitting its request to update the Final LTP; held a technical conference; PA conducted its review of the filing; and stakeholders had an additional month to provide comments on the submission.[366] National Grid argues that this review process complied with the Commission's procedural requirements.[367]

As an initial matter, we find ourselves in general agreement with National Grid's response and opposition to the purported "motion to strike." The Company appropriately brought the NESE matter forward here.

---

[363] Response to Motion to Strike, pp. 9 and 12.

[364] Response to Motion to Strike, p. 11.

[365] Response to Motion to Strike, p. 12.

[366] Response to Motion to Strike, p. 12.

[367] Response to Motion to Strike, pp. 12-13.

We also identify additional reasons to decline the invitation to strike. This proceeding, in accord with our Planning Order, is a notice-and-comment proceeding. The gas planning process requires the subject utility to file multiple iterations of its plan, provides for an independent consultant to review each iteration, and affords stakeholders many opportunities to engage with the subject utility and file comments on the utility's plans. Instead of being fixed and static, the process here is intended to be adaptable to changing conditions. In this proceeding, there is no statutory requirement for an evidentiary hearing, and there is not an evidentiary record as might be developed in an adjudicatory evidentiary hearing proceeding. Rather the record consists of the multiple, iterative filings by National Grid, PA, and stakeholders. The Commission's role is to consider all filings and comments, assess their relevance and import on the public interest, and issue a determination rationally supported by that paper record. In notice-and-comment proceedings, striking portions of filings runs contrary to that purpose because it limits the record, may artificially exclude material and evolving real world events, and could lead to less-informed determinations. Moreover, all stakeholders have been afforded ample opportunity to provide comments on National Grid's Supplement. The Commission has thoroughly considered those comments in this Order and striking any portion of the record would serve no useful purpose. Indeed, and contrary to Movants' contentions, the continued scarcity of reliable gas capacity could negatively impact New Yorkers residing or working within the Downstate service territories. The record developed since National Grid's filing of the Supplement will allow the Commission to make an informed determination.

We turn now to how National Grid's Supplement fits within the gas planning process. The Commission developed and adopted the gas planning process in part as a response to claims by LDCs of supply constraints that prevented or created concern about their ability to accept applications for new firm gas service.[368] National Grid was one of the LDCs that raised such concerns. After permits for the NESE project were initially denied in 2019, National Grid instituted a moratorium for new firm service and for requests for additional firm load for thousands of new and existing customers.[369] National Grid lifted this moratorium under a settlement agreement later in 2019.[370]

In addition, the Commission's gas planning process is designed to be flexible and adapt to changing policies and needs. For example, the Commission issued the Planning Order on May 12, 2022, after the CAC published its Draft Scoping Plan,[371] but before the CAC published its final Scoping Plan in December 2022.[372] The gas planning process was designed to be flexible to

[368] Planning Order, p. 2.

[369] Planning Order, p. 2-3; see also 2021 KEDNY/KEDLI Rate Order, pp. 11-15 (providing additional background information).

[370] Case 19-G-0678, supra, Order Adopting and Approving Settlement (issued November 26, 2019).

[371] New York State Climate Action Council, Draft Scoping Plan (December 30, 2021), https://climate.ny.gov/-/media/Project/Climate/Files/Draft-Scoping-Plan-Overview.pdf.

[372] New York State Climate Action Council, Scoping Plan (December 19, 2022).

incorporate recommendations in the Scoping Plan.[373] Likewise, the Commission has repeatedly stated that the Gas Planning Procedure is an iterative process wherein the filings and plans will evolve over time.[374]

The gas planning process has been in place for over three years and is designed to allow the Commission the flexibility to adapt the process to ensure that it is able to assess the need of maintaining safe and reliable service in a transparent and equitable way. The Commission and the public benefit from the analysis contained in the Supplement to National Grid's Final Report regarding the potential of NESE being added to National Grid's supply portfolio. The Supplement, PA's analysis on the Supplement, and public comments on the Supplement are necessary and sufficient to reasonably assess National Grid's Final LTP and what is needed to ensure National Grid can continue to provide safe, adequate, and reliable gas service to its customers. Stakeholders have had ample opportunity to, and in fact have presented substantive comments regarding National Grid's Supplement. This demonstrates that the process leading to this Order has resulted

[373] Planning Order, pp. 19, 63-64 ("we will consider future phases of this proceeding when more guidance is available [from the CAC]"); see also New York State Climate Action Council, Scoping Plan (December 19, 2022), p. 56-57 (deferring questions of studies or trading programs for renewable natural gas for a future phase of the Gas Planning Proceeding), p. 63 (establishing the Avoided Cost of Gas working group, to help produce "accurate estimates of costs and benefits" for future LTPs).

[374] See Case 23-G-0147, supra, Order Regarding Long-Term Natural Gas Plan and Requiring Further Actions (issued September 20, 2024), p. 32; Case 23-G-0437, supra, Order Regarding Long-Term Natural Gas Plan and Directing Further Actions (issued January 23, 2025), p. 32; Case 23-G-0676, supra, Order Regarding Long-Term Natural Gas Plan and Directing Further Actions (issued July 17, 2025), p. 37.

in analysis and public engagement envisioned by the Commission's Planning Order.

Additionally, we note that Transco's redevelopment of the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project was a circumstance that emerged in May 2025, approximately one year after the start of this proceeding, but before we had the opportunity to solicit comment on PA's Final Report. As such, Movants ask that we essentially either ignore this significant emerging impact on National Grid's gas system or indefinitely extend the process. It would be unreasonable to ignore these emerging events when they could be, and were, adequately addressed through the process afforded in advance of this Order. Alternatively, the Movants ask that we prolong indefinitely a process that has already developed substantial and sufficient information for Commission consideration. We conclude that there is not a compelling need to further extend this process or develop additional analyses in order to make the reasoned determinations contained in this Order.

Due to the importance of the analysis regarding NESE from National Grid, PA Consulting, and stakeholder comments, and in the interest of making an informed decision based on the record, the Commission finds it appropriate to exercise the flexibility afforded it within the gas planning process to consider all of the filings related to the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project in this matter. For all these reasons, we deny the purported Motion to Strike and Request for Additional Analysis on the merits as unfounded and also as academic.

CONCLUSION

In this proceeding, National Grid submitted a gas system long-term plan for its NMPC, KEDNY, and KEDLI service territories. Additionally, in its Supplement, National Grid

assessed the benefits and costs of Transco's renewed proposal for the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project. In this Order, the Commission addresses National Grid's Final LTP and acknowledges that there is a need for the more reliable source of supply that the proposed NESE project would provide if it receives all required approvals and is constructed. Accordingly, the Commission observes that based on the record in this proceeding, it is appropriate for National Grid to seek capacity from the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project to ensure it can continue to provide safe, adequate reliable service. However, as the Commission does not have a formal role in permitting or approving the construction of NESE, and unless and until NESE is constructed, National Grid must rely on less reliable and more expensive sources of supply on design day to meet customer demand. Upon consideration of National Grid's Final LTP and Supplement, PA's reports, and stakeholders' comments, the Commission directs the Company to make additional filings related to demand forecasting and meeting with Community Board No. 1 as described in the body of this Order. We also direct that the Company include certain information in its annual updates to this long-term plan, due May 15, 2026, and May 17, 2027, and in its next long-term plan filing, due on October 2, 2028.

The Commission orders:

1. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to file a report within 90 days of the date of this Order explaining their methodologies and processes for demand forecasting and developing estimates of use per customer on design day, and explicitly listing and describing the

improvements they are making to those methodologies and processes, consistent with the discussion in the body of this Order.

2. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to file, together with the report required in Ordering Clause 1, updated design day and annual demand forecasts for each of their operating systems that reflect the improvements described in that report and using the data available through the end of November 2025.

3. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY is directed to contact Community Board No. 1 to determine when and how it can take part in its meetings, develop a plan for interaction with Community Board No. 1, and file it with the Secretary within 90 days of this Order.

4. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY is directed to file information in its first annual update to this LTP on the impact to the environment of the local community from operation of the Greenpoint liquefied natural gas facility and information comparing the cost of liquefied natural gas per dekatherm compared to compressed natural gas and delivered services.

5. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY and KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to file a comprehensive analysis in their next long-term plan filing concerning the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project’s ability to allow for the decommissioning of the Greenpoint Liquified Natural Gas facility, including demand-side and supply-side alternatives, cost estimates and available forecasts for gas load growth and electrification.

6. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to provide a thorough update on their non-pipe alternative deployment efforts in their next long-term plan filing, including listing all solicitations and their results.

7. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to provide information in their annual updates to this LTP, as well as in their next long-term plan filing, regarding the mileage of leak prone pipe remaining on each company's system and the results of solicitations for non-pipes alternatives issued by each company focused on retiring leak prone pipe.

8. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to provide a bill impact analysis in their next long-term plan filing that includes a share-of-wallet calculation to reflect increased electric usage by customers choosing to electrify and provide sensitivities in bill impacts to reflect varying levels of electrification by its customers.

9. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY and KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to include impacts from all dimensions of the potential inclusion of the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project, if it is approved, within the supply stack in the bill impact analysis, consistent with the discussion in the body of this order, in their next long-term plan filing and the annual updates to this long-term plan that are filed after the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project is placed into service.

10. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY and KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to develop a plan to reduce reliance on its risk prone, less reliable, capacity assets and file that plan within 120 days of any decision by Transco to abandon the Northeast Supply Enhancement Project or by November 1, 2028, whichever comes first.

11. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to produce an optimization model as part of their next long-term plan filing.

12. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to monitor data on its system related to how many customers decommission their natural gas heating systems in favor of either geothermal applications, including thermal energy networks, or air-source heat pumps and how many of those customers terminate gas service completely and report this data as part of each annual update to their LTP, due May 15, 2026, and May 17, 2027, as well as their next LTP filing due October 2, 2028.

13. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to provide information on the amount of renewable natural gas purchased on an annual basis in the annual updates to their LTP and in future LTP filings.

14. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are

directed to identify the programs and investments that are intended to benefit disadvantaged communities in its annual updates to this LTP, including an explanation of how these investments benefit disadvantaged communities and a quantification of the benefits.

15. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to calculate the price point where blending RNG or hydrogen becomes more expensive than heat pumps for residential customers and how that compares to the prices each is paying for RNG in their next long-term plan filing.

16. Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid is directed to include information on the East Gate reliability in its next rate case filing including the projected date of any supply-demand gap and a description of all alternatives considered including non-pipe alternatives.

17. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY, KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid, and Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid are directed to file their next long-term plan by October 2, 2028.

18. The June 3, 2025, Request for Additional Analysis and the July 18, 2025, Motion to Strike are denied.

19. In the Secretary's sole discretion, the deadlines set forth in this Order may be extended. Any request for an extension must be in writing, must include a justification for the extension, and must be filed at least three days prior to the affected deadline.

20. This proceeding is continued.

By the Commission,

(SIGNED) MICHELLE L. PHILLIPS
Secretary

SCHEDULE OF PROCEEDING

Event	Date
Technical Conference	May 8, 2024 - Pre-Filing Educational
Company's Filing of Initial Long-Term Plan	June 3, 2024
Technical Conference	June 27, 2024 – Company's Presentation of Initial LTP
Technical Conference	July 17, 2024 – Downstate Joint Proposal and NMPC Rate Case
Technical Conference	July 30, 2024 – Demand Forecast
Technical Conference	August 28, 2024 – Clean Energy Programs
Technical Conference	September 5, 2024 – Low Carbon Fuels
Technical Conference	September 12, 2024 – Geothermal Applications
Initial Comments Due	September 18, 2024
PA Consulting Initial Report	September 27, 2024
Reply Comments Due	October 3, 2024
Technical Conference	October 10, 2024 – Bill Impacts and Affordability
Technical Conference	October 17, 2024 – Moratorium Management
Company's Filing of Revised Long-Term Plan	October 23, 2024
Technical Conference	November 20, 2024 & December 12, 2024 – LNG/Greenpoint
Comments Due	December 13, 2024
PA Consulting Preliminary Findings Report	January 30, 2025
Technical Conference	February 12, 2025 – PA Consulting's Preliminary Findings Report
Comments Due	February 21, 2025

Technical Conference	February 27, 2025 – Thermal Energy Network and District Geothermal
Company's Filing of Final Long-Term Plan	March 7, 2025
Comments Due	April 3, 2025
Public Statement Hearings	April 10, 16, 17, 2025
Comments Due	April 18, 2025
PA Consulting Final Report	May 19, 2025
Company's Filing of Supplement to Final Long-Term Plan	July 2, 2025
Technical Conference	July 22, 2025 – Company's Supplement to Final Long-Term Plan
PA Consulting Report on Supplement to Final Long-Term Plan	August 6, 2025
Comments Due	September 5, 2025

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Public Comments

Approximately 3,700 comments were received between September 5, 2024, and September 11, 2025, throughout all phases of the LTP process, that expressed opposition to the LTP and to the NESE pipeline (Multiple Commenters).

Multiple Commenters recommend that the Commission reject National Grid's LTP. Multiple Commenters recommend that the PSC require the Company to develop a new plan that solely focuses on gas reduction. Multiple Commenters recognize the Company's failure to reduce gas consumption as non-compliance with New York State Laws, in particular the CLCPA.

Multiple Commenters recommend safe and clean alternatives for heating and cooking such as thermal energy networks, demand response, electrification, and energy efficiency. Multiple Commenters recommend that the PSC direct National Grid to conduct a "true and transparent" cost-benefit analysis of Accelerated Electrification, Energy Efficiency programs, and NPAs.

Multiple Commenters note that the Company does not clearly evidence a need for additional gas infrastructure. Multiple Commenters affirm that downstate New York faces no current natural gas shortage and will experience declining demand in the coming years. Multiple Commenters note that New York State has passed several laws that will significantly reduce natural gas use in the coming years such as the Advanced Building Codes, Appliance and Equipment Efficiency Standards Act, All-Electric New Buildings Act, and Green Affordable Pre-Electrification Fund. Multiple Commenters recognize that National Grid has adjusted its projected date for gas supply shortfall in downstate New York from 2028 to the 2040s.

Multiple Commenters urge the PSC to reject NESE. Multiple Commenters note that NESE has even less grounds for necessity than during its initial proposal in 2017 given efforts to reduce fossil fuel consumption in New York City and statewide with the adoption of Local Law 97 and the CLCPA in 2019. Multiple Commenters note that no electric generators have committed to purchasing gas from National Grid due to the prospect of NESE. Multiple Commenters also affirm that support for the wholesale electricity market remains outside the scope of National Grid's duties. Multiple Commenters note that NESE's estimated cost of $3.2B, which includes a guaranteed 14 percent profit for Williams and still remains uncertain due to volatile steel prices and unpredictable federal tariffs, would impose exorbitant costs on ratepayers in Brooklyn, Staten Island, Queens, and Nassau and Suffolk Counties, many of whom already struggle with rising energy bills, which are set to increase by another $30 in 2026, and would deepen energy insecurity. Multiple Commenters note that 30 percent of New York City households are struggling to pay bills or facing utility shutoffs. Multiple Commenters project that NESE would raise bills for National Grid's downstate customer by over $7 per month.

Multiple Commenters claim that NESE's plans to increase methane combustion in downstate New York violate the CLCPA and undermine the constitutional right to a healthful environment in New York State. Multiple Commenters assert that NESE will worsen extreme weather in New York, which is already encountering record-breaking downpours, lethal heat waves, and rising sea levels. Multiple Commenters note that the proposed pipeline path for NESE risks rupture by crossing an earthquake-prone area off of the coast of Coney Island. Multiple

Commenters affirm that this pipeline would excavate six feet of seabed for over 23 miles off New York's shores, which would stir up decades-old toxic industrial pollutants including arsenic, lead, PCBs, and Dioxins. Multiple Commenters note that toxins would threaten not only human health but also the resurgence of marine life. Multiple Commenters note that construction noise, vibrations, ship traffic, and water turbidity would disorient marine animals, disrupt migrations, reduce fish feeding and breeding success, and put endangered species at further risk. Multiple Commenters also note that the NESE project distracts from flaws with the Company's Final LTP.

Multiple Commenters recommend the development of a community-led stakeholder group to plan for the retirement of the Greenpoint LNG Facility. Multiple Commenters affirm that this facility perpetuates the Company's disproportionate pollution of Black and Brown communities. Multiple Commenters recommend that the PSC disallow cost recovery from ratepayers for this facility.

Multiple Commenters recommend that the PSC deny National Grid's proposal to expand and prolong the life of the Iroquois Pipeline. Multiple Commenters claim that the Company's proposals for gas system expansion primarily benefit corporate shareholders.

Multiple Commenters note that the Final LTP's focus on low-carbon fuels such as RNG and hydrogen conflicts with the Climate Action Council's focus on efficient electric air- and ground-source heat pumps and thermal energy networks. Multiple Commenters also note that National Grid's plan for RNG relies on overly optimistic projections for availability. Multiple Commenters additionally note that the Final LTP incorporates

inflated demand forecasts to justify significant investments in the gas pipeline system.

Comments on Initial Long-Term Plan (LTP):

City of New York (CNY or City)

CNY recommends a systematic transition off of fossil fuels. The City emphasizes that National Grid must be clear about the limitations and lifecycle emissions of technologies considered for decarbonization. The City advocates for grounding short and medium-term commitments in gas alternatives that are currently zero-emissions, market-ready, safe, and affordable, with decarbonization achieved in the most cost-effective way through data-driven planning undertaken in collaboration with the City, neighboring electric utilities, and communities. The City urges National Grid to operate its existing decarbonization programs efficiently, prioritizing easy-to-electrify assets, leveraging capital repair and replacement needs, and investing significantly in Disadvantaged Communities (DACs).

The City argues that Non-Pipe Alternatives (NPAs) must be at the forefront of the gas transition and advocates for their increased implementation. While the Commission directed utilities to integrate NPAs into their standard gas system planning processes, the City believes National Grid has not sufficiently scaled NPAs. The City recommends that National Grid include a "no infrastructure" scenario in its plan, and if not feasible, be specific about the sections of the plan requiring infrastructure upgrades and explain the reasoning. Additionally, the City recommends incorporating oil to electric conversions as a best practice and adopting mechanisms to

prioritize these conversions over oil to gas conversions as part of the overarching NPA strategy.

According to the City, thermal energy networks can play a critical role in long-term planning and encourages the Company to build capacity to install and expand district thermal systems. The City has been a strong advocate of KEDNY's utility thermal energy network pilot project located at a New York City Housing Authority campus, which will deliver substantial benefits to a Disadvantaged Community. The Company must make a concerted effort to build capacity to install and expand deployment of district thermal systems, including the proposed thermal network pilot projects. The City requests that the Company's final Plan identify what characteristics of a geography or building make thermal systems or networks a viable solution to decarbonization, what project components must be the focus of cost reduction efforts, where the current workforce capacity must be grown to meaningfully implement projects, and other barriers and opportunities to scaling thermal projects.

The City also emphasizes the importance of electrification and weatherization efforts. Issues relating to the costs of weatherization and electrification efforts must be addressed through different relevant proceedings, and the Plan must address these funding gaps and delays to ensure continuity for customers and scale to meet the need over time. Moreover, these programs should target and stack incentives to low-income New Yorkers and affordable housing, where building investments improve quality of life for the City's most vulnerable residents. National Grid must also rapidly scale up heat pump deployment due to the emissions impact of these devices. Furthermore, the Company must create a more detailed plan

addressing how they will accelerate the installation of heat pumps and increase the rate of heat pump adoption by customers.

The City argues that National Grid's "Clean Energy Vision" cannot rely on imported Renewable Natural Gas and Hydrogen. The Clean Energy Vision scenario in the Plan relies heavily on a large-scale increase of renewable natural gas (RNG) and hydrogen use to support decarbonization. While the City supports the use of certain sources of RNG and is partnering to bring renewable biofuels made from local organic waste feedstocks into the gas system, it does not support importing large volumes of RNG from outside the region or RNG made from non-waste feedstocks. As such, the City supports the use of RNG as a viable alternative to natural gas, specifically in hard-to-electrify end uses, but only if such RNG is produced locally from existing organic waste streams to encourage beneficial use of captured methane and to avoid upstream greenhouse gas emissions.

Additionally, while the City has been clear that hydrogen is not currently a viable solution to replace natural gas, the Company has not addressed the City's safety concerns or demonstrated that hydrogen can be produced at scale with zero lifecycle greenhouse gas (GHG) and criteria air emissions. To help develop locally-produced RNG into a more feasible and economically viable choice as an alternative fuel, the City recommends that the Commission define specific requirements for RNG attributes, including requiring local attribute sales and retirement of attributes to hard-to-electrify critical safety and public health assets/economic drivers, and encouraging development of a local or statewide market for attributes.

CNY recommends that the Commission scrutinize National Grid’s demand forecasts. The City states that National Grid

projects continued demand growth, which will result in a near-term supply/demand gap. As a result, the Company relies on a number of proposed infrastructure solutions, including the Iroquois ExC project and the Greenpoint LNG Facility vaporizer project. The City requests that DPS Staff closely scrutinize the Design Day forecast for downstate New York, stating that the Design Day forecast is a major driver of infrastructure investments, but the Design Day is based on the actual observed air temperature conditions on February 9, 1934, and New York City has not experienced Design Day conditions since that date 90 years ago.

The City questions the Company's forecast that customers (meter counts) increase all the way to 2050. Specific questions include: Who are these new customers? Why is the growth of annual usage greater than the growth of new customers? Why is the design day demand growth greater than the growth of both the number of meters and the annual usage? What causes this increase in usage per customer? These fundamental questions about demand projections are critical to understanding whether the proposed infrastructure investments are truly necessary.

The City's scrutiny of demand forecasts reflects broader concerns about the accuracy and methodology of projections that drive significant infrastructure investments. The reliance on historical weather data from nearly a century ago raises questions about the relevance of such benchmarks in contemporary planning, particularly given climate change and evolving building efficiency standards. The City's detailed questioning of customer growth patterns suggests a need for more granular analysis of who these future customers will be and what will drive their gas consumption patterns.

CNY recommends maintenance of a safe, reliable, and resilient system. The City states that National Grid has made strides in reducing its gas leak backlog, but KEDNY and KEDLI continue to have the largest backlog of all the New York gas utilities. The Plan does not address the leak backlog, nor how any of the infrastructure investments that are related to reducing the backlog could be replaced with NPAs. The City recommends that National Grid address this issue in the next filing of this Plan. Safety and reliability remain critical priorities, and it is essential that the Plan preserve safety and reliability for ratepayers without sacrificing the imperative of replacing leak prone pipes ("LPP") with NPAs.

The City recommends that greater emphasis be placed on the retirement of gas mains and conversion of customers to heating and hot water systems that do not rely on fossil fuels. Rebuilding an aging gas system risks extending reliance on carbon-intensive infrastructure and creating stranded assets.

The City recommends National Grid continue to look for ways to reduce the miles of LPP to be replaced annually, with the percentage of LPP being taken out of service incrementally decreasing each year. They assert this approach would align infrastructure replacement with the broader goal of transitioning away from gas dependence.

The City notes that a critical component of long-term gas planning is avoiding infrastructure investments that would prolong the life of the gas system. Demand response programs have proven to be an effective and efficient tool to minimize the need to connect to upstream gas pipelines and/or localized gas production and have been generally successful since inception and should be expanded upon to reap maximum benefits. The City also recommends assessing LPP areas that are

appropriate for NPAs with data about age of building systems fueled with natural gas and their mortgage terms to align implementation with a building system's capital and mortgage cycle.

The City expects that a detailed study of the Greenpoint Facility will be conducted by PA Consulting, per the terms of the Joint Proposal. The City reserves comments on the Greenpoint Facility pending results of that study and National Grid should be exploring options for the near-term beneficial re-use of portions of the Greenpoint Facility site through pilot or demonstration on-site solar, storage, or thermal network projects, and seeking immediate- and short-term opportunities for emission reductions from onsite operations. The City also recommends extending the commitment to perform preliminary NPA analysis to all new and expanded gas service requests.

CNY recommends that the Company ensure that gas rates remain affordable. The City states effective energy policy can play a critical role in promoting fairness and equity, reducing burdens on DACs, and encouraging successful and equitable economic development, public health, sustainability, and resiliency. The City indicates a commitment to identifying pathways to reduce the energy cost burden as many New York City residents struggle to pay their utility bills and programs will become even more critical as the clean energy transition continues because those who cannot afford to move off the gas system quickly will see increased gas bills as other customers are able to move off of the system.

The City states that the current Plan is deficient because it includes bill impacts based on the scenarios presented, rather than bill impacts based on sufficient bill mitigation tactics used in concert with the proposed pathways.

The Plan must also place more responsibility on National Grid to ensure that remaining gas customers do not disproportionately shoulder increased energy cost burdens as the gas system shrinks. The City also calls on National Grid to proactively and significantly increase the number of customers that are eligible for low-income discount programs but are not currently enrolled. The City recommends surveying available bill mitigation and rate design tactics that have been proposed nationally to reduce energy cost burden and effectively enroll low-income rate payers.

The City indicates that benefits must be equitably distributed to Disadvantaged Communities. It is imperative that any actions taken by the State to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels "should prioritize the safety and health of disadvantaged communities, control potential regressive impacts of future climate change mitigation and adaptation policies on these communities and prioritize the allocation of public investments in these areas." As such, National Grid's Plan should be designed to have a significant impact on improving the air quality and, concurrently, the health of the residents in these communities. The City also recommends assessing and identifying the reasons why eligible New Yorkers are not enrolled in energy assistance programs and developing solutions to make these programs more accessible.

The City further recommends exploring transformative rate design, corporate governance, and regulatory reform strategies to ensure that higher costs resulting from winding down gas infrastructure over the coming decades do not disproportionately burden remaining customers. This comprehensive approach to affordability recognizes that the transition away from gas must be managed carefully to avoid

creating additional financial hardships for vulnerable populations who may be the last to transition off the gas system.

CNY notes that specific legislative and policy changes are needed. The City states that neither the State nor individual utilities like National Grid will be able to efficiently and cost-effectively transition from natural gas infrastructure to other power sources without legislative and/or regulatory changes to support them. One of the key changes that has been discussed in various proceedings before the Commission and the State as a whole is whether or not the "100-foot rule" should be modified and/or eliminated. National Grid briefly addresses the "100-foot rule" in its discussion of proposed statutory or regulatory changes that should be considered, but does not provide a distinct recommendation as to whether the rule should be modified or eliminated altogether.

The City strongly supports the elimination of this rule, as it pertains to gas service and not electric service, to mitigate this obstacle to the transition away from gas service, and calls on National Grid to present a formal position on how this rule should be modified and/or eliminated as a means to prevent future extension of gas infrastructure and encourage electrification. This regulatory change would remove a significant barrier to electrification by eliminating the requirement to extend gas service to properties within 100 feet of existing gas mains.

The City largely supports the Company's proposal of establishing a framework for RNG accounting to make it more financially competitive in New York State. The City supports the use of RNG as a viable alternative to natural gas, specifically in hard-to-electrify end uses, but only if such RNG

is produced locally from existing waste streams to encourage beneficial use of captured methane and to avoid upstream greenhouse gas emissions. This framework would help create market mechanisms that properly value locally-produced renewable gas while avoiding the environmental concerns associated with imported alternatives.

The City agrees that enhanced coordination and planning between electric and gas utilities, particularly those with neighboring and/or overlapping service territories, will be essential to maximizing efforts and efficiently transitioning customers off the gas system, and should already be in place. The Commission should conduct coordinated planning between electric and gas utilities, including by, but not limited to, aligning rate case and long-term gas plan proceeding timing. The City also notes that more must be done after National Grid makes the referral to ensure that gas customers convert to electrification through enhanced, close coordination to encourage better results from the referral process.

The City has identified a number of inconsistencies between the Climate Action Council's recommendations and the Company's Plan that should be rectified. The Plan's Clean Energy Vision assumes that "by 2050, over 40 percent of residential and commercial buildings will transition to hybrid heating systems that combine an electric [air source heat pump ("ASHP")] with a gas-fired heating system." This proposal is inconsistent with the Scoping Plan's clear directive to reduce emissions from both the transportation sector and gas sector and finding that the use of RNG must not result in increased emissions.

CNY recommends that the Company reconsider its gas network depreciation strategy. The City urges the Company to

reconsider its approach to the depreciation and decommissioning of its gas network assets as outlined in the Plan. Under both the Clean Energy Vision and Accelerated Electrification scenarios, certain gas network assets with potential for alternative and viable uses are being marked down for complete retirement as though they have zero remaining useful life after the accelerated depreciation schedule, which seems premature and does not take into account the potential for these assets to support the clean energy transition in innovative ways.

The City recommends that the Company conduct a thorough review to explore potential alternative uses for these assets, such as repurposing the gas network for hydrogen or biomethane distribution, integration into district thermal heating systems, utilization for energy storage solutions like compressed air energy storage, or adaptation for transporting biofuels and synthetic gases. This review could uncover opportunities to repurpose existing infrastructure in ways that align with clean energy goals, thus potentially mitigating the need for expedited cost recovery and reducing the financial burden on remaining customers.

The City notes that the aforementioned examples would need to be thoroughly vetted to ensure feasibility and alignment with clean energy goals—and the City's recommendation for this exploratory analysis is not an endorsement of these technologies and is not counter to the above-stated comments. This careful approach recognizes that while alternative uses for existing gas infrastructure may provide value, any such repurposing must be consistent with overall decarbonization goals and not serve to extend the life of fossil fuel infrastructure beyond what is necessary for an orderly transition.

The depreciation strategy represents a critical financial and policy decision that affects both utility shareholders and ratepayers. By exploring alternative uses for existing assets, National Grid could potentially avoid stranded asset costs while contributing to the clean energy transition. However, the City's cautious approach ensures that such exploration does not become a justification for delaying the fundamental transition away from fossil fuel dependence.

Environmental Defense Fund (EDF)

EDF states that the LTP Plan must align with New York's climate policy mandating reduced reliance on fossil fueled energy. EDF claims that natural gas use and production must decline to meet New York's climate goals. EDF affirms that the Initial LTP presents National Grid's "Clean Energy Vision" scenario (CEV) as the preferred pathway towards decarbonization. EDF disputes National Grid's justification for this pathway preference. EDF claims that National Grid justifies this preference by observing overlaps between this and the "Accelerated Electrification" scenario (AE), which the LTP derives from the Climate Action Council's (CAC) Scoping Plan. EDF notes National Grid's emphasis on overlaps between the near-term enabling policies required for each. EDF, however, observes notable differences between these two pathways. EDF recognizes that the Accelerated Electrification scenario models significantly greater reductions in Design Day Volume by 2044. EDF correspondingly suggests that the "Clean Energy Vision" deviates from the Scoping Plan's guidance on downsizing the natural gas system despite this pathway's high-level consistency with this plan. EDF recommends that the Commission not approve the LTP without the following changes: improve NPA programs;

remove plans to inject hydrogen into the natural gas system; and reduce planned reliance on RNG.

EDF states that the Company must strengthen its NPA framework. EDF recognizes the LTP's high-level commitment to aggressive NPA pursuit but recommends the following improvements to National Grid's NPA framework: identify demand needs as early as possible; consider NPAs for all supply, capacity, and capital projects; seek solutions through an open and transparent RFP process; incorporate the climate and health benefits of avoiding gas infrastructure into project evaluation; maintain a robust and transparent record or decision-making process for NPA evaluation and implementation.

EDF recommends that National Grid expand the scope of its NPA program by better defining this program's criteria for "reliability." EDF notes the frequency with which National Grid invokes "system reliability" as a criterion for denying NPA eligibility and views this as a sign and symptom of this term's vagueness in National Grid's framework for NPA evaluation. EDF recognizes that National Grid's downstate affiliates denied NPA eligibility for 85 out of the 183 capital projects which they cumulatively reviewed in their 2023 rate case according to reasons of "system reliability" while Niagara Mohawk invoked this reason to deny NPA eligibility for 27 capital projects in its 2024 rate case. EDF recommends that National Grid only employ this term during NPA review for instances of an urgent need that pose a safety risk or threaten immediate system failure. EDF also recommends that National Grid remove the time thresholds from its NPA framework to ensure that all capital projects undergo a feasibility analysis for NPA implementation.

EDF states that hydrogen blending is not a viable decarbonization strategy. EDF addresses National Grid's

hydrogen proposals by first comparing those found in the LTP's CEV and AE scenarios. EDF notes that CEV proposes systemwide blending at a 20 percent volumetric blend rate, or 7 percent energy load relief, by 2050, as well as 100 percent hydrogen networks dedicated to servicing one-fifth of commercial buildings and two-thirds of industrial customers by 2050. EDF notes that AE assumes the deployment of significantly less hydrogen and reserves this for cement, iron and steel facilities.

EDF proceeds to describe various safety, climate, and health risks with hydrogen blending. EDF affirms a higher leakage rate for hydrogen than methane (1.3 to 3 times faster) according to the lower mass and higher diffusivity of the former. EDF recognizes a greater fire risk than methane according to hydrogen's higher/wider explosive limit, lower ignition energy, and lower flame visibility. EDF notes that hydrogen's higher flame temperature also contributes to greater production of nitrous oxide (NOx) than methane. EDF also notes that hydrogen itself is an indirect greenhouse gas (GHG) that increases the concentrations of short-lived GHGs through its reaction with and concomitant reduction of hydroxyl radicals (OH), or naturally occurring atmospheric oxidants which act as key sinks for methane. EDF asserts that a 20 percent hydrogen-blend would only reduce emissions associated with natural gas-heated buildings by 5.1 percent while the renewables needed to produce the same amount of energy as this blend could achieve three times these reductions if used to support building electrification via heat pump deployment. EDF additionally challenges the accuracy of the scholarly research performed by National Grid to support the safety of 20 percent hydrogen-blending. EDF notes that National Grid supports this with a

2022 study on hydrogen-blending which the California Public Utilities Commission study directed the University of California Riverside to conduct; EDF asserts that this study only supported a blend rate of 5 percent and reserved blend rates between 5 to 20 percent for demonstration projects rather than deployment. EDF then affirms that the National Renewable Energy (NREL) issued a 2022 study to problematize any limit generalization on hydrogen blending and essentially retract its 2013 study in generalized support of a 5 to 15 percent hydrogen-blend. EDF also notes that the Pipeline Safety Trust, a national organization advocating for pipeline safety policies, recommended against blending hydrogen into local gas distribution systems under any circumstances.

EDF then challenges the energy efficiency of hydrogen relative to natural gas and building electrification. EDF affirms that hydrogen yields less than energy than natural gas according to a lower energy density per unit of volume and subsequently higher requirements for velocity and input energy per unit of volume. EDF affirms that building electrification via heat pumps requires 70 percent less renewable electricity to produce the same amount of energy as green hydrogen and 87.2 percent less renewable electricity to produce the same amount of GHG emission reduction. EDF correspondingly notes that the production of climate-beneficial hydrogen would divert a significant amount of clean energy from cleaning the electric grid. EDF additionally recognizes that the Climate Justice Working Group (CJWG), which the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act (CLCPA) created to provide recommendations on environmental justice concerns to CAC, imbues hydrogen with the potential to increase GHGs in the environment and localized pollution concentrated in environmental justice communities.

EDF ultimately offers the following recommendations regarding hydrogen proposals in the Company's LTP: remove hydrogen-blending from the CEV scenario; remove assumptions of near-term deployment of hydrogen-blending; remove assumptions that anticipate serving commercial customers with hydrogen; assess the cost-effectiveness and energy efficiency of hydrogen relative to electrification for industrial customers and, if this assessment favors hydrogen, develop a pilot program for industrial hydrogen deployment. EDF also offers the following recommendations for considering hydrogen projects in general: compare the costs and benefits with alternatives, including electrification and NPAs, as well as the status quo in sufficiently granular manner for the evaluation of various end uses and end users; demonstrate the cost-effectiveness, comparative technological feasibility, and environmental benefits according to the best available data gathering technology; consider hydrogen leakage rates to the safety and climate impact; examine infrastructure and end-use degradation; reserve hydrogen for circumstances without any more viable option available.

EDF states that biomethane or RNG presents significant climate and safety concerns. EDF proceeds to address the LTP's proposals for RNG. EDF affirms that the CEV proposes significant reliance on RNG, whereby 41 percent of residential and commercial buildings will rely on hybrid heating systems that receive a mixture of 80 percent RNG and 20 percent hydrogen by volume. EDF also observes significant reliance on RNG in AE. EDF asserts that this proposal deviates from most decarbonization recommendations, including the Scoping Plan, and ignores the supply constraints of climate-beneficial RNG. EDF notes that the greatest amount of RNG deployment in the Scoping

Plan involves a 9 percent RNG blend by volume, which appears in the "Strategic Use of Low Carbon Fuels" scenario. EDF also notes that the Scoping Plan likens the pollutant emissions from the combustions of RNG and natural gas. EDF limits the availability of climate-beneficial RNG to between 1.4 and 12 percent of U.S. natural gas demand according to analyses from the American Gas Foundation, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), and NREL. EDF accordingly recommends that the Company reserve RNG for hard-to-electrify sectors rather than system blending.

Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis (IEEFA)

IEEFA's comments for the Initial LTP focus on the green hydrogen portion of the plan. IEEFA asserts that National Grid's LTP should not rely on hydrogen for homes or buildings. IEEFA notes that hydrogen is hard to manage, requires enormous infrastructure development and significantly expanded monitoring, and will likely have limited impact on carbon dioxide emissions in blended form. IEEFA recommends that National Grid reconsider its proposal regarding hydrogen and hydrogen-blending.

IEEFA asserts that hydrogen is not an efficient source of energy by volume. IEEFA notes that a 100 percent hydrogen substitution for natural gas would provide only 35 percent of the previously provided energy.

IEEFA asserts the limited availability of large volumes of hydrogen. IEEFA notes that petrochemical and fertilizer industries use most of the 10 million tons of hydrogen annually produced in the U.S. IEEFA references the Renewables 2023 report from the International Energy Agency (IEA), which discusses the slow pace of bringing planned hydrogen projects to financial close due to a lack of off-takers

and the impact of inflation on production costs. IEEFA states that the costs of hydrogen production remain a challenge for the Initial LTP's proposed reliance on hydrogen even though National Grid proposes to be the off-taker.

IEEFA asserts that the Initial LTP does not rule out the use of methane-based, or blue, hydrogen if green hydrogen, which is produced from water through electrolysis, is unavailable. IEEFA asserts that blue hydrogen is neither clean nor low-carbon. IEEFA claims that the GREET model (Greenhouse gases, Regulated Emissions and Energy use in Transportation), which the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) uses to evaluate CO2-equivalent (CO2e) emissions from methane-based hydrogen, significantly understates the likely emissions associated with blue hydrogen. IEEFA recommends using a 2.5 percent methane fugitive emission rate rather than the 1 percent rate employed by the GREET model.

IEEFA asserts that pipeline transport of hydrogen presents a challenge. IEEFA states that National Grid's plans for hydrogen would require an undetermined amount of new pipeline construction because the U.S. only has about 1,600 miles of hydrogen-dedicated pipelines, nearly all of which are concentrated in Texas and Louisiana. IEEFA challenges the Initial LTP's assertation that existing gas networks can transport a 20 percent hydrogen blend. IEEFA notes the stress that hydrogen can place on plastic and steel piping as well as pressure regulators to confront hydrogen's high leakage rate relative to methane.

IEEFA expresses concern with increased nitrous oxide (NOx) emissions from hydrogen combustion. IEEFA notes that NOx interacts with volatile organic compounds in the atmosphere to form tropospheric ozone pollution.

IEEFA asserts that hydrogen-methane blends in pipelines and homes or buildings poses safety risks and uncertainties. IEEFA notes that hydrogen has a broader range of conditions under which it will ignite. IEEFA also asserts that maintenance costs for distribution systems under hydrogen service will likely increase because these systems would require more frequent inspections, additional leak detection systems, and the elimination of all remaining LPP.

IEEFA challenges the likelihood of National Grid's projection that 67 percent of industrial energy use by 2050 will be 100 percent hydrogen. IEEFA references a 2020 report from McKinsey & Company which found that roughly 49 percent of fuel used for industrial activity could be replaced by electrification from extant technologies.

IEEFA asserts that hydrogen storage raises issues while battery technology offers better certainty as an energy storage resource. IEEFA asserts that only three underground salt cavern hydrogen storage facilities operate in the U.S., all of which reside in Texas. IEEFA also expresses concern with hydrogen loss through cap rock in underground storage. IEEFA notes leakage and safety issues with National Grid's plan to store excess hydrogen within its pipeline system. IEEFA confirms that battery storage in the power sector was the fastest-growing commercial energy technology worldwide in 2023 and that battery costs have dropped 90 percent since 2010.

Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)

NRDC identifies major risks associated with the Company’s preferred pathway, the Clean Energy Vision (CEV). NRDC finds the heavy reliance on renewable natural gas and hydrogen in the building sector to be risky, likely incompatible with CLCPA targets, and highly uncertain with respect to price,

supply, emissions impact, and technical feasibility. Also, NRDC states that National Grid's LTP deviates from the Scoping Plan's path in its assumptions on electrification and alternative fuels.

NRDC raises concerns about the CEV scenario's heavy reliance on hydrogen and RNG. These concerns are based on overly optimistic assumptions regarding RNG's availability, the retention of RNG's environmental attributes, understated price assumptions and operational concerns. RNG availability faces significant barriers, including competition for it from combined heat and power systems, significant capital costs to build production facilities, and competition for RNG supply from non-residential gas-using customers. Also, NRDC states that RNG is not emission free, releasing pollutants when it is combusted. Without policy changes, RNG is expected to cost three times as much as fossil gas.

NRDC also raises significant concerns about National Grid's proposed reliance on hydrogen. NRDC states that the technology and market infrastructure to support hydrogen are underdeveloped. NRDC also expresses concerns about National Grid's ambitious proposal to blend hydrogen with fossil gas, noting that studies indicate that significant system retrofits are required. Additionally, NRDC states that hydrogen does not have scalable technologies to service demand from the gas network.

NRDC challenges the LTP's modeling assumptions for building electrification, particularly those for heat pump performance and backup fuel usage thresholds. NRDC notes that electric heating is already more affordable than gas, especially for new construction. NRDC expects full electrification to become increasingly cost-effective and gas service to become

more expensive over the full plan horizon. Further, NRDC states that hydrogen combustion for heating in buildings is inefficient compared to electric heat pumps, with hydrogen boilers requiring 5.5 times more energy than electric heat pumps to produce an equal amount of heat. NRDC states that even though National Grid predicts ambitious cost decreases for hydrogen by 2050, the cost of hydrogen still remains more expensive than fossil gas.

NRDC also highlights the underutilization of non-pipe alternatives (NPAs). NRDC raises concerns with National Grid's process for utilizing ten criteria to determine the suitability of LPP projects, which resulted in approximately 90 percent of the projects failing to pass the screening process.

NRDC recommends strengthening the NPA identification and planning process, potentially through use of analytical tools such as Pacific Gas and Electric's Gas Asset Analysis Tool, to support targeted system downsizing. NRDC views the Company's ongoing investments in pipe replacements as a source of future stranded costs and suggests that NPA screening criteria should be broadened to enable electrification-based decommissioning of aging assets.

NRDC's analysis highlights the financial and equity risks associated with continued capital investment in a shrinking gas system. NRDC references new modeling by Synapse Energy Economics showing that gas delivery rates and bills would rise significantly under a Customer Defection scenario in which customer departures exceed the Company's projections.

NRDC ultimately concludes that the CEV scenario is not a viable long-term strategy because it would likely result in unaffordable bills, higher-than-expected customer defection, and substantial stranded costs. NRDC states that widespread partial building electrification is not a viable strategy to meet

emissions targets. NRDC asserts that maintaining the full gas system for intermittent use, whether for backup combustion or alternative fuels, would increase system risk, raise customer costs, and likely fall short of the Company's stated emissions reductions. NRDC also disputes the similarities that the Company notes between the early-stage actions under the LTP's CEV and Acceleration Electrification (AE) scenarios; NRCD notes that CEV involves continued infrastructure expansion while AE scales back investment. NRDC notes that AE still falls short of CLCPA alignment; NRDC asserts that partial electrification and near-term alternative fuel reliance are unlikely to deliver the required emissions outcomes.

NRDC recommends that the Company reorient its planning to accelerate electrification, avoid new infrastructure lock-in, fully utilize non-pipe alternatives, and reconsider the role of alternative fuels as a long-term solution.

New Yorkers for Clean Power (NYCP)

NYCP flags the following concerns with the Initial LTP for PA to note: inaccurate emissions accounting in CEV related to fugitive emissions from National Grid's gas distribution network; and inaccurate alternative fuel assumptions.

NYCP disputes the assumption in CEV that GHG emissions reductions are proportional to the volume of gas delivered. NYCP asserts that gas demand reduction with no system shrinkage will increase the real carbon intensity of the gas remaining on the system and that fugitive emissions depend on the size of the distribution network.

NYCP also questions the downstream fugitive emissions factor of 2.2 percent from the 2022 NYS Statewide GHG Emissions Report by noting that several research institutions from across the U.S. support a factor of approximately 0.4 percent. NYCP

additionally supports the significance of fugitive emissions in New York according to the age of building stock in the state.

NYCP further questions the emission reduction benefits of LPP replacement. NYCP attributes the minimal difference that it observes between LPP and modern pipe to underestimated leakage coming from real downstream leakage. NYCP observes comparably high emission levels from the Boston gas distribution system, which features a significant amount of leak prone cast iron pipe, and from the Indianapolis gas distribution system, which is vastly comprised of modern plastic pipe.

NYCP questions the assumption that RNG is carbon negative for many RNG feedstocks and sources. NYCP characterizes RNG production as a carbon and energy intensive process due to the life-cycle energy inputs required for procuring the necessary crops. NYCP notes that RNG emissions factor from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation does not incorporate supply chain and production emissions but rather only counts downstream fugitive methane emissions. NYCP acknowledges challenges to accurate assessments of supply chain and process emissions for RNG production; however, NYCP notes the carbon intensity of intentionally produced RNG begins to rival that of fossil natural gas when modeled with the median leakage rate of 5 percent from the 2022 NYS Statewide GHG Emissions Report. NYCP questions the climate benefits of RNG produced from both thermal gasification and anerobic digestion given that both extract methane that would not otherwise exist in free form. NYCP ultimately implicates gas system plans with heavy reliance on RNG as well as hydrogen in efforts to circumvent gas system downsizing rather than meaningfully reduce GHG emissions.

NYCP recommends against the inclusion of hydrogen blending in any LTP as a means to achieve CLCPA-compliant GHG reductions. NYCP discusses the complexities and expenses involved in producing green hydrogen that qualifies as zero emission. NYCP provides an overview of the three criteria endorsed by American Clean Power and the European Union to qualify green hydrogen as zero emission: additionality, regionality/deliverability, and hourly matching. NYCP recommends reserving zero-emission hydrogen for difficult-to-electrify industrial uses, displacing current supplies of gray hydrogen in industrial and manufacturing applications, and long duration energy storage. NYCP asserts that a comparison of hydrogen and electricity for home heating finds the former less economical, less efficient, more resource intensive, more environmentally harmful, and ultimately uncompetitive with the latter.

NYCP concludes by challenging CEV as a realistic option for not only CLCPA-compliant emission reduction but also implementation in general. NYCP supports the Scoping Plan's assertion that deep electrification combined with dramatic shrinkage of the gas distribution system represents the only realistic option for achieving the CLCPA's emission reduction targets for 2050.

Sane Energy Project (Sane)

Sane recommends that the Commission reject National Grid's LTP. Sane disagrees with National Grid's prioritization of investment in gas infrastructure rather than renewable energy solutions and energy efficiency measures. Sane proposes increased investment in energy efficiency programs, demand response, and technological solutions such as thermal energy networks and heat pumps in lieu of the Company's proposals to

utilize hydrogen and RNG. Sane claims that these RNG and hydrogen proposals are insufficient and derive the lack of incentive for KEDNY and KEDLI to facilitate decreases to gas demand as gas-only distribution companies.

Sane claims that National Grid justifies the need for new or constant gas infrastructure expansion or repair with inflated gas demand projections. Sane proposes that the Commission should explore grounds for revoking National Grid's ability to operate in New York.

Sane critiques the Gas Planning Procedure at large according to its consideration of gas and electricity in isolation, which discourages the integration of energy services. Sane urges National Grid to develop a new plan that is all inclusive rather than gas-only. Also, Sane urges the Commission to work collaboratively with stakeholders to develop a plan that prioritizes the health and safety of New Yorkers and helps to achieve a sustainable clean energy future. Sane then urges the Commission to issue the following three orders for the National Grid LTP: decommission and remediate the Greenpoint Energy Center; align National Grid's business model with the state's current climate goals; investigate gas demand projections.

Sane calls for the establishment of a working group including National Grid, Department of Public Service Staff, and other interested parties to specifically address the long-term viability of the Greenpoint LNG facility through 2050. Sane cites a variety of conditions that support the case to decommission Greenpoint including increasing volatility of natural gas due to increased LNG exports, New York City and New York State carbon reduction mandates, developments of alternatives to gas heating such as geothermal, and the increasing risk of failure for the aging infrastructure of the

natural gas system. Sane also asserts that the Greenpoint facility does not address: gas demand and supply considerations in the context of modified demand; gas supply and delivery rates in the context of modified demand; or gas supply and delivery alternatives in the context of increased volatility and costs for traditional service. Sane notes that National Grid's downstate design day temperature of 65 heating degree days (HDDs) is at a level not seen since 1932 and that using the peak HDDs from the past 30 years, which is 61, or the peak from the past 10 years, which is 58, would reduce the design day demand requirement by 120,000-210,000 Dt. Sane then notes that National Grid's downstate demand forecast from 2023 shows a significantly lower design day forecast in 2029/30. Sane additionally asserts that the Greenpoint facility does not address potential rate shocks, safety risks, or environmental justice.

Sane acknowledges the Company's defense of the Greenpoint LNG facility, which affirm that the facility provided 105,000 Dth of deliverability on 24 December 2022 during Winter Storm Elliot when pipeline volumes did not materialize at city gates as expected. Sane rebuts this defense by asserting that a combination of delivery commitments through flowing supplies and curtailment of cogen deliveries would have been sufficient to cover the downstate system. Sane adds that the maximum daily send-out of the Greenpoint facility over the past decade was 36 percent of total capacity and that the facility's total utilization in any one-year period was 28 percent. Sane also recognizes the ability of upstate utilities to serve design day demand without LNG in their supply portfolios. Sane additionally limits National Grid's ability to arbitrage gas by liquifying in the Summer, given that the maximum annual

deployment for LNG was 460,000 Dth, or less than 0.5 percent of the total annual throughput of the downstate system.

Sane notes the proposed capital expenditures of $297M over the next four years to support the Greenpoint facility and the Company's proposed alternatives, which include LNG trailer trucks, CNG injection stations, and demand-side alternatives. Sane points out that National Grid provided a cost estimate for the CNG injection stations and not the LNG trailers and demand-side alternatives. Sane then raises concerns with the Company's $11B cost estimate for the hypothetical alternative of full building electrification and weatherization. Sane notes that the National Grid assumes full-electrification of 291,000 households as the only alternative to Greenpoint and does not account for thermal dispatch models. Sane also claims that National Grid may overestimate both the cost of increased electrical capacity and the revenue requirement for avoided gas infrastructure. Sane additionally affirms that this estimate excludes site remediation costs.

Sane recommends that the Commission evaluate its capacity to require gas demand and infrastructure reduction plans to align with the CLCPA. Sane calls for collaboration between Con Edison, LIPA and NYPA to develop a "decommissioning plan" for the KEDNY and KEDLI service territories.

Sane supports Iroquois Pipeline retirement rather than the Company's proposed ExC Project to increase compression capabilities of two existing compressor stations in Athens and Dover Plains, New York. Sane raises concerns regarding environmental impacts on disadvantaged communities from these projects in accordance with the CLCPA. Sane's last concern regarding these projects is the communication between the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and

Department of Public Service regarding the role of Iroquois in ensuring safe and reliable service for gas system.

Sane proposes an investigation into National Grid's projections regarding hydrogen and renewable natural gas. Sane recommends that the Commission consider revoking National Grid's certificate of public convenience and necessity if the utility does not actively participate in long-term planning that aligns with Sane's proposed orders.

Sierra Club (SC)

SC appreciates National Grid's recognition that consensus around an LTP will prove elusive and National Grid's efforts to identify enabling actions for decarbonization on a CLCPA-compliant timeline. SC, however, still seeks demonstration that the near-term options proposed by National Grid for CLCPA-compliant decarbonization pathways are "no regrets" options for customers and that these pathways are consistent with the CAC's Final Scoping Plan. SC argues that National Grid's scenario modeling was not structured in a way that enables the Company to definitively identify "no regrets" policies and that National Grid mischaracterizes CAC Scoping Plan Recommendations.

SC agrees with National Grid's affirmation that the Company should follow the Scoping Plan for the gas transition but disagrees with National Grid's interpretation of decarbonization for New York's buildings. SC affirms that the Scoping Plan limits the role of hybrid heat pump systems with gas back-up and offers no role for either RNG or hydrogen. SC claims that National Grid proposes much larger roles for both RNG and hydrogen than the Scoping Plan.

SC also claims that National Grid's scenario modeling does not validate increased investment in low-carbon fuel as a

"no regrets" policy. SC notes National Grid's contention that any action common to the LTP's two policy scenarios, CEV and AE, are "no regrets." SC disagrees with this contention on the grounds that National Grid separately developed these scenarios and overstates their commonalities, especially regarding the role of LCFs. SC notes that hydrogen-blending investment through 2051 in CEV is $5B but $400M in AE. SC also notes that RNG plays almost no role by 2050 in AE but peaks by 2025 in CEV.

SC questions the necessity of RNG for decarbonization in National Grid territories by noting that RNG represents 1MDth/day of the Company's combined Upstate and Downstate portfolio total of 3,961 MDth/day and that estimated RNG production at Newtown Creek stands at 2/3rd of a MDth/day. SC notes the lack of regulatory framework that would permit National Grid to procure RNG in a competitive manner. SC also notes that RNG from Newtown Creek cannot be classified as RNG since the environmental attributes are being commodified for sale outside of NYS. SC contends that National Grid has not demonstrated the cost-effectiveness of RNG because National Grid bases RNG cost estimates on production cost rather than procurement cost. SC claims that RNG procurement costs could exceed $37/MMBtu while National Grid estimates production costs at $16.03/MMBtu. SC asserts that National Grid's RNG cost estimates may not consider the potential for increased RNG competition in the event of statewide adoption for a cap-and-invest program, which would drive RNG prices higher.

SC contends that National Grid has not demonstrated the viability or cost-effectiveness of hydrogen as a component of a deep decarbonization strategy. SC notes that National Grid provides no analysis to demonstrate the safety of the proposed 20 percent systemwide hydrogen-blend. SC cites a report from

Switchbox that claims manufacturing the green hydrogen required for a 20 percent blend would require an additional 48 TWh of electricity, or the entire power demand of New York City, and consume eight times as much electricity to achieve the same emissions reductions from heat pumps.

SC provides recommendations for National Grid's scenario modeling assumptions based on analysis provided by Current Energy Group (Current) at SC's request. SC recommends that National Grid decrease the annual CapEx and OpEx forecasts at the same rate as the declining peak demand in AE scenario. SC recommends that National Grid shift its design day from the coldest day on record to the coldest day in the past 40 years. SC recommends that National Grid quantify the following electrification benefits: reduction of asthma related ER visits, reduction in child mortality risk, and reduction of calls to fire departments related to natural gas leaks. SC recommends that the Company model cold climate heat pump operations on an hourly basis rather than daily and assume heat pumps operate down to 15F from 2030-2035 and down to -5F from 2035-2042.

SC provides a list of additional concerns with the LTP that includes issues with forecast methodology and the viability of LPP replacement as a climate strategy. SC claims that National Grid does not adequately support its forecast of robust customer and load growth through 2050. SC seeks clarity on how National Grid's econometric modeling incorporates incentives for electrification or impacts on the cost of electric versus gas-based systems according to a cap-and-invest program. SC notes that new construction drives the Company's modeling even after the implementation of Local Law 154 and the All Electric Buildings Act in 2029. SC's challenges the modeling's continued growth in use per customer for non-residential and multifamily

buildings by noting state and federal incentives for weatherization and efficiency incentives. SC notes that National Grid observes significant GHG emission reductions from LPP removal without addressing the cost or how this compares to the costs of other GHG reduction strategies. SC notes that National Grid's 2020 gas rate case values the cost emission reduction at $5,000 per ton of CO2E for LPP replacement and $240 per ton for gas efficiency programs. SC correspondingly challenges the Company's proposal to remove 4,500 miles of LPP as a good use of ratepayer funds. SC affirms that NPAs can offer an effective alternative to LPP replacement once the state removes the obligation to serve; however, SC also observes difficulties in scaling NPAs. SC encourages National Grid to pursue NPAs but urges the Company consider alternatives to full LPP replacement such as pipeline repair, which can cost between 1/10th and 1/100th of a full replacement per the D.C. Department of Energy and Environment. SC cites Groundwork Data's findings that a managed transition away from pipeline gas in phases through pruning and frontloaded investments in low to moderate income households and DACs could avoid ballooning costs and minimize ratepayer burden. SC affirms that a desirable outcome from this LTP docket would be a targeted downsizing of National Grid's gas system.

SC concludes its comments by reiterating a shared desire for gas utilities to move forward with implementation of recommendations for the decarbonization of the gas system as detailed in the final Scoping Plan. SC affirms that CEV presently stands in tension with the Scoping Vision and that AE does not fully reflect the Scoping Plan, especially given its reliance on both RNG and hydrogen-blending. SC urges

modification to National Grid's scenario modeling based on technical issues identified by Current.

Spindelman, Margot

Spindelman affirms that National Grid cannot effectively implement New York State's energy transition because KEDNY and KEDLI are gas-only utilities. Spindelman claims that National Grid's approach to electrification is inadequate and that its discussions on leaving emissions decisions to the consumer only extend reliance on the gas system.

Spindelman states that the use of RNG and hydrogen (H2) are false solutions to address decarbonization. Spindelman references a 2019 American Gas Foundation that cites the cost of natural gas at $3.67 per MMBTU, the median cost of RNG for 44 percent prospective RNG projects at $18 per MMBTU, and the cost of RNG for the remaining 56 percent of RNG projects at prices over $20 per MMBTU. Spindelman asserts that the cost of RNG is an irresponsible expense since it is chemically identical to traditional natural gas and presents the same health risks. Spindelman also states that RNG should be reserved for difficult-to-electrify industries or energy intensive businesses since the amount of procurable RNG is too small to be used on a large-scale.

Spindelman expresses concern with the consideration of hydrogen as a feasible pathway in the LTP. Spindelman affirms hydrogen's incompatibility with pipeline distribution and combustion according to its smaller particle size and higher propensity for leakage relative to methane. Spindelman also affirms that hydrogen is more energy intensive than methane because it needs to be super cooled more than methane for storage and only provides one-third of methane's energy content per volume. Spindelman ultimately asserts that the

LTP's proposals for hydrogen and RNG will not achieve New York State energy goals and will only serve to keep gas and, in turn, Company profits flowing through the pipes.

Spindelman disagrees with National Grid's advocation for full funding of the Greenpoint Energy Center and the Iroquois pipeline; Spindelman cites this infrastructure's age, history of leaks, and long-term health risks. Spindelman advocates for alternatives to this infrastructure, such as thermal energy networks, which simultaneously negate gas need and reduce electrical grid load. Spindelman accentuates the urgency of pursuing alternatives by recognizing the disproportionate and lethal effects of this infrastructure in Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities.

Spindelman states that we need to change the public service law so that GSLTP discussions consider all fuels and strategies rather than focus on gas. Spindelman disagrees with the recent National Grid downstate rate case as a win for customers, given the $67 increases to monthly bills allotted for the rate case term end. Spindelman ultimately disagrees with the proposals in the National Grid LTP and recommends that the Public Service Commission reject the LTP.

Reply Comments on Initial LTP

National Grid

National Grid responds to PA's concerns that the Company's forecasted meter count increases conflict with Moody's forecasted decreases to population and households in both Upstate and Downstate New York. National Grid notes Moody's forecasted increases to the number of housing units--which is the economic variable used by National Grid to forecast residential customers, given that meters are associated with

housing units. National Grid also recognizes an overall national trend in lower numbers of population per housing unit and population per household.

National Grid disagrees with PA's concern that forecast values for the Company's usage per customer (UPC) modeling demonstrate a jump relative to historical values. National Grid asserts that PA does not accurately represent normalized historic values and references Figures 7-10 through 7-17 from PA's Initial Report. National Grid also disagrees with PA's concern that the Company's UPC values do not fully reflect impact and trends from 2023. National Grid asserts that PA does not support its claims regarding demand-side trends from 2023. National Grid additionally challenges the notion that one-year's data represents a trend.

National Grid disagrees with PA's claim that the LTP's customer count forecasts do not adequately reflect evolving policy, macroeconomic, and electrification factors across classes. National Grid affirms that it accounts for impacts from full and partial electrification and anticipates reduced customer counts and usage through DSM programs. National Grid also affirms that it accounts for impacts from the All-Electric Building Act and Local Law 154, including exemptions from each, and plans to accordingly incorporate these impacts as it continues to gather information on them.

National Grid disagrees with the recommendation from NRDC and SC that the Company assume a lower switchover temperature for partially electrified customers with dual-fuel capabilities. National Grid defends its assumption of 30 degrees Fahrenheit for an average switchover temperature as reasonable according to a recent study which supports this

temperature as the average for switchovers from natural gas customers in Massachusetts and Connecticut.

National Grid disagrees with the scrutiny recommended by CNY, Sane, and SC regarding the Company's Design Day forecast. CNY recognizes that the Company bases the DNY Design Day on conditions from 1934 that haven't occurred since, while Sierra Club recommends using the coldest temperature from the most recent 40 years for Design Day. National Grid defends its Design Day according to a lack of sufficient scientific evidence indicating that severe cold outbreaks cannot occur in a warming climate.

National Grid disagrees with CNY's recommendation to update the period used for calculating the average number of Heating Degree Days (HDDs), which is currently six years old. National Grid affirms that it updates this period at the time of its rate cases and seeks to keep its LTP analysis consistent with its rate case methodology.

National Grid addresses SC's concern that CEV and AE assume greater reliance on LCFs in the LTP than their corollary scenarios in the Climate Action Council's Scoping Plan. National Grid notes that all CLCPA-compliant scenarios in the Scoping Plan use significant amounts of LCFs. The Company then asserts that this concern conflates CEV with the Company's ultimate LTP. The Company affirms that CEV and AE are not forecasts but rather assumptions of requisite LCF levels for CLCPA-compliance under different electrification scenarios. The Company's Scenario Analysis also reflects SC's concern by finding that the LCF volumes required by either CEV or AE cannot be achieved without new policy and regulatory frameworks which enable utility procurement of LCFs, accurate accounting of associated emission reductions, and incentivized production.

The Company also affirms that electrification and efficiency accordingly denote the primary decarbonization solutions in CEV and AE.

The Company's ultimate position on LCFs is that they should be enabled to the extent which they can deliver cost-effective emission reductions and that policies and regulations should be established for LCF use to ensure their lifecycle emission reductions and support of CLCPA objectives. The Company also advocates for policies and regulations that appropriately reflect the carbon abatement values of all decarbonization technologies in the prices customers pay and enable customers to choose the most cost effective and feasible mix of these technologies for their particular circumstances. The Company affirms the consistency of this position with the Scoping Plan's recommended course of action and research agenda.

National Grid addresses PA's concern that the Company underestimates LCF costs. National Grid welcomes alternative data points around these issues. National Grid notes that the decarbonization scenarios reflect potential scaling of heat pump adoption from policy and electrification incentives and that the Reference Case reflects policies and programs supporting electrification.

National Grid addresses the recommendation from PA and CNY that the Company target LCFs to difficult-to-electrify customers. National Grid contends that this approach over the long-term would likely hinder cost-effective emission reductions and foster greater dependence on fossil fuels. National Grid suggests instead to maximize targeted electrification and the broad adoption of technologies for gas demand reduction while using LCFs to reduce the carbon intensity of all remaining gas load. National Grid supports targeted LCF deployment in the

near term as part of the Scoping Plan's recommended agenda to inform development of a comprehensive suite of LCF-enabling frameworks.

National Grid responds to concerns from EDF, NRDC, CNY, NYCP, and SC regarding the viability and safety of hydrogen in the existing natural gas system. National Grid references its exceptional track record of safe operations dating back to 1849 along with scientific evidence that supports hydrogen-blending's compatibility with large portions of the gas distribution system, such as those with modern high-density plastic pipeline. National Grid also asserts that it bases its proposed 20 percent hydrogen blend rate on impacts to customer appliance reliability rather technical limitations of infrastructure and that the Company's LPP Replacement program ensures the compatibility of new infrastructure with hydrogen-blending.

National Grid acknowledges the validity of concerns from EDF and the Institute for Energy Economics Financial Analysis (IEEFA) about the limited supply and high cost of green hydrogen. National Grid, however, also notes efforts to increase clean hydrogen production from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, the Inflation Reduction Act, Plug Power, and Linde. National Grid additionally notes efforts to reduce the cost of clean hydrogen from the Department of Energy's Hydrogen Shot initiative.

National Grid disagrees with PA's recommendation to include UTENs and 100 percent hydrogen network costs in gas customer bill impacts. National Grid asserts that doing so is not consistent the Company's strategy or current regulatory policies. National Grid affirms that final regulatory cost recovery frameworks for these types of networks remain

unestablished, which renders premature any assumption that customers remaining on the legacy gas system will bear costs for these types of networks.

National Grid agrees with PA's recommendation that the Company provide a more robust assessment of opportunities to right-size the gas system through targeted electrification and with CNY's recommendation to do so through coordinated gas and electric planning. National Grid notes that it is in the early stages integrated energy planning in areas where it serves as the gas LDC and EDC.

National Grid responds to NRDC's recommendation that the Company perform a sensitivity analysis utilizing standard accounting for in-state RNG and gross-accounting for all out-of-state RNG. The Company affirms that its approach to RNG accounting fully adheres to New York's established approach and employs emissions factors defined by NYSERDA for all emissions sources. The Company excludes biogenic CO2 emissions and does not take credit for upstream methane abatement from RNG production. The Company welcomes additional discussion around the State's existing approach to quantifying gross emissions. The Company supports the development of lifecycle assessment (LCA) accounting approaches to protect against GHG leakage and ensure that New York's decarbonization policies do not increase out-of-state emissions.

National Grid acknowledges stakeholder challenges to RNG as a truly low-carbon fuel according to methane leakage associated with RNG production and transportation. National Grid would support excluding RNG from purpose-grown energy crops and only allowing RNG produced from waste.

National Grid challenges SC's recommendation that the Company include indoor air quality costs into their BCA.

National Grid asserts that SC has provided neither substantive support for the benefit estimates cited around the health impacts of gas or gas-related emergencies nor any serious consideration of how to appropriately integrate these benefits into a BCA methodology. National Grid disagrees with stakeholder questions regarding the consistency of AE with Scenario 3 from the CAC's Integration Analysis (CAC3). National Grid affirms that AE represents how natural gas demand from National Grid customers would evolve through 2050 by applying the resource mix from CAC3 to the Company's system.

National Grid responds to PA's recommendation that the Company detail initiatives to minimize cross-subsidization impact among customer classes to avoid the risk of disproportionate burdens. National Grid affirms that it based the revenue allocation among the service classifications used in its bill impacts on most revenue allocations approved in the Company's most recent rate cases.

National Grid responds to CNY's recommendation that the Company continue engagement in relevant proceedings to overcome perceived funding gaps and delays in EE deployment as well accelerate heat pump installation. National Grid notes that it is in the process of relaunching its residential weatherization program with the goal of enrolling contractors and processing rebate applications in Q1 2025. National Grid also notes that it filed EE and building electrification program proposals for 2026-2030 under Case 18-M-0084.

National Grid responds to CNY's recommendation that the Company develop a more robust referral process that tracks their work with overlapping electric utility partners. National Grid notes that it has executed a memorandum of understanding with the LIPA in 2022 to coordinate weatherization and other EE

programs and share program data to understand customer participation and cross-utility referrals.

National Grid responds to PA's recommendation that the Company develop a view on how the economics of heat pumps for residential and small commercial space and water heating in the Company's service territories will change as gas rates increase over time. National Grid recognizes the importance of understanding heat pump adoption economics for individual customers but also asserts that the scope of the GSLTP proceeding does not encompass the coordination and data sharing with overlapping electric utilities necessary to develop a more informed view on the individual economics of heat pump adoption.

National Grid responds to recommendations from PA, NRDC, and CNY that urge the Company to develop strategies for mitigating bill impacts and barriers to electrification for vulnerable customers who remain on a shrinking gas system. National Grid supports the development of IEP tools to ensure that remaining gas customers who face barriers to electrification are not unduly burdened by gas system transition. National Grid also notes that rate design alone cannot solve the affordability challenges of decarbonization.

National Grid responds to NRDC's assessment of residential customer bill impacts which concluded that annual energy costs for customers who fully electrify through 2050 are less expensive than for customers who do not or who partially electrify. National Grid claims that it could not evaluate this analysis due to a lack of workpapers and sufficient detail on modeling assumptions. National Grid seeks further clarity on NRDC's source for electric supply costs, use of the Annual Energy Outlook to determine baseline growth for delivery rates,

and expectations for how potential electric bill impacts of EE program investments will scale to support electrification.

National Grid responds to the recommendation from EDF and NRDC that the Company evaluate capital projects for NPA feasibility without rigid timelines or filters on project types or quotas. National Grid affirms that the goal of NPA feasibility criteria is to maximize the potential number of projects screened. National Grid states that it will provide updated NPA Screening and Suitability criteria in its annual NPA reporting and future GSLTP iterations.

National Grid responds to recommendations from CNY and NRDC that urge the Company to prioritize various electrification-based NPAs. National Grid notes that its work to develop IEP capabilities will provide insight into system areas where the deployment of electrification-based NPAs will have the lowest probability of necessitating electrical infrastructure build-out.

National Grid responds to CNY's recommendation that the Company provide additional strategy and commitments to scale NPA implementation. National Grid notes that its recent NMPC JP includes NPA commitments similar to those from the latest KEDNY/KEDLI JP. National Grid notes its commitments to enhancing its NPA processes as reflected in the recent KEDLI/KEDNY Order, which the Company received after filing the Initial LTP. National Grid states that it will file an Implementation Plan within 120 days of the KEDLI/KEDNY Order.

National Grid responds to the recommendation from CNY and NRDC that the Company prioritize NPAs in DACs to avoid future bill impacts to those customers. National Grid notes that it proposed to increase the value of avoided cost in DACs by 20 percent from a BCA perspective in the recent NMPC rate

case. National Grid also agrees to work closely with its implementation contractor and local community groups to increase NPA receptivity.

National Grid responds to PA's recommendation that the Company address the inherent risks and potential costs to customers for relying on delivered services supplies. National Grid notes that the chief risks for these supplies include: commodity cost, given that the pricing structure of delivered services contracts are often tied to daily city gate price indices; uncertainty in the Company's ability to recontract for supplies, given that marketers also take service under pipeline tariffs and can continue to hold capacity without any obligation to sell to the Company; and new contract pricing, given the appeal of multi-year arrangements to avoid re-contracting risk. National Grid notes that the delivery risk for its current levels of delivered services is very low, given that these pipeline resources are backed by primary firm capacity.

National Grid responds to PA's recommendation that the Company explicitly discuss the risks of using incremental CNG injection sites to meet Design Day demand. National Grid notes that CNG truckers may encounter thoroughfare closures since they deliver during peak weather conditions. National Grid also notes difficulties with retaining a trained and capable workforce since CNG injections are meant for a limited number of days during the winter.

National Grid responds to PA's recommendation that the Company explicitly explain the possibility of viable alternatives to the Iroquois Exc project and emphasize the degree to which KEDNY and KEDLI are reliant on this project to mitigate the supply-demand gap projected by the Company for 2027-28. National Grid asserts that there are no alternatives

to this project. National Grid notes that the Company's Long-Term Gas Capacity Report series from Case 19-G-0678 documents the Company's assessment of alternatives such as Greenpoint Vaporizers 13/14 and incremental CNG. National Grid asserts that this assessment gave the best chance of closing the gap to supply projects already under development. National Grid affirms that ExC was the only project capable of closing the gap already under development. National Grid notes that the Department of Public Service submitted a letter to NYSDEC on 26 February 2024 which confirms the need for the ExC project to support the safety and reliability of the New York gas system.

Sane

Sane supports the CNY's recommendation to position NPAs at the forefront of the gas transition. Sane equally contends that the LTP's approach is not conducive for the adoption of NPAs. Sane reiterates CNY's recommendation that National Grid point to specific projects or sections of the Plan where NPAs were considered and rejected or develop a scenario that assumes the implementation of enabling policies while calling for the Commission and legislature to adopt these policies. Sane agrees with the CNY's recommendations that National Grid prioritize oil-to-electric conversions rather than oil-to-gas conversions; assess LPP areas that are appropriate for NPAs according to building systems data and mortgage terms; align NPA implementation with a building system's capital and mortgage cycle; and extend the Company's commitment to perform preliminary NPA analysis to all gas service requests.

Sane additionally agrees with CNY's support for the role of thermal energy networks in decarbonized heating. Sane reiterates CNY's concerns regarding the design day forecast methodology being based on a one-in-90 observation. Sane

supports CNY's recommendations that National Grid place greater emphasis on retirement rather than replacement of main rather than replacement and that National Grid explore the use of the Greenpoint site for alternative technologies such as solar, storage, or thermal network projects.

Sane supports NRDC's recommendations that the Company conduct a review of the system, expand the type of projects eligible for NPA consideration, make screening criteria less restrictive, improve customer outreach and education, and pursue NPAs for easy-to-convert areas and low-income communities.

Sane supports EDF's NPA framework that identifies demand needs as early as possible; considers NPAs for all supply, capacity, and capital projects; seeks solutions through open and transparent RFPs; evaluates projects using, among many factors, the climate and health benefits of avoiding gas infrastructure; and maintains a robust and transparent record of decision-making processes in evaluating and implementing NPAs.

Sane agrees with Sierra Club's contention that the LTP overstates HDD design criteria are overstated and the methodology for developing these criteria demands serious analysis. Sane also raises issue with the Design Day calculation being a 1 in 90-year occurrence.

Sane agrees with PA's assessment that the Company does not appear to adequately reflect evolving policy, macroeconomic, and electrification factors in development of customer count forecasts. Sane also agrees with PA's contention that the LTP overstates Design Day Demand. Sane, however, disagrees with PA's assessment on the importance of LNG assets at Greenpoint and Holtsville.

Sane disagrees with National Grid's justification for the continued operation of the Greenpoint LNG Facility. Sane

states that National Grid's LTP did not include any discussion about why the downstate system's needs could need be met without the LNG facility. Further, Sane states that National Grid did not provide cost estimates for all of the alternatives to Greenpoint that were listed in the LTP.

Sane contends that Greenpoint does not represent a significant commodity cost-saving opportunity, and the Company has not demonstrated that Greenpoint has provided the system with the needed supply on peak days. Also, Sane states that the BCA for Greenpoint is based on faculty assumptions about the need to completely electrify a massive number of residences. Finally, Sane states that the Company should be ordered to convene a working group to consider the potential retirement of Greenpoint.

Sane also urges the Commission to issue an Order aligning National Grid's business model with 21st century climate goals. Sane states that the Order should ensure that the Company adheres to our climate commitments and discourage gas growth proposals. Additionally, Sane states that the Iroquois pipeline must be retired. Sane states that Con Edison, LIPA and NYPA should collaborate to develop a decommissioning plan for KEDNY and KEDLI to avoid the chaos of a death spiral. This collaboration should prioritize investments in energy efficiency programs, demand response initiatives, and proven technological solutions, such as thermal energy networks. Sane states that it is deeply concerned about the communication between DEC and DPS concerning Iroquois, when the conclusion seems misguided and imprudent, leaning on National Grid's projections of gas growth, all while seeming to keep public comment out of the decision-making process for their communities. Sane requests that the NYS DPS, PA Consulting, the City of New York, and other

influential Parties to this case thoughtfully consider our argument for retiring the Greenpoint facility.

CNY

The City's reply comments to National Grid's Long-Term Plan (LTP) assert their original positions with renewable natural gas (RNG) as a focal point. The concerns brought up by the City's stakeholders were the availability, economic viability, emissions potential, alignment with CLCPA goals and the counting of environmental attributed associated with RNG which is included in the plan's Clean Energy Vision. While the City wants to make the concerns of stakeholders known, they reiterate their support in the limited use of locally produced RNG derived from waste feedstocks.

The City claims National Grid did not conduct due diligence when citing such a high volume of RNG in their Clean Energy Vision scenario which include demonstrating that local sources of RNG are available, cost effective, produced and transported in a manner that reduces lifecycle GHG emissions, and that such combustion of RNG will not negatively impact New York City air quality. The city maintains its position that RNG large volumes of RNG should not be imported from outside the region or derived from non-waste feedstocks.

The City states that the specification for locally produced RNG from waste feedstocks is critical since the emissions benefit from RNG is realized through the non-emission of methane into the atmosphere. As such, the city believes that only RNG locally produced will have a meaningful benefit to the emissions in the region.

The City believes the commission should take steps to establish an in-state RNG attributes market in which they believe will facilitate the proper accounting of RNG emissions

reduction in the state. They express concern that not having an in-state RNG attribute market prevents RNG emissions benefits from being recognized in the state. Specifically, the City recommends the Commission (1) require local attribute sales and retirement of attributes to hard-to-electrify critical safety and public safety end uses; (2) encourage development of a local or statewide market for attributes; (3) acknowledge the impact of RNG on upstream emissions reductions; (4) allow RNG from local feedstocks to count towards emission reduction goals in the short-term (*i.e.*, until 2030), in recognition of market and affordability constraints; (5) incorporate a Lifecycle Assessment methodology, as noted above, that accounts for methane abatement and the reduction of upstream emissions; and (6) post-2030, require the attributes to be sold either locally or retired to ensure that RNG can count toward emissions reductions.

Comments on Revised LTP

Alliance for a Green Economy (AGREE)

AGREE asserts that the LTP understates RNG costs up to a factor of three from 2030 and beyond by excluding purchases of environmental attributes associated with anticipated RNG procurement during this period. AGREE requests the incorporation of appropriate RNG environmental attribute purchases because scenarios from this LTP claim GHG emission reductions from procured RNG and the U.S Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) tracks claims to environmental benefits from RNG production according to purchases of associated attributes. AGREE challenges National Grid's production-based approach to RNG cost from 2030 and beyond; AGREE does not

observe any evidence-based reason to expect significant changes to the environmental attribute market in the next five years.

AGREE supports NYSERDA's recommendation that National Grid incorporate health benefits from reduced fossil fuel combustion into benefit costs analyses. AGREE notes NRDC calculated that fossil fuel combustion costs each person in the U.S. roughly $2500 per year.

AGREE supports Sane's proposal for a working group to transparently and critically assess the necessity of National Grid's Greenpoint Energy Center. AGREE notes that many stakeholders question the necessity of this facility, which serves Design Day demand, by questioning the reasonableness of National Grid's Design Day forecast for DNY, which derives from a temperature measured on 9 February 1934. AGREE also notes that the facility will cost $364M in the next four years alone.

Canepa, Judith K.

Canepa states that climate change poses serious risks to elderly and disabled residents living in adult care facilities across New York City. Canepa affirms that these individuals face disproportionate harm during extreme weather events; Canepa notes that these individuals often reside in outdated buildings within flood zones like the Rockaways, Coney Island, and Staten Island. Canepa cites Superstorm Sandy as a key example of systemic failure during extreme weather response wherein delayed evacuations and inadequate post-storm support left residents in dangerous and chaotic conditions. Canepa notes that little has changed in the years since.

Canepa critiques National Grid's LTP, particularly the proposal to continue replacing leak-prone pipes. Canepa asserts that this strategy prolongs dependency on fracked gas and exacerbates methane emissions. Canepa identifies methane as a

critical climate threat. Canepa notes that methane produces significantly more heat than carbon dioxide over a twenty-year span and contributes to increasingly unstable weather patterns.

Canepa challenges National Grid's suggestion to pair electrified heat pumps with gas backup as misleading. Canepa claims that modern, high-efficiency heat pumps can already perform well in cold climates and that continued investment should go toward electrification and renewable energy technologies instead of fossil fuel infrastructure.

Canepa claims that the proposals to use hydrogen and renewable natural gas are technically flawed and environmentally harmful. Canepa advocates for scaling up proven solutions such as ground- and water-source heat pumps, thermal energy networks, energy storage, efficiency improvements in buildings and appliances, and subsidies to support low-income households through the energy transition.

Canepa ultimately calls for an urgent and equitable shift away from gas infrastructure and toward a clean energy future. Canepa frames the gas system transition as not only a matter of climate responsibility but also an issue of justice for frontline communities.

EDF

EDF asserts that the Revised LTP incorporates some changes that represent improvement and some changes that are inadequate. EDF also contends that many elements of the Revised LTP are the same as the Initial LTP.

EDF continues to recommend that the LTP align with CLCPA targets for GHG emission reduction and New York State mandates for reduced reliance on fossil energy systems. EDF appreciates that National Grid removed hydrogen-blending from AE; however, EDF recognizes that the CEV, National Grid's

preferred pathway, still assumes systemwide hydrogen-blending and a 100 percent hydrogen network for the building sector. EDF also recognizes that CEV reduces its projection for non-residential participation in a 100 percent hydrogen network from 20 to 11 percent; however, EDF continues to critique CEV's assumption that commercial customers participate in this network and recommends reserving hydrogen for difficult-to-electrify industrial customers. EDF mainly reiterates its comments for the Initial LTP regarding the climate, health, and safety risks of hydrogen blending. EDF additionally notes that the Revised LTP supports the safety of this blending with a non-public analysis, which the Company declined to provide upon EDF's request for copyright reasons. EDF further supports its recommendation against the Company's hydrogen-blending proposal according to this lack of disclosure and subsequent hindrance to stakeholder review of this proposal. EDF ultimately recommends that the Commission not approve any final long-term plan which includes hydrogen-blending.

EDF also reiterates its comments for the Initial LTP that urge the Company to both strengthen and enhance the flexibility of its NPA approach in anticipation of a statewide NPA framework currently under development in Case 20-G-0131. EDF nevertheless appreciates the Revised LTP's addition of a more detailed plan for developing thermal energy networks (TENs) as a positive step toward strengthening this approach and as a responsive integration of the comments provided by the City of New York for the Initial LTP. EDF still urges the Company to expand and concretize its plans for TENs by focusing on difficult-to-electrify buildings, which the City also recommends.

NRDC and SC

NRDC and SC disagree with the Company's heat pump switchover temperature in the Initial and Revised LTP of 30 degrees Fahrenheit (°F). Both NRDC and SC's initial comments propose that the Company adopt a 10°F switchover temperature consistent with rated specifications for all existing subsidized heat pumps in the State. NRDC and SC contend that the Massachusetts and Connecticut Heat Pump Metering Study upon which National Grid bases its defense of the 30°F switchover does not justify this temperature but rather points out reasons why this number is inflated. NRDC and SC affirm that this study maintains an average heat pump Coefficient of Performance (COP) value ranging from 1.6 and 2.3 at temperatures below 5°F. NRDC and SC also note that this study observes a lack of integrated controls to automatically manage the transition between heat pumps and backup system, which can lead to inefficient manual operation by customers. NRDC and SC notes this study's demonstration that the majority of heat pump customers who adjust internal controls chose to lower the switchover temperature to enable greater heat pump use. NRDC and SC conclude that National Grid should adopt a lower switchover temperature assumption in their modeling and that a 10F switchover temperature more accurately reflects the capabilities of modern heat pumps.

New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA)

NYSERDA recommends that National Grid develop more proactive practices to identify and implement NPAs. NYSERDA appreciates the NPA reporting and stakeholder engagements stipulated by the Joint Proposal from the 2023 KEDNY and KEDLI rate cases (Case 23-G-0225 and Case 23-G-0226), and NYSERDA

expects these provisions to support its recommendations to improve National Grid's NPA processes. NYSERDA notes that National Grid has pursued implementation for only one of the 72 new connection requests which have met the Company's NPA threshold criteria to date. NYSERDA also notes that National Grid performs outreach on only five LPP segments per operating company per year for avoided replacement NPAs and that National Grid reports a low number of bids for reliability and reinforcement NPAs.

NYSERDA recommends that National Grid proactively avoid new connections and low-use heating upgrades. NYSERDA recommends that National Grid do so by leveraging the analysis conducted by the Company to estimate an upper limit on future oil-to-gas conversions and support LTP scenario modeling design. NYSERDA notes that this analysis identifies non-customer structures and evaluates their respective distances to the nearest gas main; NYSERDA subsequently suggests that National Grid could employ this analysis to identify off-system customers and target them for electrification incentives. NYSERDA correspondingly recommends that National Grid's downstate affiliates collaborate with local electric distribution companies to promote avoided new connection NPAs.

NYSERDA recommends that National Grid proactively identify and facilitate avoided replacement NPAs. NYSERDA appreciates that National Grid screens all LPP removal projects for NPA feasibility and performs NPA outreach to affected customers; nevertheless, NYSERDA qualifies these procedures as reactive. NYSERDA recognizes the Commission's present collaboration with local distribution companies to develop a comprehensive NPA framework for New York State, as well as the realities of NPA adoption barriers; however, NYSERDA affirms

that the Gas Planning Order still requires the LTP of each gas utility to identify specific LPP segments for NPA implementation. NYSERDA recommends that National Grid do so by further developing its May 2022 whitepaper with the Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI) on NPAs and using site-specific data to identify LPP segments with: high estimated replacement costs; low customer counts; reliability or hydraulic impacts; available headroom on corresponding portions of the electric system; customer loads capable of electrification; location in a disadvantaged community; and a schedule for replacement. NYSERDA appreciates this whitepaper's prioritization of outreach for LPP NPAs with relatively longer periods of time before replacement.

NYSERDA recommends that National Grid proactively identify reliability and reinforcement NPAs. NYSERDA qualifies National Grid's current approach to screening for these NPAs as reactive, given its exclusive focus on areas already identified for near-term reinforcement needs. NYSERDA recommends a system-wide assessment to identify medium-term (10 years) reinforcement needs, as well as the methodology for doing so developed in the LTP for Central Hudson (CH). This holistic methodology forecasted high gas loading and demand growth for over 40 sub-systems in the CH territory and incorporated winter loading factors for electric transmission areas, substations, and circuit feeders. CH also estimated the potential sub-system reinforcement cost based on the size, timing, and location of the upgrade to produce an expected value of reduced peak demand ($/Ccf-year) metric. CH additionally proposed avoided capacity expansion NPA pilots from an analysis of yearly and hourly load relief requirements, estimated infrastructure upgrade costs and deferral value, and estimated load relief potential.

NYSERDA recommends that National Grid provide further characterization and justification for the assumptions framing the LTP's hydrogen-blending proposal and thereby refine the proposal's implications for technical feasibility, safety, and cost. NYSERDA claims that National Grid has not yet demonstrated the feasibility of the proposed 20 percent systemwide hydrogen-blending nor identified requisite system investments. NYSERDA recommends that National Grid provide a more substantive assessment of anticipated technical and safety issues such as elevated risks of leaks and explosions, higher pipeline maintenance and leak detection costs, recalibration and replacement of appliances and behind-the-meter piping, and increased NOx pollution. NYSERDA also notes that National Grid offers no basis for the CEV's assumption of 11 percent non-residential customer participation in a 100 percent hydrogen network. NYSERDA notes that the LTP does not provide information about the character and location of these customers, their energy requirements, and the suitability of their end uses for hydrogen. NYSERDA notes that the geographic proximity of these customers represents an important factor in developing a network of this sort.

NYSERDA recommends that National Grid develop a framework to update its definition of design day conditions to reflect long-term extreme weather patterns. National Grid appreciates that the Revised LTP updates the Company's normal year by changing the range of weather data averaged to determine this from 1988-2013 to 2014-2023; however, NYSERDA notes that National Grid does not similarly update its methodology for determining design day conditions. NYSERDA asserts that National Grid's design day criterion is 0°F for KEDNY and KEDLI and -10°F for NMPC. NYSERDA claims that the technical chapters

of New York State's Climate Impact Assessment project a decline in the number of days below 0°F in National Grid's service territories by the 2040s. NYSERDA notes that these chapters only forecast temperatures below 0°F; however, NYSERDA assumes the decline in these temperatures to indicate a decline in even colder temperatures. NYSERDA recommends that National Grid work with the Commission and potentially other utilities to develop a framework to update its design day conditions.

NYSERDA notes that National Grid's BCA methodology does not incorporate health benefits from avoided criteria air pollutants and recommends that National Grid's BCA calculations reflect these. NYSERDA recognizes that National Grid attributes the absence of these benefits from BCA calculations in the Revised LTP to difficulty in quantifying these benefits. NYSERDA acknowledges the complexity of this quantification but also its possibility. NYSERDA notes that the Climate Act recommends the consideration of public health benefits in energy planning decisions. NYSERDA asserts that omitting these benefits understates the benefits of LTP scenarios that reduce combustion through greater reliance on electrification.

NYSERDA recommends that National Grid provide additional information in its bill impacts analysis. NYSERDA notes that National Grid's bill impacts analysis only presents average bills. NYSERDA recommends that National Grid reflect projected bills for representative customers with particular configurations of appliances. NYSERDA suggests providing projected bills for customers that do not electrify, customers that fully electrify, customers that partially electrify, and different combinations of full or partial electrification of space heating and non-space heating loads. NYSERDA asserts that this analysis would help stakeholders understand tradeoffs

between the scenarios and identify customer types at high risk of untenable cost burdens.

NYSERDA recommends that National Grid conduct a sensitivity analysis in which costs for electrification and energy efficiency decline over time or as the number of completed projects increases, particularly for full-load ccASHP and GSHP systems. NYSERDA notes National Grid's acknowledgement that unit costs are the same for all scenarios. NYSERDA recognizes that National Grid's approach of holding costs constant (in real dollars) over time may be defensible as a baseline assumption; however, NYSERDA claims that a sensitivity analysis to reflect the inherent uncertainty of projecting future equipment costs remains warranted. NYSERDA recommends that National Grid reference the Scoping Plan's Integration Analysis to conduct this analysis.

Onserud, Hélène Filion

Hélène Filion Onserud is a social worker who has lived and worked in downstate New York for over 30 years. Onserud observes continuous climate warning signs, such as the Canadian wildfires that affected New York City during the summer of 2023, and includes fossil fuel emissions among the causes for these unprecedented events. Onserud underscores the urgency of the climate crisis by affirming that its pace has accelerated beyond that predicted by scientists a couple of decades ago.

Onserud affirms that DPS can offer innovative and transformative leadership on the climate crisis for the rest of the country by earnestly pursuing CLCPA goals in its review of the LTP. Onersud claims that the LTP currently falls short of CLCPA goals by not curbing infrastructure expansion or prioritizing NPA investment.

Onserud hopes that DPS will direct National Grid to abandon its LTP. Onserud claims that this plan only postpones the inevitable; negatively affects a great number of people's health, particularly in areas with a history of environmental racism; and contributes to higher rates of poor health conditions for communities of color. Onsersud ultimately urges DPS and the Company to pursue healing for communities and the environment through renewable energy, thermal heat pumps and energy networks, and decreases to fossil fuel infrastructure, pollution and emissions.

Sane

Sane requests a redline version of changes between the Initial LTP and Revised LTP. Sane contends that National Grid did not incorporate recommendations or input provided by Parties or the public during the comment period and did not provide an explanation for their exclusion. Sane asserts that it is unacceptable to exclude the integration of stakeholders' collective input until the Final LTP. Sane urges National Grid to ensure that all voices are heard, considered, and integrated into the Final LTP. Sane emphasizes the importance of health, safety, and climate resiliency in utility planning.

Spindelman

Spindelman comments on the Revised LTP through a fictional story-telling excerpt to address two scenarios in the year 2050. Spindelman illustrates how pursuing UTENs will provide a cleaner, healthier, and more reliable future than one in which people continue to rely on the gas system.

The fictional story on the left-side column discusses a theoretical future in which UTENs are pursued and gas is abandoned. Spindelman claims through this story, that there would be improved resilience of the energy grid against severe

weather events and that UTENs would encourage other forms of green infrastructure to take place.

The fictional story on the right-side column discusses a theoretical future in which the existing gas system continues to operate in North Brooklyn. Spindelman uses this scenario to bring up concerns about the long-term reliability of gas infrastructure, such as leaks at the Green Point Energy Facility. She also uses this narrative to bring up the resilience of gas infrastructure against severe weather events which she believes is vulnerable to catastrophic failure in an imaginative extreme hurricane scenario. Furthermore, Spindelman uses the story to discuss how rate payers will burden ever-increasing costs as gas infrastructure becomes more expensive to repair or replace with fewer customers paying rates decades into the future.

Other areas of concern she brings up is the long-term feasibility of hydrogen projects citing that the energy-intensive processes to generate and use the hydrogen is unsustainable in a future with greater energy needs. Additionally, she raises issues with RNG investments in a scenario where the population of North Brooklyn declines such that there is not enough feedstock for RNG waste sites to generate enough methane.

Thompson, Katherine Conkling

Thompson claims that the LTP falls short of CLCPA goals. Thompson cites the LTP's plans to expand the Greenpoint LNG facility as evidence of the LTP's inconsistency with the CLCPA. Thompson recommends that National Grid redirect ratepayer resources from fossil fuel infrastructure toward significant NPA investment to support a robust transition from fossil fuel dependency, as well as reduce the risk of stranded

assets. Thompson promotes full electrification as a decarbonization strategy. Thompson claims that the feasibility of this strategy depends on reducing electrical grid load through geothermal heat pumps, thermal energy networks, and energy from wind, solar, and hydro sources. Thompson emphasizes the urgency of a transition from fossil fuels by aligning the success of this transition with the survival of the human species.

Comments submitted on PA's Preliminary Findings Report

National Grid

The Company's comments focus on two key areas in the Preliminary Findings Report: PA's observations that the reliability of the gas system is essential to ensuring public health and safety, and PA's findings regarding the Company's demand forecast. The Company will subsequently file its Final Gas System Long-Term Plan ("GSLTP") addressing more fully the findings and recommendations in the Preliminary Findings Report, as well as stakeholder comments.

While the Company does not agree with all findings and conclusions in the Preliminary findings report, the Company strongly supports PA's overarching observation that the Company's primary focus must be to ensure that the appropriate investments in the gas system are made to maintain safe, reliable, and adequate service to customers who continue to rely on gas to meet their energy needs. This finding supports the need for continued investment in gas infrastructure in the coming years, and that PA acknowledges that critical reliability-related assets, such as the Greenpoint LNG Facility, are needed for the foreseeable future.

The Company notes that PA provides a high-level analysis of the Company's load forecast and includes recommendations on potential adjustments, though does not attempt to replicate the comprehensive forecast the Company produces.

The Company, by stating that PA's forecast values are within the uncertainty bands of the company's analysis and that the Company is ultimately responsible for the safe operation of gas networks, conclude that their forecast must be used to inform future investments and other long-term planning considerations.

Because the gas networks will play a critical role in serving customers' energy needs for the foreseeable future, PA concludes that it is reasonable to assume that under any set of planning assumptions, the Company will be required to continue to invest in the gas delivery system well into the future. The Preliminary Findings Report is generally supportive of National Grid's capital investment programs, including the leak prone pipe replacement and reliability projects discussed in the report.

National Grid states that the Preliminary Findings Report also emphasizes that National Grid's LNG facilities are essential for maintaining adequate gas supply during peak demand periods and extreme weather events. Further, the Company notes that the Preliminary Findings Report concludes that these on-system assets are vital to preventing service interruptions that could lead to prolonged gas outages, and this is additionally noted in FERC's inquiry into the performance of the bulk power system during Wister Storm Elliot.

National Grid states that PA's report highlights the benefits of capital investments to upgrade the existing LNG

facilities, such as the proposed Vaporizers 13/14 Project, as it is an asset given near term projections of demand from both a supply and reliability perspective. While stakeholders may disagree on the trajectory of future gas demand, and whether new supply resources are needed, PA is clear that the reliability benefits of projects like the vaporizers are not fully captured simply by evaluating high level supply-demand shortfalls on a Design Day.

According to the Company, the Preliminary Findings Report appropriately concludes that considerations of public health and safety demand that the Company maintain reliable gas networks and sufficient gas supplies for the customers it has committed to serve, which fully supports the Company's approach to modernizing infrastructure and upgrading existing facilities in a manner that balances the costs and reliability benefits.

The Company states that it has developed a consistent, proven, and data-driven forecasting methodology that adheres to econometric best practices to meet its obligations to customers. This process involves rigorous model selection that minimizes reliance on subject matter expert judgment. Instead, models are chosen based on their economic sensibility, their ability to pass comprehensive diagnostic tests, and their high out-of-sample prediction accuracy. The Company states that its forecast has a proven accuracy of +/-2 percent.

The Company disagrees with PA's assumptions around the forecast of long-term demand, as well as the impacts of the existing regulatory framework and future policy uncertainties. PA's proposed adjustments to the Company's forecast yield results within the Company's uncertainty bands however, thus the Company sees alignment with PA on the need for incremental supply projects to bolster gas system reliability.

National Grid notes that while PA's analysis suggests the potential for a slightly lower forecast than the Company forecast, the numbers are comparable given the Company's calculated uncertainty range. The Company states that PA's analysis is essentially a low sensitivity on the Company's forecast and shows what happens if NY has poorer economic performance than forecasted. The Company agrees that it is a possible outcome, though states that the state could also outperform expectations, so uncertainty should extend in both directions.

The Company states that it uses a quantitative, data-driven approach to model the Reference Case and associated uncertainty bands. This process is proven with a historical accuracy rate of +/- 2 percent and unbiased, with roughly equal chances of actuals coming in higher than forecast vs. lower than forecast. It captures evolving trends to account for factors such as energy efficiency, demand response, electrification of heat, saturation of off-system conversions, and relevant public policies. These forecasts are updated annually. In contrast, PA has proposed several selective adjustments to National Grid's forecast with minimal data-driven support. These adjustments fall within the uncertainty bands of the Company's existing models, but PA has not developed an alternative forecast suitable for gas planning purposes. Therefore, the Company believes it would be inappropriate and unnecessary to replace its forecasting methodology with PA's approach.

CNY

The City highlighted significant discrepancies between PA Consulting's and National Grid's demand forecasts, particularly regarding population growth assumptions. The City noted that PA Consulting assumes less population growth

downstate than National Grid, resulting in less gas demand in later years than the Company forecasted. However, the City's own population forecasts differ from both. Specifically, PA Consulting assumes a decline in population for New York City, whereas the New York City Department of City Planning's population projections prepared for the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council show an increase in New York City's population over the next few decades.

The City requested closer analysis to determine which population assumptions are accurate and which forecasts should be followed, given the varying results in expected shortfalls. The City emphasized that PA Consulting's Report underscores their prior request for the Commission to closely scrutinize National Grid's demand forecast.

The City supports PA Consulting's recommendation that National Grid provide additional analysis on a potential moratorium and urges National Grid to include this in the final version of the Plan to determine if the forecast for a moratorium is accurate.

The City strongly supports PA Consulting's recommendation that National Grid select a preferred pathway in its final Plan. The City noted that the fact that National Grid has not chosen a preferred pathway is inconsistent with both the point of this proceeding (i.e., planning toward decarbonizing the gas system) and Commission guidance. The Commission has made it clear in its decisions regarding other utility long-term gas plans that selecting a preferred pathway is critical to properly assessing infrastructure needs and bill impacts. National Grid has presented three different pathways that each result in different supply-demand shortfalls, as well as drastically different bill impacts.

The City expressed concerns about the assumptions underlying the CEV pathway, noting that it has unreasonable assumptions regarding the availability of renewable natural gas and the expected usage of hydrogen. The City reiterated that renewable natural gas may only be a viable alternative to natural gas if it is produced locally and used specifically for hard-to-electrify end uses.

The City supports PA Consulting's recommendation that National Grid provide updated, accurate bill impact analyses. The City also emphasized that National Grid must identify mechanisms to proactively and significantly increase the number of customers that are eligible for low-income discount programs but are not currently enrolled.

The City recommended that National Grid address affordability issues by:(1) Providing analyses that illustrate the bill impacts to customer service classifications under multiple scenarios using varying increments of a decreased customer base and accompanying gas sales; (2) Surveying available bill mitigation and rate design tactics that have been proposed nationally to reduce the energy cost burden and effectively enroll low-income ratepayers; (3) Assessing and identifying the reasons why eligible New Yorkers are not enrolled in energy assistance programs and developing solutions to make these programs more accessible; (4) Proposing and forecasting costs of scalable programs to fund electrification of low- and moderate income 1-4 family and multifamily buildings to prevent inequitable future cost distribution; and (5) Exploring transformative rate design, corporate governance, and regulatory reform strategies to mitigate the higher costs resulting from winding down gas infrastructure over the coming decades.

Comments on Final Long-Term Plan:

Letter signed by 36 New York State Legislators

A letter was submitted, signed by the following members of the New York State Legislature: State Senators Julia Salazar (D. 18), Jabari Brisport (D. 25), Nathalia Fernandez (D. 34), Brad Hoylman-Sigal (D. 47), Cordell Cleare (D. 30), Kristen Gonzalez (D. 59), Robert Jackson (D. 31), Liz Krueger (D. 28), James Sanders Jr. (D. 10), Luis R. Sepúlveda (D. 32), and Jose M. Serrano (D. 29); and signed by State Assemblymembers Claire Valdez (D. 37), Khaleel Anderson (D. 31), Alex Bores (D. 73), Noah Burroughs (D. 18), Robert Carroll (D. 59), Maritza Davila (D. 53), Harvey Epstein (D. 74), Phara Souffrant Forrest (D. 57), Emily Gallagher (D. 50), Deborah Glick (D. 66), Jessica González-Rojas (D. 34), Dana Levenberg (D. 95), Zohran Mamdani (D. 36), Marcela Mitaynes (D. 51), Steven Raga (D. 30), Karines Reyes (D. 87), Linda Rosenthal (D. 67), Amanda Septimo (D. 84), Sarahana Shrestha (D. 103), Jo Anne Simon (D. 52), Tony Simone (D. 75), Michaelle Solages (D. 22), Yudelka Tapia (D. 86), Emerita Torres (D. 85), and David Weprin (D. 24).

The letter urges the Commission to: (1) reject National Grid's LTP, and launch a new proceeding that acknowledges the urgency of the climate crisis and requires the Company to address the need for gas reduction only; (2) prioritize clean alternatives such as thermal energy networks, beneficial electrification, and energy efficiency; and (3) deny National Grid's claims to prolong the life of its LNG depots in Greenpoint and Holtsville, oppose the expansion of the Iroquois Pipeline, and reject National Grid's false solutions like RNG and Hydrogen.

The letter states that PA consistently found National Grid's assertions regarding the necessity for additional gas infrastructure lack solid evidence.

The letter also states that the Order in the recent rate cases for National Grid's downstate region approved a $5 billion expansion of fracked gas infrastructure, resulting in bill increases of $30 per month, increasing to more than $65 per month over the next three years. The letter states that the Commission's decision in the rate cases undermine the CLCPA and threatens our progress towards a sustainable and equitable future. The letter states, "The time is now for New York State to adopt a 21st-century perspective on energy infrastructure and policy, not to continue to promote the outdated and dangerous reliance on natural gas."

The letter states that National Grid's gas network perpetuates racist and harmful legacies of polluting Black and brown communities, contribute to the climate crisis, and cause significant health crises for many in environmental justice communities.

Brooklyn Community Board #1 (BCB1)

BCB1 urges the PSC to reject National Grid's Final LTP. BCB1 challenges National Grid's justification for: continued operation at the Holtsville and Greenpoint LNG facilities; the expansion of the Iroquois pipeline; and the viability of hydrogen and RNG as solutions to fracked gas. BCB1 cites PA's concerns regarding National Grid's demand forecast to challenge National Grid's justification for these proposals. BCB1 also notes that the Iroquois pipeline expansion would double the compression in the nearly 40-year old pipeline in Greene and Dutchess Counties. BCB1 ultimately contends that prioritizing the maintenance and expansion of National Grid's

gas business primarily benefits National Grid's corporate shareholders at the expense of state goals and commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect disadvantaged communities. BCB1 affirms that these proposals increase already prevalent risks to health and safety in minority, working class, and environmental justice communities; and impose unjustified and harmful additional financial burdens on BCB1's constituents through increased utility bills. BCB1 promotes alternative solutions such as thermal energy networks, beneficial electrification, and energy efficiency.

Caiazza, Roger

Caiazza claims that there is insufficient consideration to the challenge of the CLCPA transition to a zero-emissions energy system in the Final LTP. Caiazza states the calculation of avoided GHG emissions is incorrect.

Caiazza claims that the LTP, which Caiazza characterizes as a renewable energy plan, should not be implemented until the Commission establishes "metrics for affordability and reliability" through a hearing, pursuant to PSL Section 66-p(4). Caiazza states that such hearing should establish a definition of safe and adequate electric service. Caiazza states that there are electricity deliverability issues associated with extreme weather events that are not present with gas deliverability.

Caiazza states that weather variability risks will continue to be an issue as long as New York's electric system is dependent on wind and solar resources. Caiazza states that electric reliability calculations are questionable because they are based on the performance of conventional power plants. This calculation is questionable because it does not consider the loss of multiple power plants at the same time.

Caiazza states the Societal Cost Test (SCT) methodology overestimates the benefits of the societal impacts of GHGs. Caiazza claims that calculations of avoided emissions benefits consider reductions over some time frame, and that it is inappropriate to claim the benefits of an annual reduction of a ton of greenhouse gas over any lifetime or to compare it with lifetime avoided emissions. Caiazza claims that the correct societal benefit can be no more than the current GHG emissions times the social cost of carbon, as using cumulative values counts those values over and over.

EDF

EDF asserts that the Final LTP repeats many elements from the Initial and Revised LTP; however, EDF's comments for the Final LTP exclusively discuss this plan's duplication of hydrogen-blending proposals from prior LTP iterations. EDF notes that the Final CEV maintains: 1) the systemwide 20 percent volumetric hydrogen blend rate included in the Initial and Revised CEV; and 2) the 100 percent hydrogen network for 11 percent of non-residential customers included in the Revised CEV to update the 20 percent non-residential participation rate which the Initial CEV assumes for this network. EDF accordingly reiterates its comments for the Initial and Revised LTP regarding hydrogen-blending's safety, climate, and health risks.

EDF supports these concerns by citing PA's review of the LTP, which challenges both hydrogen-blending and 100 percent hydrogen networks as effective decarbonization strategies. EDF also notes PA's concerns regarding the cost of requisite infrastructure modifications for hydrogen combustion and PA's corresponding recommendation to reserve hydrogen use for difficult-to-electrify commercial and industrial end-uses. EDF alternatively prefers electrification for commercial

decarbonization and accordingly recommends that PA's Final Report for the LTP further explore the safety and climate risks of servicing commercial buildings with hydrogen gas. EDF ultimately recommends that the Commission not approve any final plan that invests in systemwide hydrogen blending, or a costly buildout of hydrogen-dedicated pipelines, given the availability of more affordable and feasible options for building decarbonization.

The Newtown Creek Alliance

The Newtown Creek Alliance (NCA) maintains a strong stance against any investment, rate increases, or long-term planning at the Greenpoint Energy Center that fails to prioritize site cleanup and transition away from hazardous operations. The organization specifically opposes any planning that does not prioritize a cleanup of the site and a transition away from the storage of hazardous Liquified Natural Gas and processing of fracked gas. This opposition stems from their broader environmental and public health concerns regarding the facility's current operations and their impact on the surrounding community.

A significant portion of NCA's critique focuses on what they perceive as inadequate climate data analysis within the LTP. The organization expresses serious concern with the lack of temperature forecasting within the LTP that reflects current winters and predictably warming climate conditions. They argue that National Grid's reliance on outdated weather data undermines the validity of their planning assumptions.

Specifically, NCA points to problematic data usage, noting that the Company uses a 65 HDD (Heating Degree Day), which is problematic since this is an occurrence that was last experienced in 1934. The organization references testimony from

Mark D. Kleinginna in Case 23-G-0225 to support their position on climate data concerns. According to NCA's analysis, the 5-year moving average of annual heating degree days has dropped by almost 8 percent over the past 30 years, indicating a clear warming trend that should be reflected in long-term planning.

NCA challenges National Grid's use of Winter Storm Elliott as justification for maintaining and expanding Greenpoint LNG operations. They argue that one of the main arguments within the LTP for the benefit of not just maintaining, but even expanding operations at the Greenpoint LNG storage is Winter Storm Elliott. However, NCA contends that this storm was not unprecedented and that the value of Greenpoint LNG is based on failures within the gas delivery system rather than genuine necessity. The organization characterizes this approach as fear-mongering and recommends that the PSC should reject this hypothetical.

NCA raises concerns about National Grid's financial motivations regarding the Greenpoint facility. They argue that by framing the long-term necessity of Greenpoint LNG as an essential part of a transition off of fossil fuel, the company is able to utilize their 117 acre facility as a long term revenue source. The organization believes this approach allows National Grid to maintain profitability while avoiding environmental responsibilities.

Furthermore, NCA contends that by keeping Greenpoint LNG active for the foreseeable future, National Grid will not just be able to earn revenue through rate-payer funded capital investments, but also delay, defer, and potentially avoid the much needed cleanup of their state superfund designated facility. This concern reflects their broader worry that

continued operations will impede necessary environmental remediation efforts.

The organization expresses specific concern about National Grid's plans for facility expansion. NCA states they are concerned that the Company has indicated plans to again seek approval to construct Vaporizers 13 and 14. They note that this plan was outright denied by NYS DEC less than 4 years ago, and there is no clear rationale as to why NYS would consider it differently now. This opposition reflects their broader stance against any expansion of LNG operations at the site.

NCA criticizes the LTP's treatment of environmental justice concerns, particularly regarding Disadvantaged Communities. They argue that it is misleading to include a map showing Disadvantaged Communities serviced by the Greenpoint LNG within the LTP without acknowledging the actual direct impacts that local Disadvantaged Communities have been and are currently exposed to by living next to the Greenpoint Energy Center. This criticism highlights their concern that the plan emphasizes potential benefits to these communities while downplaying the ongoing environmental and health burdens they face from the facility's operations.

CNY

The City expressed significant concerns about National Grid's selection of the CEV as its preferred pathway. The City cites the PA Consulting report which found the CEV had unreasonable assumptions regarding the availability of RNG and the expected usage of hydrogen. The City recommended that if the Company pursued the CEV as their preferred pathway, it should be revised to limit the use of these fuels.

The City was extremely concerned about affordability and in-city air quality. The City noted that RNG and hydrogen

do not reduce in-City combustion and fail to achieve the air quality benefits that electrification and thermal solutions bring to New Yorkers. The City emphasized that it was essential for the Company to take the right path forward that would minimize bill impacts, criteria pollution emissions, and public health impacts in a meaningful way.

The City also noted that there had been no explanation for why the cost of the CEV had increased so drastically, or why the cost of the AE pathway had decreased.

On balance, the City preferred the AE over the CEV, but remained concerned about the high projected costs of either pathway. The City requested additional analysis specific to the projected costs of the AE pathway to understand not only the true costs of the pathway itself, but also how these costs could be mitigated for vulnerable populations such as low-income customers or those residing in Disadvantaged Communities.

The City formally requested the Commission to: (1) reject National Grid's proposed selection of the CEV unless it could demonstrate that it could proceed without reliance on hydrogen and RNG and mitigate criteria air pollution impacts; and (2) direct National Grid to proceed with the AE option after the costs associated with that option were scrutinized and materially reduced to mitigate bill impacts, particularly for the most vulnerable customers.

National Grid's demand forecast had been a focus of concern throughout the proceeding. Concerns were raised by the City and stakeholders in response to the Company's initial Plan, and PA Consulting made significant adjustments to the forecast in its Report. Those changes resulted in different investment needs and delayed the projected supply/demand gap for several years. Despite these adjustments and concerns raised by

stakeholders, National Grid held firm to its forecast and the assumptions used to develop it in the Final LTP.

Under National Grid's forecast, a projected supply/demand gap would arise in the winter of 2028-2029, while PA Consulting did not project a supply/demand gap until at least the winter of 2030. In fact, PA Consulting projected an oversupply under both the CEV and AE pathways using certain assumptions.

The City requested that the Commission closely scrutinize both forecasts to ensure that the Commission-approved Plan reflected the needs of New York City residents. Considering the importance of the demand forecast's role in determining capital investment and moratorium decisions, it was critical for stakeholders to have confidence in the chosen forecast.

Senator Salazar, Julia (Senator Salazar)

Senator Salazar represents the 18th State Senate District in North Brooklyn, home of the Greenpoint LNG facility. Senator Salazar opposes National Grid's Final LTP. Senator Salazar states that the LTP does not comply with the CLCPA. Senator Salazar states that this plan does not offer relief to ratepayers' utility bills and funds infrastructure which should be deprecated in accordance with the CLCPA.

Senator Salazar proposes investing in alternatives to fossil fuels such as thermal energy networks, waste heat recycling, and energy efficiency and building electrification. Senator Salazar supports the proposed NY HEAT Act, which would "[c]ap utility bills at 6 [percent] of income," "[e]nd gas subsidies," and "[f]und clean energy upgrades for low-income households."

Senator Salazar calls for the decommissioning of the Greenpoint LNG Facility. Senator Salazar describes the Greenpoint LNG facility as dangerous and underutilized. Senator Salazar cites that PA claim that Greenpoint could be safely retired by 2034-2035 under a clean energy transition. Senator Salazar also states that PA claims that the Final LTP's demand forecasts were inflated and unsupported. Senator Salazar argues against the expansion of National Grid's gas infrastructure, including Greenpoint and the Iroquois Pipeline. Senator Salazar asserts the broader environmental injustices related to the pollution of Black and Brown communities by National Grid's gas networks.

Senator Alazar raises concerns about transparency and access in the LTP process. Senator Salazar notes that the Commission offered only virtual, and no in-person, public statement hearings. Senator Salazar states that only allowing a virtual option created difficulties and confusion regarding the registration process, and that many impacted residents were shut out as a result.

Senator Salazar ultimately calls for the PSC to reject National Grid's Final LTP, launch a new, just planning process, and prioritize a reduction in gas use while protecting affordability and uplifting disadvantaged communities.

Spindelman

Spindelman raises several objections to the Final LTP. First, Spindelman states that PA found that National Grid did not choose a scenario among the three offered. Spindelman cites PA's statement that there are "significant path dependencies in this long-term planning, meaning an action taken today will limit the range of options available to the Company and the favorability of these options in the future."

Spindelman asserts that the company inflated its design day forecast and continued to plan for the Reference Case scenario (which Spindelman describes as "business as usual"), even though both the CEV and AE scenarios can be met without a supply shortfall. In support of this claim, Spindelman references PA Consulting's proposed adjustments which reveal discrepancies in National Grid's forecasting. For the Reference Case, PA's proposed adjustments to the Design Day forecast result in 3,101 MDth/day in 2050, compared to National Grid's forecast of 3,551 MDth/day—a difference of 14 percent lower. For the CEV scenario, PA's proposed adjustments result in Design Day demand of 1,673 MDth/day in 2050, compared to National Grid's forecast of 1,733 MDth/day—4 percent lower than the company's forecast. In addition, Spindelman states that National Grid has inflated its demand forecast by miscalculating future customer counts, again citing the PA report.

Spindelman highlights the "extraordinary amount of money" National Grid expects to spend to maintain Greenpoint. Spindelman cites Table 5-1 of the PA Report, which states that the company forecasts spending $603 million from fiscal years 2025 to 2033 on the Greenpoint LNG Facility. Spindelman argues that this massive expenditure should end, and instead there should be "a plan to responsibly decommission the Greenpoint Energy Center, not a bill to keep lining the pockets of shareholders while funding a project whose useful life is coming to a close, as demanded by our State climate law."

Regarding hydrogen initiatives, Spindelman notes that PA Consulting discovered National Grid is "first targeting green hydrogen blending on areas of the gas system that were or will be replaced as part of the LPP program." Spindelman cites PA's observation that the HyGrid pilot includes blending hydrogen for

delivery to residential and small commercial customers who may be better suited for decarbonization through electrification, given the price premium of hydrogen when compared to heat pumps.

Regarding RNG, Spindelman criticizes National Grid's approach, noting that "in spite of the high cost and low availability forecast for Renewable Natural Gas going forward, the Company still clings to RNG, as it will enable them to maintain their gas pipe system." Spindelman states that PA Consulting takes issue with National Grid's assumptions about RNG volumes, questioning the reasonableness of assumptions that are "speculative and highly unlikely."

Spindelman also points out that National Grid has failed to present a moratorium scenario and has been disingenuous when discussing both RNG and hydrogen. Based on these comprehensive concerns, Spindelman objects to the Long-Term Plan and asks that the PSC reject it and fight for a sustainable and rapid energy transition going forward.

Reply Comments on Final LTP

Sane

Sane recognizes that PA's Final Report made important and necessary corrections to National Grid's assumptions but recommends deeper analysis to further strengthen PA's findings. Sane states that the Final Report validates concerns regarding demand projections, especially with respect to design day, and failure to fully consider viable non-gas alternatives. Sane also states that the report observes a feasible retirement for the Greenpoint LNG facility in 2035 along with no credible near-term gas supply shortfall.

Sane continues to call for the Commission to reject the Final LTP and direct National Grid to: conduct rigorous

analysis into feasible gas alternatives; develop a clear time-bound roadmap for the retirement of Greenpoint; engage with impacted communities overburdened by industrial pollution and environmental injustice; and align all infrastructure investments with CLCPA mandates.

Comments on the Final LTP, the Supplement to the Final LTP, PA's Final Report, and PA's Report on the Supplement

Letter to the Governor, Commissioner Lefton, and Chair Christian

Kim Fraczek filed a letter signed by New York State Senator Liz Krueger (District 28, Manhattan), New York State Assemblymember Khaleel Anderson (District 31, Queens), New York City Comptroller Brad Lander, as well as leaders of the organizations Sane, 350Brooklyn, Rockaway Women for Progress, and the Natural Resources Protective Association. This letter was directed to Governor Hochul, Department of Environmental Conservation Commissioner Lefton, and Department of Public Service Chair Christian.

The letter resubmits a report on NESE from the Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis (IEEFA), and states that the NESE fracked gas pipeline is "unwanted, unnecessary, and unjustifiable – posing an economic threat that New Yorkers cannot afford." The letter states that NESE's current estimated cost is $1.25 billion, which will be pushed higher by construction overruns, and that ratepayers will be saddled with those costs. The letter states that NESE would deliver no permanent jobs to New York, and only 9 percent of temporary construction jobs would occur in-state. Further, the letter states that the majority of profits would go to Williams, a Tulsa-based company, while New Yorkers pay the tab.

The letter also states that National Grid is incorrect in its claim that NESE would lower electric bills, claiming that short-term reductions would be offset by massive costs the project would impose, which will hurt downstate families and businesses.

The letter states that there is no looming gas shortage, and that National Grid's own analysis shows there is no supply-demand gap until at least 2041. The letter states that the "crisis" NESE claims to solve is manufactured, and that it will merely lead to more profit for National Grid and shackle New Yorkers to decades of unnecessary fossil fuel costs.

The letter states that building NESE violates the CLCPA and undermines the law.

First Street Companies, The Plumbing Foundation, the Long Island Contractors' Association, and the Suffolk County Alliance of Chambers, Inc.

First Street Companies, The Plumbing Foundation, the Long Island Contractors' Association, and The Suffolk County Alliance of Chambers, Inc. submitted substantively identical comments in support National Grid's Final LTP Supplement and the proposed NESE Project. The commenters believe the LTP addendum will be positive for Long Island by making energy more affordable and reliable.

The commenters state that the NESE project is a critical investment in New York's energy infrastructure by increasing supply, which helps address growing demand from homes, businesses, and emerging sectors like data centers, and ensures resilience in the face of future weather and supply disruptions. The commenters state that NESE is the only major infrastructure in the next fifteen years capable of addressing the region's escalating reliability risks.

The commenters state that NESE offers economic and environmental benefits. The commenters support this by citing an unspecified independent analysis, claiming that such analysis shows that New Yorkers could save up to $6 billion in electricity costs over 15 years, nearly half of which directly benefiting Downstate residents. Additionally, the commenters state that NESE will reduce reliance on diesel-fueled truck deliveries, which will lower GHG emissions. The commenters also state that NESE aligns with the state's climate goals by reducing dependency on oil, and balances immediate energy reliability needs with long-term sustainability objectives.

NYCP

NYCP states that National Grid's GSLTP is based on wildly inaccurate and unreasonable assumptions and assertions to support investments in and the longevity of the gas distribution infrastructure. This GSLTP is incompatible with the CLCPA's goals and with some of the key objectives of this proceeding. Company and industry practices call for caution on the part of Staff and the Commission and call for in-depth scrutiny of all of Company's claims and assertions.

National Grid's preferred pathway, the CEV is discussed as being similar to all other gas utilities' preferred decarbonization pathways as it follows a blueprint similar to one released by the American Gas Association in 2021. NYCP states this blueprint is designed to feign emissions reductions while maintaining or expanding the size of gas distribution infrastructure.

A significant and vastly undercounted amount of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the fossil gas system are the result of downstream fugitive methane emissions from the gas distribution system. NYCP notes that the Company's CEV pathway,

which is endorsed in the GSLTP, relies on reducing gas delivered through energy efficiency, partial electrification and RNG with relatively small shrinkage in the gas distribution system. None of these reduce downstream fugitive methane emissions.

The CEV assumes GHG emissions reductions in proportion to the volume of gas delivered, which is incorrect as these emissions depend on the size of the distribution system and not the amount of gas consumed. Additionally, as gas demand declines, the carbon intensity of the remaining gas on the system continues to increase because the leakage to consumption ratio continues to increase. Therefore, the CEV will not achieve the claimed GHG emissions reductions as downstream fugitive emissions rates are underestimated, and all downstream leakage is unaccounted for.

NYCP notes that a large and growing body of research shows that methane emissions from the distribution network for natural gas and its on-site use in buildings in New York are significant and are vastly underestimated based on results from recent top-down measurements. Fugitive emissions from heating and cooking appliances and from leaks inside buildings have typically been ignored in downstream emissions estimates and are likely to be significant in New York due to aging building stock. NYCP states the average downstream emissions rate would be closer to about 2.2 percent, like other similar cities, versus the current EPA estimates and DEC's current overall emissions factor of 0.41 percent. Atmospheric remote sensing data also points to this general underestimation in areas such as Los Angeles and when comparing ages of systems in Boston and Indianapolis. NYCP states that LPP replacement only results in a very small percentage of emissions reductions. Further, NYCP states that only a significant downsizing of the distribution

network can achieve significant GHG emissions, and these emissions also boost the case for non-pipe alternatives that the GSLTP underutilizes.

NYCP states that procuring truly zero-emission hydrogen capable of displacing fossil natural gas to reduce emissions for compliance with the CLCPA is neither simple nor inexpensive. Without zero-emissions conditions, hydrogen production from grid-connected electrolyzers can be worse than fossil fuel derived hydrogen.

Zero-emission hydrogen must be reserved for hard-to-electrify industrial uses for displacing current supply of gray hydrogen in industrial and manufacturing applications, and for long duration energy storage, according to NYCP. In best case scenarios, hydrogen would displace less than 4 percent of methane gas in a distribution system for delivering the same amount of energy. Additionally, hydrogen itself acts as a greenhouse-effect enhancing agent.

NYCP notes the Company's proposals to blend hydrogen in utility gas are entirely untenable and do not pass scientific, technical, or economic muster. There are metal embrittlement and leakage risks that also increase the risk of fires and explosions in homes. 32 independent studies found hydrogen is worse than electricity for heating homes, and hydrogen demand in buildings will be close to zero in 2050 according to many of the studies.

Using clean electricity to electrolyze water to generate clean hydrogen, piping it int homes and burning it to produce heat consumes five to six times more energy than using the same clean electricity to operate heat pumps. Hydrogen would cost at least four times as much as natural gas and transporting it would be expensive as well. NYCP calls hydrogen

for domestic heating "uncompetitive." New York and Massachusetts regulators are also seemingly ready to reject roles of hydrogen to replace gas.

NYCP states that given the strength and success of the fossil fuel industry, the hydrogen proposals are poor, especially given that the Company has sufficient technical expertise and the same access to research that the rest of us do, yet continue to propose hydrogen as a solution. This calls into question the sincerity and legitimacy of this and other aspects of the GSLTP.

RNG is another fuel, according to NYCP, that overstates its GHG emissions reductions, as the RNG production process extracts vastly more methane than the same feedstock would naturally release. Significant quantities of methane are being created that wouldn't be there otherwise. The methane becomes intentionally produced from thermal gasification sources that would naturally only release minimal amounts. This is also the case for anaerobic digesters, which are then being designed to optimize methane production versus practices to minimize.

The DEC statewide GHG emissions report in 2022 amplifies these claims, and in summary, either a bulk of RNG that the gas industry claims that it can inject into the gas distribution system does not exist, or if it does, then it mostly consists of methane that wouldn't be produced otherwise, i.e., it is just as emissions intensive as fossil gas. The RNG industry and National Grid cannot claim to avoid methane emissions that do not exist in the states' GHG inventory.

Additionally, the supply chain, production and distribution of RNG is energy-intensive and is disposed to significant methane releases. Any use of energy crops for any biofuel, including RNG, would always be carbon intensive due to

significant life-cycle energy inputs required for producing these crops. Energy inputs and associated emissions for RNG production are generally well understood, but accurately assessing supply chain and process emissions for RNG production can be challenging. A growing body of research suggests that methane emissions from the supply chain and production are substantial and have been underestimated. At the median leakage rate, the carbon intensity of RNG rival that of fossil fuel gas.

None of these fairly significant methane emissions related to the supply chain and production of RNG are currently included in the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation's emissions factor associated with RNG. Massachusetts rejected a change in their gas supply procurement policy to enable inclusion of RNG, citing cost, availability, and emissions concerns.

NYCP finds the long-term gas demand forecasts used in the GSLTP to be unrealistic from the perspective of accelerating atmospheric warming. The weather-normalization in Use Per Customer models is also inappropriate and doesn't reflect real world data. NYCP urges the Commission, through this proceeding, to help shape the gas demand trajectory that supports the state's policy objectives rather than accepting and supporting National Grid's aspirations turned into forecasts of continued high demand in the coming decades.

NYCP urges the Commission to direct Staff to work with a consultant to make major modifications to National Grid's GSLTP so that its emissions reduction trajectory is compatible with the CLCPA's targets and it follows a cost-efficient decarbonization pathway, which would involve curtailing gas infrastructure investments, strategic downsizing of the gas system, pursuing beneficial electrification and non-pipe

alternatives, and rejecting hydrogen and RNG as possible fuels for space and water heating delivered through the gas distribution network.

NYCP states that in the absence of specific and quantitative direction from the Commission for accomplishing key objectives, gas LDCs continue to submit plans that mostly serve to legitimize their aspirations of continuing to draw immense profits from investments in the gas distribution network in the coming decades. This is incompatible with the CLCPA and the objectives of the Gas Planning order, but detrimental to New Yorkers. National Grid's Final LTP and their usurpation of this proceeding to boost the NESE Project are examples of this.

An important long-term driver of rising home energy costs is the amount of infrastructure investment in the energy transmission/transportation and distribution system, according to NYCP. Many investments in electric infrastructure are due to its age, the transition towards a singular energy system in taming investment-driven increases in energy costs was cited by none other than the Commission Chair Rory Christian during his 2025 budget testimony. Moreover, heating electrification would continue to use unused system capacity during winter months for more than a decade, thus improving system utilization and spreading cost recovery over more kWhs.

The failure of the gas LDCs to produce GSLTPs compatible with the state's climate and affordability objectives has long been predicted by multiple stakeholders. LDCs continue to fail to make good faith efforts to prepare LTPs compliant with the Gas Planning Order and the CLCPA, despite ample opportunity to pivot towards a more sustainable business model.

NYCP repeats their plea that the Commission learn from the gas LDCs' inability or unwillingness to produce CLCPA-

compliant GSLTPs and modify the process to add requirements to adhere to reasonable utilities-specific GHG emissions reduction trajectories that are compatible with CLCPA's emissions reduction targets, to pursue a deep strategic downsizing of the gas distribution system as recommended in the Climate Action Council's Scoping Plan, and to exclude any use of hydrogen or differentiated methane and the use of significant volumes of RNG in the plans. Setting some basic parameters for the LTPs will not only help yield plans that broadly comply with the CLCPA and are consistent with goals of the Gas Planning Order, but will also result in a more efficient process in which Staff, LDCs, and the stakeholders aren't rehashing the same issues repeatedly in each LDC's plan.

Vision Long Island

Vision Long Island states support for the NESE project. Vision Long Island's submitted comments that are substantively identical to those of First Street Companies, The Plumbing Foundation, the Long Island Contractors' Association, and The Suffolk County Alliance of Chambers, Inc. In addition, Vision Long Island states that over 10 thousand units of multifamily housing and commercial growth in the coming years relies on the energy provided by NESE.

Greater Jamaica Development Corporation

The Greater Jamaica Development Corporation states that it has partnered with National Grid to communicate local development and housing growth in Southeast Queens. The commenter states that five large-scale projects were recently shared with National Grid to assist in planning. The commenter states that reliable energy service is critical to revitalization and population growth. The commenter states that National Grid's Long-Term Plan was formed and guided by

stakeholder outreach and should be approved by the Public Service Commission.

The Partnership for New York City

The Partnership for New York City states that it is a nonprofit organization with over 330 members who including business leaders and companies. The commenter supports NESE, stating that it is a pragmatic reliability solution that complements, but does not compete with, New York's energy transition. The commenter states that NESE provides supply which adds meaningful buffer on peak days, improving reliability and reducing reliance on trucked fuels. The commenter states that it would make electricity more affordable for homes, small businesses, and energy-intensive sectors like life sciences, finance, and AI computing. The commenter states that renewables are not sufficient or consistent enough to meet peak needs, and NESE is necessary to maintain reliability during decarbonization. Last, the Partnership for New York City claims that NESE makes efficient use of existing corridors, using an existing interstate energy transportation system.

Teamsters Joint Council 16 (JC-16)

JC-16 states that it represents 120 thousand workers in downstate New York and Puerto Rico. JC-16 supports the NESE Project, and states the NESE project is critical to strengthen the reliability of the region's energy network. JC-16 cites a New York Times article which states that the downstate region relies heavily on natural gas and that gas and electricity prices are high because of insufficient pipeline capacity. JC-16 also cites the New York State Energy Planning Board, which stated that continued investment in natural gas is necessary to assure reliability. JC-16 states that there is insufficient electricity without adequate supply of natural gas. JC-16

asserts that the NESE project aligns with the state's all-encompassing approach to energy, using natural gas as a "bridge" to a clean energy future.

IEEFA

IEEFA asserts that downstate New Yorkers would subsidize the following for NESE: higher-than-projected construction costs, operation and maintenance costs, volatile gas throughput prices, new distribution infrastructure, and developer profits from return-on-equity (ROE) at a rate of 15.34 percent. IEEFA adjusts National Grid's estimate for NESE of $1.06B to $1.25B according to the rate of construction inflations. This adjustment does not include the potential impact of trade or economic disruptions such as tariffs on foreign-made materials or the inability to obtain rights-of-way, skilled labor, equipment, materials, or permits. IEEFA notes National Grid's plans to pay $2.2B to $2.5B to Transco over 15 years through a negotiated agreement.

IEEFA affirms that: NESE would provide no direct permanent jobs in New York; only about 9 percent of the temporary construction jobs would be sited in New York, with the remainder in New Jersey and Pennsylvania; and NESE profits would largely go out of state given that the project developer, Williams Company, is based in Tulsa, Oklahoma and locates its other major offices in Houston, Pittsburgh, and Salt Lake City. IEEFA notes that the non-pipeline approach from the Final LTP would fund local installation and maintenance of locally-sited renewable energy or local energy efficiency services.

IEEFA questions NESE's potential to reduce electricity bills by abating congestion at gas gathering points and NESE's potential to provide benefits to downstate New Yorkers that offset its costs. IEEFA asserts that only $2.75B in savings

from lower electricity bills would flow directly downstate residents while pipeline costs inclusive of infrastructure improvements may range from $2.16B to $2.59B. IEEFA notes that any reductions to New York's electricity prices from lower gas system congestion may be short-lived given New York policies designed to lower natural gas demand and require emission-free electricity generation by 2040. IEEFA affirms that national gas pricing trends are more consequential than local gas system congestion for electricity prices. IEEFA also notes that the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) reveals a weak correlation between the prices that New York electric utilities pay for gas and the prices that industrial consumers (a proxy for wholesale prices) pay for electricity. IEEFA additionally asserts that the pipeline could raise demand and produce higher year-round expenses, even in terms of reduced investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy, which would have lower overall costs relative to a new pipeline.

IEEFA asserts that downstate New Yorkers do not face an urgent need for more gas because the 2025 forecast indicates that a supply-demand gap would not be imminent before 2041/42. IEEFA recommends strategic planning for energy efficiency and demand management to meet peak demand in downstate New York. IEEFA notes that National Grid makes no claims regarding past or imminent failure of its existing peak demand management plan and supply systems. IEEFA affirms that both increases and decreases to gas prices could lower gas demand to levels which could render NESE into a stranded asset.

IEEFA asserts that ratepayers should not bear the cost of supporting new data centers, which National Grid cites as a benefit from NESE. IEEFA claims that data centers raise economic and environmental concerns. IEEFA's research indicates

that the utility industry is planning for about 50 percent more data center demand than the tech industry is projecting.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 1049 (IBEW 1049)

IBEW 1049 writes in support of NESE's timely advancement on behalf of over 4,000 members who work on Long Island. IBEW 1049 affirms that NESE would strengthen energy reliability during peak demand and extreme weather events in IBEW 1049's region for households, small businesses, and larger employers. IBEW 1049 states that NESE would stimulate job creation in construction and long-term operations. IBEW 1049 claims that unspecified independent analysis asserts that NESE would reduce energy costs by billions of dollars over the next 15 years and nearly half of these benefits will accrue to downstate residents. IBEW 1049 states that NESE would help to reduce emissions and improve air quality by lowering reliance on diesel deliveries and older, less efficient heating fuels.

Long Island Board of Realtors

The commenter states that the Long Island Board of Realtors represents nearly 29,000 members across Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties and advocates for private property rights, housing access for consumers, and infrastructure development. The commenter states that reliable energy supply is critical to addressing housing needs, reversing youth outmigration, supporting intergenerational wealth, and enabling seniors to remain in the region. The commenter states that the Final LTP addresses environmental and economic concerns while New York works toward CLCPA goals. The commenter states that unnecessary regulations and uncertainty in energy supply should be avoided. The commenter states that the Final LTP, including the NESE

project, deserves full and favorable consideration by the Public Service Commission.

Independent Power Producers of New York, Inc. (IPPNY)

IPPNY states it is a not-for-profit trade association representing the independent power industry in New York State. IPPNY states the NESE Project is "critically needed" to maintain downstate gas system reliability and enhance reliability of downstate electric markets. IPPNY states that NESE is the only option currently available to support gas system reliability in the western portion of its downstate service territory, which is close to several electric generation facilities in New York City. IPPNY states that FERC's reissuance of the certificate to construct and operate NESE reflects the gas system reliability needs.

IPPNY states that the LAI Report supports the claims that NESE will produce substantial electric market savings which will benefit New Yorkers. IPPNY states that the LAI Report shows NESE could save New Yorkers up to $6 billion in electricity costs over 15 years.

IPPNY states that, until renewable and zero-emissions technologies, including dispatchable emissions-free resources, become "commercially viable solutions to fully meet customer needs," gas-powered facilities are a necessary part of the energy system.

Long Island Association (LIA)

LIA strongly supports the Company's GSLTP and the proposed NESE project. LIA states the Final LTP and NESE should serve to further these goals by making energy on Long Island more reliable and affordable.

LIA states that Long Island needs stable, cost-effective and abundant energy sources to enable businesses to

expand and create jobs. LIA states that the LTP and NESE present this opportunity and could help address growing demand for now and for future needs in the face of challenges including extreme weather and supply disruptions.

LIA states that NESE would enhance the entire downstate region's energy reliability for homes and businesses and stabilize electric generation. LIA states that NESE may be the only major infrastructure project in the next fifteen years to address reliability risks.

LIA states that NESE has environmental benefits, such as reducing reliance on diesel fueled trucks and decrease dependency on oil.

LIA urges the PSC to give full and favorable consideration to the GSLTP and advance NESE as it is a critical resource for a reliable energy future.

NRDC

NRDC's comments: 1) identify violations of procedural norms due to the eleventh-hour timing of the Addendum's filing; 2) detail issues in both the Addendum and the LAI Study; 3) highlight continuing issues with the Final LTP; and 4) underscore the necessity of a geospatial NPA analysis.

NRDC claims that the NESE would impose long-lived and unjustified costs at odds with New York's climate and affordability goals. NRDC claims that the Addendum's case for NESE relies on outdated forecasts and speculative claims, obscures risks to customers, misreads winter reliability lessons, and ignores statutory clean energy mandates. NRDC recommends that the Commission: 1) strike or disregard the Addendum as procedurally improper; 2) reject National Grid's request to pre-approve the prudence of entering into the NESE precedent agreement outside of an adjudicated rate proceeding;

3) direct National Grid to remedy demand-forecasting and NPA deficiencies; and 4) require National Grid to adopt and implement a geospatial analysis and robust NPA screening framework.

NRDC challenges the Addendum's claim of near-term supply need by noting that the 2025 Gas Load Forecast shows reduced demand and no constraints until the 2040s. NRDC supports PA's observation that the Addendum fails to update its scenarios from the 2024 Gas Load Forecast. NRDC supports Synapse's observation that the Addendum relies on outlier heating degree day values from late December 2017 through early January 2018, which artificially elevates forecasted demand and accelerates the appearance of supply constraints. NRDC supports Synapse's claim that the Addendum inflates projected winter gas demand by assuming a 30F switchover temperature for heat pump customers. NRDC supports Synapse's claim that the Addendum disregards CLCPA mandates to reduce emissions and electrify building heat by showing continued gas demand growth through 2050. NRDC claims that the Addendum fails to account for upstream methane leakage and relies on oil-to-gas conversions rendered implausible by New York city's Climate Mobilization Act (LL97), improving heat pump economics, and declining grid emissions.

NRDC contends that NESE's provision of interstate pipeline capacity would not address the main drivers of stress during Winter Storm Elliott (WSE), upstream freeze-offs and local distribution limits related to intra-system pressure. NRDC notes the LAI assessment's observation that National Grid's peak-day risk management pivots around city-gate peaking measures such as compressed natural gas (CNG) rather than contracted interstate receipt points. NRDC affirms that NESE

does not diversify away from Appalachian freeze-off risk in the manner of projects that transport gas from diverse basins like Iroquois ExC. NRDC acknowledges PA's claim that National Grid would receive proportionally more gas than other utilities during system-wide curtailments since NESE ties into Transco's mainline, which sources gas beyond Marcellus; however, NRDC affirms that proportional upstream allocations are meaningless if localized distribution constraints prevent additional volumes from reaching end-users. NRDC challenges NESE as an electric-system hedge by noting that NYISO did not enter an energy emergency and was able to assist neighboring balancing authorities.

NRDC claims that the Addendum minimizes true ratepayer exposure by ignoring construction overruns, rising commodity prices due to surging LNG exports and international gas demand, and the risk of future FERC-approved rate increases. NRDC limits NESE's benefits to uncertain, winter-only wholesale electric cost reductions driven by and assumed reductions in Transco Z6-NY/TETCO M3 gas indices. NRDC underscores this uncertainty according to Synapse's claim that the LAI Assessment also relies on outdated demand projections, extreme weather-year assumptions, and unrealistic heat pump switchover temperatures. NRDC supports PA's observation that several offsetting gas-side portfolio optimizations such as reduced peaking services, capacity release, and AMA revenues are unquantified or speculative. NRDC also affirms that downstate gas customers would face higher bills to underwrite speculative statewide electric market benefits and subsidize National Grid's gas-fired generation on Long Island, which raises conflict-of-interest concerns. NRDC states that Synapse estimates annual costs and electric savings for a typical downstate gas customer to fund

NESE at $90 and $43, respectively. NRDC affirms that the Addendum offers no credible or lawful mechanism to resolve this allocation problem.

NRDC cites the PSC's Order for the Con Edison and Orange and Rockland LTP from Case 23-G-0147 to affirm that gas planning proceedings are not appropriate venues for detailed assessments of prudence or cost recovery to pre-approve specific proposals. NRDC also cites the Con Edison and Orange and Rockland LTP Order to affirm that adjudication for specific proposals should rather occur in rate or other proceedings, subject to stakeholder comment and the due process protections of the SAPA process.

NRDC asserts that the Addendum undermines the procedural guardrails established by the Commission to prevent selective and opaque filings and circumvents the notice-and-comment framework essential to meaningful stakeholder review. NRDC notes that the Addendum does not revise but rather supplements the Company's Final LTP scenarios and thereby contradicts National Grid's June 2 request to update its Final LTP. NRDC asserts that the Addendum's focus on near-term system reliability is relevant to the LTP but outside the scope of the Company's LTP filing. NRDC states that the Addendum selectively presents the benefits of an unpermitted supply project without integrating it into the GSLTP's demand forecasts, infrastructure investment plan, or scenario modeling. NRDC claims that the Addendum deprives stakeholders of the opportunity to transparently assess how NESE would compare with NPAs or other fossil gas infrastructure proposed by the Final LTP to solve the same alleged supply shortfall. NRDC counters National Grid's claim that striking the Addendum would deny stakeholder the opportunity to review new supply options by noting that

stakeholders cannot meaningfully assess NESE absent its integration into demand forecasts and scenario modeling.

NRDC asserts that an actionable and CLCPA-compliant long-term plan must begin with a geospatial and systemwide NPA analysis which identifies specific main segments and service areas where targeted electrification, efficiency, demand response, and other NPAs can avoid or defer pipe investments and support strategic downsizing. NRDC notes that the Synapse geospatial analysis tool whitepaper illustrates how a transparent, proactive, and map-based process can systematically identify NPA opportunities.

New York Building Congress (NYBC)

NYBC represents more than 500 member organizations and 250,000 skilled tradespeople and professionals. NYBC writes in support of NESE as a pragmatic effort to balance immediate energy reliability needs with long-term sustainability objectives. NYBC states that there are gas network supply constraints and demand growth. NYBC asserts that NESE would save customers up to $6B over the next 15 years and direct $2.75B of these savings to downstate residents. NYBC contends that NESE would free up capacity on the Texas Eastern Transmission (TETCO) line that currently must be directed from Staten Island to Brooklyn and Queens. NYBC correspondingly contends that extra local supply on Staten Island would strengthen reliability for essential facilities and lower electricity for Staten Island households by shaving peak gas prices. NYBC states that NESE would generate thousands of union construction jobs, support data center build-out, and spur housing development.

CNY

The City of New York submitted comments expressing significant concerns about the proposal to authorize National Grid to proceed with the NESE Project. The City maintains its strong support for maintaining a safe and reliable gas system but raises substantial objections to both National Grid's Addendum and PA Consulting's findings on multiple grounds.

The City's primary argument centers on procedural concerns, asserting that the Long-Term Gas Planning Proceeding is not the appropriate venue for authorizing National Grid to proceed with the NESE Project. Instead, the City contends that such authorization should be considered in National Grid's next rate case, which is expected to be filed in the coming months. This position is reinforced by the City's observation that National Grid has fundamentally inverted the original intent of the proceeding, transforming it from one focused on a long-term transition away from gas system expansion to one now focused on expanding the gas system in both the near- and long-term.

Regarding the technical and analytical foundations of the proposal, the City identifies significant gaps and concerns with the demand forecast underlying the Company's justification for the NESE Project. The City notes that in the Addendum, the Company previewed potentially significant reductions in future demand in their next iteration of their demand forecast, which is not yet finalized but will be complete by the Company's next rate filing, highlighting the importance of waiting for this key piece of information. Additionally, the City challenges the unproven assertion that the NESE Project will solve the reliability issues highlighted by Winter Storm Elliot, noting that neither the Addendum nor the PA Report contains a substantive discussion on how the NESE Project would solve the

upstream infrastructure issues that arose during Winter Storm Elliot, such as freeze-ups at the compressor station.

The City raises substantial concerns about the financial impact and cost-effectiveness of the proposed project. According to National Grid, the costs of the NESE Project are forecasted to increase the average residential bill by $7.61 and $7.44 per month for KEDNY and KEDLI, respectively, which equates to a 3.5 percent increase per month for each company. The City characterizes this as wholly unacceptable, particularly given that the city faces an affordability crisis that threatens the ability of families and small businesses to live comfortably and healthily in New York City. Furthermore, the City criticizes National Grid for failing to conduct a benefit-cost analysis to inform whether the extraordinary cost of this project is necessary or whether it will help avoid the upstream equipment failures that occurred during Winter Storm Elliot.

From a climate policy perspective, the City argues that the NESE Project represents a material leap backwards from the City and State's climate goals, as it would construct an estimated $1.4 billion asset, the costs of which National Grid proposes to impose on its customers over several decades. The City contends that the Addendum contravenes the stated purpose of the proceeding, the goals and commitments of the Commission, and the mandates set forth in the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act (CLCPA). The City emphasizes that the Addendum is not a good faith effort to tackle the monumental challenge of transitioning off fossil fuels, which is necessary to protect human health and the environment.

The City notes that National Grid had previously identified solutions to reliability concerns in the Long Term Gas Plan but offers nothing now to explain why building NESE

should be a preferred alternative. Without a thorough assessment of forecast project and gas costs and resulting climate damage, including a robust analysis that considers less expensive solutions with shorter useful lives, the City states it cannot condone any action by the Commission that would directly or indirectly support the construction of such a significant gas pipeline. The City also points out that the NESE Project is not yet fully permitted, making any approval for National Grid to proceed with this project premature. The City argues that such approval would only serve to bolster the project to the benefit of its private sector developers.

In conclusion, the City argues that more analysis is needed to fully analyze the potential reliability benefits of the NESE Project, and such benefits should be weighed against the potential costs to customers and the failure to aggressively address CLCPA goals. The City requests that the Commission defer a decision until National Grid's next rate case, where these issues can be more appropriately addressed.

New York State Laborers' Organizing Fund (NYSLOF)

NYSLOF represents over 40,000 union members and 24 local unions. NYSLOF offers support for the Addendum and NESE. NYSLOF asserts that NESE would create career-track jobs in construction, reduce energy costs for ratepayers, and assist the state in realizing CLCPA goals. NYSLOF states that natural gas provides a necessary bridge to a clean energy future by reducing dependence on oil and diesel truck deliveries. NYSLOF states that NESE would save billions in electricity costs for New Yorkers over the next 15 years.

Real Estate Board of New York

REBNY writes in support of the NESE project as they see it as a critical expansion of Transco’s existing

infrastructure and makes natural gas more reliable for New York City via the safest method of energy transportation. They credit increased displacement of fuel oils by natural gas for New York City experiencing its cleanest air in over 50 years, and state the project will continue the progress NYC has made in improving its air quality.

REBNY states timing as a factor, as significant economic and population growth continues in NYC. The NY State Energy Plan cites the challenge of addressing the increased demand, and that the State acknowledges that it does not expect to meet its renewable energy goals as those projects face hurdles. Increasing the availability of gas to meet the demand allows the city to sustain and build on positive momentum and ensure growth can be managed without reliance on dirtier energy sources.

Sane

Sane recommends that the Commission take the following actions regarding National Grid's Final LTP. First, do not approve National Grid any expenditures for rate base placed into service based on the Company's "questionable" load forecasts. Sane proposes that any expenditure based on the Company's forecasting may not be paid out through rate bases, specifically Sane directs this belief towards Greenpoint. Second, Sane requests the Commission to declare that the National Grid LTP is incomplete and must not be used by any regulatory body or the Company as a justification for any action; and that the docket should remain open due to insufficient analysis. Third, Sane states that the Commission should disallow any cost recovery from NESE and that there is insufficient justification for this project to receive a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. Fourth, Sane requests that the Commission order

National Grid to identify a clear, preferred pathway to decarbonization. Last, Sane requests that the Commission issue an order requiring a binding decommissioning plan for the Greenpoint LNG facility.

Sane provides a list of its observations that they draw these recommendations from. The first observation is Sane's assessment that National Grid did not conduct its LTP in a manner consistent with industry practice. Specifically Sane argues that the Company's design day calculation utilized an exogenous design condition rather than the widely used 30- or 40-year peak day. Sane continues by pointing out that the Company's 40-year design day is about 80,000 Dt/day lower than Company's projected design day and the 30-year design day is 160,000 Dt/day lower. Sane concludes that more "standard" design day would show that the Company would not need either NESE or Greenpoint. Sane disagrees with the Company's stance that without Greenpoint the impacts of Winter Storm Elliot would have been even worse on the grounds that Greenpoint's deployment was due to a "freeze-off" in the Company's gas supply being the driver of this shortfall.

Sane does not support the Company's use of the electrification scenario in the cost-benefit analysis of the Greenpoint facility. The Company's analysis proposes that to completely electrify the total deliverable capacity of Greenpoint the Company would need to electrify 291,000 customers. Using these conditions the Company estimated the total present benefit is $9.1 billion compared to the total present value cost of $20.1 billion for a Societal Cost Test ratio of 0.45. Sane lists its concerns with this analysis: (1) the Company's approach to electrify 291,000 households is likely the most expensive pathway; (2) the Company's use of the 1 MMBtu

usage per household is not substantiated; and (3) the Company estimated photovoltaic costs to include $13.6 million in electric upgrades, which according to Sane is not consistent with conversations with electric utility. Sane believes that these issues should disqualify the Company's societal cost test, and that National Grid prepare a new societal cost test for the Greenpoint LNG Facility.

Sane points out the Company doesn't include potential impacts of New York Law 8888's potential elimination of the 100-foot rule in its model. In addition, Sane states that the Company's modeling does not incorporate a moratorium scenario. While the Company proposes in its LTP that a moratorium on natural gas service could be the result of proposed gas supply and infrastructure plans failing there is no modeling of a moratorium scenario.

Sane states that NESE would not meet the criteria for National Grid to commit 400,000 Dth/d to peak load due the Company currently holding enough resources to meet design day until 2042. Sane disagrees with the Company's assessment that NESE would be a useful gas supply resources and points to the Company's estimated costs of between $215 million and $258 million per year, which could be more in the range of $300 million due to inflation. Sane states that National Grid included an analysis of NESE's potential benefits to NYS electric customers in the Addendum, but did not previously consider impacts to electric markets anywhere else in the LTP. Sane states that National Grid should not be able to use its natural gas ratepayers to fund a project that benefits the New York State electric market. Sane states that LAI Consulting's analysis shows a reduction of electric prices of $35/MWh in January and $4/MWh in February. Three issues that Sane raises

related to the Company's modeling is: (1) due to the weather-dependency of electric and gas prices, a warmer winter could lead to no cost benefit for power generation; (2) Sane believes it is unclear if LAI considered that on extreme days this gas capacity would still need to serve gas-heating customers; and (3) Sane states that it is unclear whether the cost benefits, if they exist, would actually go to electric ratepayers, not to the electric generators.

Sane reiterates their claim that National Grid's planning scenarios are not aligned with New York State Law.

Sane states that National Grid failed to adhere to the Order in the Company's last rate case, which Sane claims required the Company to examine and plan for retirement of the Greenpoint Facility. Sane presents requirements that it believes the Company are not in compliance with and why in a table. Sane states that: the Company's forecasts are not in compliance with proper utility practice; the Company failed to analyze costs and benefits of continued operation of Greenpoint or NPAs using the total resource cost formula; the Company did not provide examples of NPAs as alternatives to Greenpoint; the Company did not estimate the reduction in customers served if Greenpoint were removed; the Company did not model system, health, land-use, and environmental impacts of decommissioning the Greenpoint facilities; and the Company did not assess the risks evaluate the bill impacts of decommissioning Greenpoint.

SC

Sierra Club states that over the 15 months of the proceeding, the Company's goals and focus shifted. In its Initial LTP, the Company described the Climate Action Council's Scoping Plan as a roadmap for the gas transition and urged implementation. The commenter notes that in the Initial LTP the

Company emphasized "no-regrets" near term actions rather than a single planning scenario.

SC states that in the Final LTP the Company departed from this approach. The Company moved away from characterizing the Scoping Plan as the roadmap, instead selectively referencing it, and formally endorsed its Clean Energy Vision as the preferred scenario. The commenter highlights that this eliminated the prior tenet that near-term actions under Clean Energy Vision and Accelerated Electrification scenarios were the same.

The commenter explains that in the July 2025 Addendum, the Company unveiled a revised load forecast that reduced claims of near-term supply shortfall and simultaneously promoted the NESE Project. The commenter argues that the NESE Project is not the subject of this proceeding, its need is undermined by the Company's revised load forecasts, its climate benefits are overstated, and its primary economic benefits accrue to electric ratepayers rather than gas customers.

The commenter identifies the following concerns with the Final LTP and Addendum: reliance on alternative fuels, including hydrogen blending, which the commenter states is contrary to the Scoping Plan and Draft State Energy Plan; inadequate focus on NPAs and pipe repairs/re-lining to avoid costly leak-prone pipe replacement; assumptions regarding availability, cost, and emissions impacts of RNG; assumptions that understate the benefits and overstate the costs of electrification; overstated gas demand and insufficient attention to implications of reduced demand forecasts for supply portfolio plans, including NESE, Iroquois ExC, and LNG vaporizers; and lack of demonstrated need, substantiated emission benefits, or cost-effectiveness for the NESE Project.

SC states that both the Climate Action Council's final Scoping Plan and the State Energy Planning Board's Draft State Energy Plan provide guidance regarding the State's strategies for decarbonizing buildings. The commenter argues that the Company's Clean Energy Vision, which relies on hydrogen blending, RNG substitution, and continued pipe replacement, is in substantial tension with these strategies.

The commenter states that CEV relies on blending hydrogen into the gas pipeline system, reaching 20 percent by volume, with more than $5 billion in expenditures through FY 2051. The commenter argues that hydrogen blending is not a viable or cost-effective strategy, is inconsistent with the Scoping Plan, and is expressly rejected by the Draft State Energy Plan.

The commenter explains that hydrogen blending poses safety, leakage, and efficiency concerns. Hydrogen requires substantially more electricity to provide the same heating, making it inefficient compared to direct electrification. The commenter notes that hydrogen is a potent indirect greenhouse gas.

The commenter states that the Scoping Plan envisioned only negligible hydrogen blending for buildings, limited to a residual role in Con Edison's district steam system. The commenter further states that the Draft State Energy Plan explicitly determined that blending hydrogen into the natural gas system is infeasible and not a pathway New York will pursue. The commenter concludes that the Company's LTP must be modified to eliminate hydrogen blending.

The commenter states that the Company's reliance on RNG as a primary decarbonization strategy is inconsistent with the Scoping Plan, Draft State Energy Plan, and PA Consulting's

recommendations. The commenter argues that electrification is the primary pathway identified in State planning, while RNG is reserved for limited residual use.

SC notes that the Scoping Plan envisions rapid adoption of heat pumps, systematic phase-out of fossil fuel appliances, and RNG limited to remaining de minimis pipeline gas needs. The commenter explains that onsite biogas use is preferable to biomethane injection.

The commenter further states that the Draft State Energy Plan identifies electrification as primary, with delivered fuels more cost effective than pipeline based RNG. The commenter notes that PA recommends RNG be limited to hard to electrify end uses, consistent with Commission precedent. The commenter concludes that the Company's proposed widespread RNG blending is inappropriate and should be limited to residual use after widespread electrification.

The commenter states that the Company should avoid large scale replacement of LPP and instead expand reliance on NPAs, repair, and relining. The commenter explains that full replacement will cost tens of billions of dollars and create long term obligations that burden ratepayers.

The commenter notes that the Draft State Energy Plan urges avoidance of unnecessary capital investment and that PA Consulting recommends reducing such spending. The commenter highlights that the Company owns more than 4,500 miles of LPP and that Synapse Energy Economics estimated tens of billions in replacement costs.

SC states that the Company has completed only three NPAs to date, retiring just over one-tenth of a mile of pipe, which is not sufficient given the systemwide scale of LPP. The commenter argues that repair and relining should be considered

as cost-effective interim measures, consistent with the Draft State Energy Plan.

The commenter concludes that the Commission should ensure that the Company maximizes NPAs, repairs, and relining as alternatives to full pipe replacement.

The commenter states that the Company has built its long-term gas system decarbonization strategy around procuring large amounts of RNG from outside its service territory to substitute for fossil methane. The commenter argues that the assumptions underlying this strategy are not realistic. The commenter states that it is not likely the Company will be able to obtain the quantities required at the projected price, and that emissions are greater than assumed.

SC notes that the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities recently rejected a proposal to modify gas supply procurement policy to include RNG due to concerns regarding cost, availability, and uncertain emissions status. The commenter concludes that RNG should not be treated as a primary decarbonization strategy and should be limited to hard-to-electrify uses.

The commenter states that to achieve its Clean Energy Vision, the Company would require 98.5 TBtu/year of RNG by 2050. The commenter explains that all proposed RNG projects in the Company's New York service territories would yield only 3 TBtu/year. The commenter notes that the Company assumes entitlement to 7.2 percent of all RNG available east of the Mississippi River. The commenter states that PA Consulting described this assumption as speculative and highly unlikely, and noted if possible, RNG would come at a cost premium.

The commenter states that the Company assumes it can obtain RNG at its production cost. The commenter explains that

RNG has a market for its renewable attributes, which must be purchased to claim decarbonization value. The commenter states that the Company's projected prices are significantly below current attribute values. The commenter notes that PA Consulting described the Company's price assumptions as highly speculative and likely underestimated, with low-carbon fuels expected to retain a substantial cost premium over traditional gas.

The commenter states that the climate benefit of RNG depends on capturing methane that would otherwise escape, but that in practice many production pathways result in additional methane generation and leakage which reduces or eliminates the benefit. The commenter notes that few RNG sources planned by the Company provide significant climate benefits. The commenter states that PA Consulting questioned whether the Company adequately accounted for upstream emissions and transport processes.

SC states that the Climate Action Council's final Scoping Plan identifies electrification through ASHP and GSHP and deployment of thermal energy networks as the primary pathway to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from buildings. The commenter explains that the Scoping Plan shows building energy demand shifting predominantly to electricity by 2050 and that fossil emitting appliances are phased out between 2025 and 2035.

The commenter notes that PA Consulting affirms the electrification pathway can reduce emissions while maintaining affordability if targeted and coordinated. PA Consulting encourages the Company and stakeholders to explore strategies to remove barriers and maximize electrification value.

SC argues that the Company's GSLTP downplays electrification and makes it appear less attractive relative to

fuel based strategies by using assumptions that understate its benefits and overstate its costs. The commenter states that PA Consulting highlights additional benefits of electrification, such as improved grid firmness, transport electrification, resilience, and health benefits, which are not represented in the Company's BCA.

The commenter states that the Company further increases the apparent relative cost of its Accelerated Electrification scenario by assuming similar capital spending and pipe replacement costs across all scenarios. The commenter notes that PA Consulting observed the Company only accounted for minimal avoided infrastructure spending, and that LPP replacement costs remain nearly identical between Clean Energy Vision and Accelerated Electrification scenarios. The commenter argues that this suggests the Company does not anticipate scaling NPAs to levels that would avoid substantial LPP replacement.

The commenter states that New York's electrical system remains strongly summer peaking, with excess winter capacity available to support additional electrification. The commenter references PA Consulting's finding that excess winter capacity could support electrification of hundreds of thousands of homes, and that further electrification potential can be achieved with energy efficiency, demand management, and demand response.

SC concludes that to fairly compare electrification and pipeline based decarbonization strategies the Company must use "even handed" assumptions. The commenter states that the Company's assumptions currently overstate the feasibility of alternative fuels while understating electrification benefits and that these must be corrected before concluding that the Clean Energy Vision is preferable.

The commenter states that both its own prior comments and PA Consulting's reports raised significant concerns with the Company's demand forecast. The commenter explains that in its July 2025 Addendum, the Company substantially revised the forecast downward, closer to PA Consulting's recommendations. The commenter states that while this addressed some issues, other concerns remain unresolved, such as the effect of climate change on heating degree days. The commenter further argues that the Addendum does not adequately address how reduced demand affects supply portfolio planning.

The commenter states that the Final LTP fails to account for climate change impacts on heating degree days. The commenter notes that heating degree days in New York declined significantly between 1960 and 2021. The commenter references a chart showing historical and projected heating degree day trends.

SC explains that PA Consulting observed the Company likely did not account for continued declines, resulting in overestimation of delivered gas volumes.

The commenter further argues that the Company's forecast relied on unrealistic macroeconomic and customer assumptions. The commenter notes that PA Consulting flagged issues such as population trends, electrification of space heating, local prohibitions on fossil fuel equipment in new construction, and customer forecasts that diverge from historical data. The commenter highlights that the Company assumed significant exemptions from gas restrictions and forecast rising use per customer for multifamily customers. SC noted that PA Consulting found inconsistent with recent trends. The commenter references charts showing PA's adjusted forecasts compared to the Company's Reference Case.

The commenter states that the Company's revised 2025 forecast is substantially lower than prior forecasts and closer to PA's adjusted projections. The commenter explains that the revisions were driven by lower assumed economic growth rates and changes in fuel-switching assumptions. The commenter notes that PA Consulting found the reductions largely attributable to revised use-per-customer forecasts.

The commenter states that the revised forecast is more realistic but still fails to incorporate reduced heating degree days due to climate change. The commenter explains that the Company instead cited the potential for unprecedented extreme events, but argues that reduced annual heating needs remain relevant to supply planning and rate impacts. The commenter references PA Consulting's statement that adjusting for reduced heating degree days would increase upward pressure on gas rates across all scenarios.

SC states that despite revising demand forecasts, the Company continues to strongly endorse the NESE Project, which would provide 400,000 dekatherms per day of capacity. The commenter references a chart illustrating supply demand balance with and without NESE.

The commenter explains that even without NESE, no shortfall is projected through 2050, and that the revised forecast delays any potential gap until 2041/42. The commenter argues that this undermines the Company's claims of urgent need.

The commenter states that the NESE Project represents a multibillion dollar investment that would impose significant costs on customers. The commenter notes that PA Consulting recommended the Company pursue alternatives to adding new gas customers and deploy targeted NPAs to avoid new investments.

The commenter concludes that the Addendum fails to show that NESE is necessary or cost effective given reduced demand.

SC states that on June 2, 2025, the Company requested additional time to update its Final LTP to assess the NESE Project, and on July 2, 2025, the Company filed an Addendum along with a report from Levitan & Associates assessing potential economic benefits. The commenter explains that the Addendum focuses primarily on NESE but also reveals that the Company has recently revised its demand forecast, which undermines the asserted need for the project.

The commenter states that the Addendum does not meaningfully update the Final LTP as promised. The commenter argues that the Addendum does not sufficiently address how the supply portfolio would change if NESE became operational and defers determinations about compressed natural gas to ongoing planning. The commenter also states that the Addendum does not address how long-term capacity contracts will interact with flexibility to de-contract if demand declines.

SC expresses concern that the Company is using the Addendum to make the proceeding into a referendum on NESE, despite the project not pending approval before the Commission. The commenter notes that while an unusual number of supportive comments have been filed, the Company has not meaningfully addressed how NESE fits with revised forecasts.

The commenter states that the Company presents a skewed view of NESE's benefits, including overstated greenhouse gas reductions. The commenter explains that claimed benefits are tied to oil to gas switching and references assumptions about incremental customer conversions. The commenter notes that recent legislation eliminating the subsidy for the first 100 feet of gas main and service will affect oil to gas

conversions, reducing climate benefits. The commenter further states that if conversions occur at the expense of oil to electric switching, claimed reductions could be eliminated or reversed.

The commenter argues that the Company's BCA is flawed. The commenter states that the analysis counts societal benefits to electric customers statewide while costs are borne by Downstate gas customers. The commenter notes that PA Consulting found it difficult to verify suppressed price benefits and highlighted risks that gas customers would subsidize infrastructure benefiting generators. The commenter further explains that solar capacity assumptions in the Company's analysis are conservative, which inflates the value of NESE.

The commenter states that long term NESE contracts would reduce supply flexibility and increase the risk of stranded costs if demand trends downward. The commenter notes that PA Consulting recommended caution regarding new capacity commitments and highlighted the value of defining a de-contracting approach.

The commenter concludes that NESE is inconsistent with the State's broader decarbonization strategy, which seeks to reduce natural gas use. The commenter notes that the project's claimed climate benefits depend on expanding gas use, contrary to policies such as New York City's Local Law 154 and the All-Electric Buildings Act. The commenter states that the Addendum fails to explain why NESE would be required in addition to other supply side resources such as the ExC and LNG vaporizers at Greenpoint and urges the Commission to carefully review the cost implications of reduced portfolio flexibility.

The commenter agrees that existing policies inhibit cost effective building decarbonization. The commenter states

that while not all issues can be addressed by the Commission without legislative action, the Commission should advance supportive changes within its authority and endorse broader reforms where legislative action is required.

The commenter states that in its Initial LTP the Company acknowledged that the obligation to serve is a barrier to cost effective electrification and suggested eliminating or modifying it. The commenter notes that in the Final LTP the Company shifted its position, instead emphasizing customer choice. The commenter expresses disappointment in this shift, pointing out that the Company previously recognized that policy changes are needed to evolve the utility business model.

The commenter states that the obligation to serve restricts the Commission's ability to require NPAs and hampers the Company's ability to implement them. The commenter highlights that to date the Company has achieved only approximately 586 feet of pipe retirement through NPAs. The commenter argues that the Commission should help educate legislators on the value of modifying or eliminating the obligation to serve.

The commenter emphasizes that affordability is important, and that electrification should be paired with building envelope upgrades and appropriate rate designs. The commenter references analysis from Massachusetts showing that heat pump economics improve significantly under alternative rate structures, and urges further investigation in New York.

The commenter states that decommissioning parts of the gas network is essential for a low-cost transition. The commenter notes that the Draft State Energy Plan envisions utilities identifying which areas will remain part of the gas system and which may transition away.

SC supports the Commission's initiation of a "tabletop" exercise in another utility docket to identify criteria for system decommissioning. The commenter urges the Commission to extend this process to additional utilities.

The commenter agrees with the Company that coordination between gas and electric utilities is required for an orderly transition. The commenter notes that the Draft State Energy Plan sets out key components of such coordination, including data sharing, linking of analyses, mapping of assets, restructuring of planning teams, and identifying electrification zones. The commenter cites examples from Massachusetts, where the Department of Public Utilities has initiated compliance planning dockets and the Company has begun collaborating with electric utilities on transition planning. The commenter recommends that the Commission require similar coordination in New York.

The commenter expresses concern with the Company's recommendations regarding cross-utility cost coordination. The commenter explains that while the Company seeks to avoid leaving costs behind for remaining gas customers, shifting costs to electric customers creates moral hazard and slows the transition away from gas.

SC states that gas utilities have pursued major capital investments despite clear signals of declining demand. The commenter states that between 2011 and 2021 gas utilities expanded distribution systems and replaced thousands of miles of pipe at high cost. The commenter argues that utilities will make more prudent investment decisions if not assured of cost recovery through cross subsidization.

The commenter states that the Company recommends a gas utility decarbonization performance standard to reduce the

carbon intensity of delivered fuel and support procurement of RNG and hydrogen. The commenter argues that this proposal is inconsistent with the Scoping Plan and Draft State Energy Plan, which reject hydrogen in the gas system and limit RNG to residual uses. The commenter concludes that such a program would lead to costly and inefficient investments.

The commenter notes the Company's recognition that a potential Cap-and-Invest program would affect planning but disagrees with its recommendations. The commenter explains that the Company seeks to provide no-cost allowances to gas utilities to support affordability but argues that this would disproportionately burden LMI households who remain on the gas system.

The commenter states that Cap-and-Invest revenues should instead be used to facilitate electrification and pre-electrification for LMI households, consistent with recommendations in the Draft State Energy Plan. The commenter emphasizes that disadvantaged communities must have equitable access to clean energy and not bear disproportionate burdens in the transition.

SC states that gas utilities have a critical role in helping New York achieve its climate mandates cost effectively. The commenter explains that the buildings sector remains the largest contributor to emissions and that effective planning is necessary to transition away from gas.

The commenter argues that the Company's Final LTP and Addendum and they rely on hydrogen blending, RNG substitution, and pipe replacement, all of which are inconsistent with the Scoping Plan, Draft State Energy Plan, and the independent consultant recommendations. The commenter emphasizes that

electrification should be the primary pathway, supported by NPAs, repairs, and relining to reduce unnecessary investments.

The commenter concludes that the Commission should require substantial modifications to the Company's plan, reject reliance on NESE, and ensure that gas system planning is aligned with New York's statutory climate targets.

Association for a Better Long Island, Long Island Association, Long Islanders Builders Institute, Long Island Contractors Association, Hauppauge Industrial Association of LI, Long Island Board of Realtors, and Commercial Industrial Brokers Society of Long Island

Combined, the coalition of commenters (Coalition) represents thousands of businesses, large and small, hundreds of thousands of employees, and over $25 billion in assets across Long Island. The Coalition states that investing in critical infrastructure projects will protect the region's economic viability by making energy more reliable and affordable. Following the federal government's recent changes to offshore wind policies, the Coalition states that we need to ensure access to a mix of energy sources that are reliable, affordable, and clean to meet future energy needs. The Coalitions states that this is exactly what the NESE project will provide for Long Island's 2.9 million people.

Also, the Coalition states that NESE addresses a sustained enhancement in energy reliability for ensuring stable electric generation across Long Island. Additionally, the Coalition states that NESE is the only major infrastructure project in the next fifteen years capable of meaningfully addressing the region's escalating reliability risks and securing our energy future. The Coalition asserts that NESE aligns with the state's climate goals by reducing our dependence

on oil. The Coalition states that NESE is a pragmatic step forward that balances our immediate energy reliability needs with our long-term sustainability objectives

For these reasons, the Coalition strongly supports the NESE project. The Coalition urges the NYS Public Service Commission to give full and favorable consideration to this plan and to support the timely advancement of the NESE project.

Assemblymember Jo Anne Simon

Assemblymember Simon stands with constituents and statewide environmental advocates in strongly opposing

National Grid's Supplement. Assemblymember Simon opposes the NESE project for the same reasons she opposed it in 2019, stating that it would endanger local communities and our climate, while further entrenching our state's dependence on fossil fuels, despite state law mandating a continued transition to cleaner energy sources.

Further Assemblymember Simon states that NESE will not be able to impact near-term reliability concerns. Assemblymember Simon states that NESE would give National Grid unnecessary storage capacity as the needs for gas decrease while renewable energy and NPAs are increasing. Also, Assemblymember Simon states that National Grid’s heart is in the gas pipelines, not in the NPA future of New York. Assemblymember Simon is concerned that we will be making a harmful choice if we proceed with the construction of NESE.

Assemblymember Simon states that National Grid bases its design day forecast on data that doesn’t reflect the changes to our climate. Also, Assemblymember Simon states that National Grid’s design day doesn’t address the dynamic of electric generation. Assemblymember Simon states that climate change is

here and we will continues to see temperatures rise and unless we kick the habit of fossil dependence.

Assemblymember Simon says that the President is focused on destruction and self-enrichment, even as it harms the public's health and well-being to advance the interests of oil and gas companies steadily. Also, Assemblymember Simon says that New York should not permit NESE to get a second bite at the apple. Assemblymember Simon states that recent federal policy choices directly contradict New York's CLCPA. Further, Assemblymember Simon states that we must not go back to relying on dirty and unhealthy fracked gas, which hastens climate change, pollutes the environment, and harms the public's health.

Also, Assemblymember Simon states that cost of building a new unnecessary pipeline will be borne by the New York ratepayers. The Assemblymember states that many New Yorkers are utility-burdened (paying 6 percent or more of income on energy), have fallen behind in their payments, and/or have had service cut off. Assemblymember Simon states that the increase that this new pipeline would bring is one that we cannot shoulder. Further, the Assemblymember states that with this pipeline, ratepayers will subsidize benefits for the fossil fuel industry.

Assemblymember Simon states that this pipeline is unnecessary, citing PA's finding that building NESE results in an excess capacity risk. For these reasons, Assemblymember states that the Commission must reject National Grid's LTP and Addendum.

Matthew Aracich, President, Building and Construction Trades Council of Nassau & Suffolk Counties (BTC)

BTC expresses staunch support for the NESE project. Further, BTC states that the NESE project will significantly

enhance the reliability of the natural gas supply across the Northeast and Long Island. Also, BTC states that the resilience that NESE will provide is crucial to ensuring consistent and affordable energy for homes, businesses, and institutions that depend on reliable service.

BTC states that NESE will be an economic engine that will generate thousands of good-paying union careers during both the construction and operational phases. Also, BTC states that NESE will provide meaningful tax revenue and support local businesses across the supply chain. Further, Mr. Aracich states that NESE will play an important complementary role as we move toward a cleaner energy future. BTC states that NESE will enable more efficient delivery of natural gas that will reduce reliance on higher emission fuels, support decarbonization of the energy system, and provide a reliable bridge to expanded and renewable energy deployment. BTC states that the Building Trades Council fully supports the NESE project.

Terri Alessi-Miceli, President & CEO, HIA-LI (HIA-LI)

HIA-LI expresses the HIA-LI's strong support for National Grid's LTP and NESE. HIA-LI represents the Long Island Business community and is committed to ensuring the well-being, economic vitality, and environmental health of our region. Additionally, HIA-LI states that the addendum will be positive for Long Island by making energy more reliable and affordable. Further, HIA-LI states that NESE a critical investment in our energy infrastructure, that will help address the growing demand from residents, businesses, and emerging sectors such as high-performance data centers designed for artificial intelligence applications. Also, HIA-LI states that the added capacity will ensure resilience in the face of future challenges such as extreme weather events and supply disruptions.

Additionally, HIA-LI states that NESE offers significant economic and environmental benefits that could save New York up to $6 billion in electricity costs over 15 years. Further, HIA-LI states that NESE aligns with the state's climate goals by reducing our dependence on oil. Further, HIA-LI states that NESE is a pragmatic step forward that balances our immediate reliability needs with our long-term sustainability objectives. Finally, HIA-LI recommends that the Commission give full and favorable consideration to National Grid's plan and support the advancement of the NESE project.

Jonathan T. Mack, President, Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, Inc. (EEIA)

EEIA expresses its strong support for National Grid's LTP and the NESE project. EEIA represents numerous New York-based companies and workers who build, operate and maintain energy infrastructure. Further, EEIA states that the LTP will help address the growing demand from residents, businesses, and emerging sectors such as high-performance data centers designed for artificial intelligence applications

EEIA also states that the NESE offers significant economic and environmental benefits that could save New Yorkers up to $6 billion in electricity costs. EEIA urges the Commission to give favorable consideration to National Grid's LTP and support the NESE project's advancement.

Randy Peers, President and CEO, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce (BCC)

BCC expresses their support for the NESE project. Further, BCC states that this critical infrastructure investment will enhance energy reliability for families, schools, and businesses. Also, BCC states that it is encouraged by the environmental and economic benefits NESE offers, stating that

reducing diesel truck deliveries will lower greenhouse gas emissions, which is especially important for vulnerable populations. Finally, BCC urges the Commission to support the NESE project for the benefit of all New Yorkers.

Multiple members of the Laborers International Union of North America

Approximately 22 members of the Laborers International Union of North America commented, expressing their support for NESE. The commenters state that their union represents over 44,000 workers who build and maintain infrastructure for New York State. The commenters state that natural gas is the cleanest and most efficient energy source and is essential to meet growing energy needs. The commenters state that without NESE, there is a risk of energy shortfalls that force reliance on dirtier, less reliable alternatives.

National Grid Reply Comments to PA's Report on the Supplement: National Grid

The Company states that the PA's Final Report validates the Long-Term Gas System Plan Addendum's conclusion that incremental pipeline deliveries from the Northeast Supply Enhancement (NESE) Project are the only option that can simultaneously enhance system reliability, lower commodity costs, reduce emissions, and meet critical system needs during the transition. The Company states that the Addendum, the accompanying LAI Study, Transco's May 2025 decision to reinitiate NESE, and recent developments raising concern about the energy system's ability to meet demand all confirm that NESE must be treated as a core component of the GSLTP. The Company states that PA's independent review confirmed that NESE confers substantial benefits in four focus areas within the Commission's

review: reliability, resiliency, energy affordability, and emissions reductions.

The Company states that it filed the Final LTP on March 7, 2025. The Company states that Transco announced in May 2025 that it would reinitiate NESE and committed to begin construction before year-end upon receipt of required permits. The Company states that it initially determined NESE could provide unique, significant benefits as a complement to the Iroquois Enhancement by Compression (ExC) Project, which serves the eastern portion of the service area, by enabling supply for the western portion. The Company states that it completed a comprehensive analysis and commissioned the LAI Study while Final LTP review was pending, and those analyses confirmed the initial determinations. The Company states that it proposed incorporating NESE into the Addendum and responded to questions at the July 22, 2025 Technical Conference.

The Company states that the NESE Project will improve pressure at key points on the distribution system, reduce reliance on transfers from Consolidated Edison at Newtown Creek and Lake Success, and expand firm supply for customers in the western portion of the territory. The Company states that NESE is a critical complement to the ExC Project, which serves the eastern portion of the territory, and that together both projects provide supply needed across the entire region.

The Company states that the NESE Project will reduce reliance on contingency resources, including compressed natural gas, which depends on truck deliveries during peak conditions, and costly city gate peaking services that are only available on a short-term basis. The Company states that NESE provides additional flexibility to manage load growth as gas and electric systems evolve, and flexibility to respond to disturbances and

curtailments on Design Day and during other peak winter conditions.

The Company states that the NESE Project will allow reduced reliance of most CNG sites and avoid risks and volatility associated with city gate peaking contracts. The Company states that NESE will avoid the need for enhancements such as new vaporizers at the Greenpoint LNG facility. The Company states that by improving system reliability and reducing reliance on trucked CNG and other contingency resources, NESE will reduce the likelihood that expensive emergency measures will be required. The Company states that these improvements will protect customers from abrupt cost spikes resulting from emergency fuel purchases or service interruptions.

The Company states that the NESE Project reduce emissions by eliminating hundreds of diesel truck trips required to transport compressed natural gas and by enabling thousands of oil-to-gas conversions. The Company states that NESE will reduce emissions from the power sector by lowering reliance on oil-fired generation and that it will reduce other pollutants, including nitrogen oxides and sulfur dioxide. The Company states that NESE will assist in achieving State climate objectives under the CLCPA. The Company states that the LAI Study found that the NESE Project would result in substantial net benefits by reducing wholesale natural gas and electricity prices. The Company states that the PA Report validated these conclusions and found them reasonable. The Company states that by adding firm pipeline capacity in a constrained market, NESE would put downward pressure on commodity prices, particularly during periods of high demand in summer and winter. The Company states that PA further found that excess pipeline capacity during off-peak periods could be marketed through capacity

release and that associated revenues would be returned to customers.

The Company states that the combined impacts of improved reliability, reduced reliance on contingency resources, commodity price reductions, and lower emissions confirm that NESE provides unique benefits. The Company states that, based on the Addendum, the LAI Study, and the PA Report, the NESE Project is the most prudent and effective project available to address current reliability, affordability, and emissions challenges. The Company states that the Addendum demonstrated that the NESE Project provides a unique opportunity to secure additional firm capacity that is both essential and prudent to continue meeting customer needs. The Company states that the project also provides broader benefits to the energy system. The Company states that the PA Report largely corroborates the Addendum's conclusion that the NESE Project will strengthen system reliability, lower emissions, and yield economic benefits for customers and the regional energy network.

The Company states that the PA Report concludes that the NESE Project's 400 MDth/d of firm pipeline capacity will directly address single-contingency and low-pressure risks identified in the Gas System Long-Term Plan. The Company states that the PA Report finds that NESE delivers the type of reliable and resilient supply resource the Commission has directed utilities to secure. The Company states that the PA Report finds the NESE Project will: improve gas pressure at critical points in the system to be well above minimum design levels; reduce reliance on gas transfers from Con Edison at Newtown Creek and Lake Success, which are currently required on design days but may not always be available simultaneously, thereby enhancing reliability for both systems; provide additional gas

stored within the pipeline system to serve as a buffer during supply disruptions and to allow more time to resolve issues without curtailing customers; deliver incremental capacity on newer infrastructure; reduce reliance on trucked compressed natural gas; and reduce dependence on short-term city gate peaking contracts, which face emerging risks of limited availability and price volatility, with no guarantee that sufficient peaking capacity can be secured in future years without bidding against other shippers for constrained supply.

The Company states that the PA Report finds the NESE Project will provide a reserve margin and operational flexibility, allowing the Company to better manage future demand uncertainties, including potential increases from electrification, economic development, and extreme weather. The Company states that PA confirms the NESE Project would diversify supply sources and reduce exposure to single points of failure or market volatility.

The Company states that incremental year-round pipeline capacity from NESE serves several distinct system's needs. The Company states that NESE increases supply margin by creating a buffer between expected peak demand and firm entitlements. The Company states that this buffer could otherwise be eliminated by a severe winter, an upstream curtailment, or a large new customer load. The Company states that the additional capacity from NESE restores the reserve margin to a prudent level and enables retirement of the most expensive and fragile elements of its supply portfolio, such as CNG facilities.

The Company states that incremental firm supply diversifies physical flow paths, reducing common failure risks identified by FERC and NERC. The Company states that NESE

provides a parallel path to the Rockaway Delivery Lateral, materially reducing exposure to a single point of failure. The Company states that NESE broadens the tools available to support integrated gas-electric operations. The Company states that with additional supply under contract, it will have flexibility to release or asset-manage surplus capacity, return revenues to customers, and structure such releases to regional generators on a recallable basis, thereby preserving reliability benefits.

The Company states that the PA Report confirms NESE would mitigate risks from severe weather events and upstream supply disruptions, referencing Winter Storm Elliott of 2022. The Company states that FERC, NERC, and regional entities documented risks beyond Design Day modeling during that event and concluded that additional natural gas supply would materially augment operational flexibility during severe weather. The Company states that the Winter Storm Elliott Report recommended expanding pipeline capacity, increasing storage, and enhancing interregional connectivity as essential to reliability and resilience, and that FERC and NERC urged policymakers and industry stakeholders to prioritize infrastructure investment and modernization as part of energy security.

The Company states that NERC's 2025 Reliability Risk Priorities Report similarly supports the need to expand gas infrastructure, noting that natural gas is the primary fuel for dispatchable generation in the near term. The Company states that the Northeast Power Coordinating Council study of the Northeast gas and electric system issued in January 2025 highlighted that insufficient pipeline capacity into New York has kept the region reliant on oil and constrained peaking resources, and emphasized the importance of preserving options

to sustain flexible operations as demand grows from electrification.

The Company states that PA confirmed both the NESE Project and the ExC Project are needed to mitigate reliability risks across the Company's territory. The Company states that the ExC Project is essential to reliability on eastern Long Island but cannot relieve constraints on the western portion of the system due to its location and the unidirectional nature of the high-pressure backbone in winter. The Company states that PA's review of hydraulic modeling confirmed that distribution pressures in Queens would remain near minimum thresholds even with ExC fully commissioned and all CNG sites operating. The Company states that in contrast, NESE would inject 400 MDth/d directly into the Rockaway Delivery Lateral, increasing line pack in the Lower New York Bay corridor and creating a second high-pressure path into the Brooklyn-Queens Interconnect. The Company concludes that while the ExC Project is an important enhancement, it must be complemented by NESE to provide a system-wide solution to pressure constraints and firm capacity needs.

The Company states that the NESE Project will reduce costs by avoiding contingency services, eliminating the need for new infrastructure, and lowering wholesale energy prices. The Company states that the LAI Study found that savings from the project exceed its costs, and the PA Report validated these findings. The Company states that NESE would allow retirement of three of the five existing compressed natural gas sites, avoid installation of Greenpoint LNG Vaporizers 13 and 14, and reduce reliance on city gate peaking contracts that are volatile, short-term, and increasingly difficult to secure. The Company states that NESE will lower wholesale natural gas prices

by relieving supply constraints, which in turn lowers wholesale electric prices because natural gas-fired generation sets marginal power prices.

The Company states that the LAI Study presented these findings in the provided table, quantifying annual wholesale electric savings averaging approximately $670 million between 2028 and 2042, totaling $6.0 billion in present value, with nearly half of the benefits accruing to Downstate customers. The Company states that avoided contingency costs and infrastructure investments, combined with wholesale price savings, demonstrate that NESE provides significant net benefits. The Company states that PA confirmed these conclusions were reasonable and consistent with market conditions. The Company states that lower energy prices will also generate broader economic benefits, including increased disposable income, reduced business costs, job creation, economic growth, and increased state and local tax revenues.

The Company states that the NESE Project advances New York's climate and energy policy goals by enabling oil-to-gas conversions, eliminating diesel-powered truck deliveries of compressed natural gas, and reducing reliance on oil-fired electric generation. The Company states that the PA Report confirmed these outcomes, including the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and co-pollutants such as nitrogen oxides and sulfur dioxide. The Company states that the NESE Project is aligned with the CLCPA requirements under Sections 7(2) and 7(3).

The Company states that the Draft 2025 State Energy Plan acknowledges the ongoing role of natural gas through 2040 and recommends continued investment in gas infrastructure to maintain safe, reliable, and resilient service during the energy

transition. The Company states that the NESE Project provides operational flexibility needed to address demand variability, electrification, and economic development, while reducing emissions and supporting environmental justice objectives by lowering local air pollution from diesel and oil use.

The Company states that the PA Report emphasizes the importance of coordinated planning that accounts for gas-electric system interdependence and the integration of non-pipeline alternatives and electrification efforts. The Company states that it agrees reliability, affordability, and compliance with the CLCPA must be treated as co-requirements rather than competing objectives.

The Company states that recent reports from NERC, NPCC, and NYISO highlight the continuing dependence of the bulk power system on natural gas. The Company states that the 2025 NERC Reliability Risk Priorities Report highlights that gas infrastructure must expand to meet the needs of dispatchable generation resources, which will remain the primary source of firm capacity over the next several years. The Company states that the NPCC and NYISO have likewise identified insufficient gas supply infrastructure as a growing risk to electric system reliability. The Company states that the NESE Project directly addresses these concerns by providing incremental capacity and operational flexibility, supporting both the gas and electric systems.

The Company states that although the June 2025 design-day forecast is lower than the prior year's forecast, this does not diminish the need for the NESE Project. The Company states that it must plan to meet its statutory obligation to provide safe and adequate service under all conditions, which requires preparing for outcomes where demand exceeds projections. The

Company states that its forecasting methodology is designed to balance risks, and actual demand could exceed forecasts due to electrification, economic development, or severe weather. The Company states that additional large commercial and industrial customer requests for service, not yet incorporated in the forecast, could further increase demand.

The Company states that the risk of stranded costs is mitigated by three factors: winter electrification load; capacity release and asset-management revenue; and retirement of costlier supplies.

The Company states that NYISO's 2025 Power Trends report projects that winter peaks will overtake summer peaks by the early 2030s. The Company states that no commercially viable dispatchable zero-emission resources or long-duration storage currently exist. The Company states that each new heat pump increases winter electric load, requiring more gas-fired generation until alternatives are developed. The Company states that NESE is the only near-term option to provide firm supply for this demand and to hedge against electrification-driven volatility.

The Company states that gas markets in New York and the region remain constrained, especially in winter, making released pipeline capacity valuable. The Company states that it has experience monetizing capacity and returning hundreds of millions of dollars in revenues to customers over the past decade. The Company states that NESE will provide additional flexibility to generate capacity release and asset-management revenues that will be credited back to customers. The Company states that NESE will allow the Company to retire city gate peaking contracts, which offsets the fixed demand charges associated with NESE volumes.

The Company states that even if demand growth slows, the NESE Project provides long-term price stability and reliability. The Company states that it offers flexibility to meet rising demand if forecasts prove low, while ensuring that excess capacity can generate revenues to reduce customer costs. The Company concludes that the risk of insufficient supply is greater than the risk of stranded costs, making the NESE Project prudent.

The Company states that concerns about inflexibility from long-term contracts are overstated. The Company states that the NESE Project can accommodate renewable natural gas and hydrogen blending as these resources mature. The Company states that nothing in the precedent agreement prevents substitution of conventional gas with low-carbon fuels.

The Company states that non-pipeline alternatives and electrification cannot yet provide the same reliability or scale as firm pipeline capacity during periods of peak demand. The Company states that the Commission has acknowledged this limitation in prior planning proceedings. The Company states that the NESE Project supports the CLCPA by enabling oil-to-gas conversions, eliminating trucked compressed natural gas deliveries, and reducing emissions from power generation by substituting natural gas for oil. The Company states that NESE provides flexibility to manage the transition while ensuring reliability.

The Company states that PA expressed concern that fixed pipeline costs could burden customers if demand falls. The Company responds that the opposite is true. The Company states that NESE reduces exposure to volatile short-term gas and oil purchases that most affect customers during winter peaks, particularly low-income customers.

The Company states that NESE avoids reliance on high-cost contingency services, including compressed natural gas trucking, city gate peaking contracts, and infrastructure upgrades such as new vaporizers at the Greenpoint LNG Facility. The Company states that with NESE in service, the Company would reduce the number of active CNG sites from five to two, eliminating hundreds of daily truck deliveries and removing the need for additional vaporizers.

The Company states that the LAI Study found that downstate customers, including disadvantaged communities, would realize nearly $2.8 billion in wholesale electric savings because NESE enables gas-fired generation to displace oil. The Company states that these savings are broadly shared and provide targeted benefits to vulnerable communities.

The Company states that NESE lowers wholesale gas and electric prices, avoids contingency costs, and eliminates the need for capital investments, resulting in broad affordability benefits. The Company states that lower energy costs will stimulate economic growth, support jobs, and increase tax revenues.

The Company states that PA reaffirmed that non-pipeline alternatives and electrification are important but cannot replace the reliability and scale of firm pipeline supply. The Company agrees, noting that adoption rates, uncertain performance in extreme cold, and long timelines limit the effectiveness of alternatives. The Company states that NESE is the only near-term option that addresses design-day reliability requirements, controls exposure to wholesale electric price spikes, and reduces near-term emissions.

The Company states that PA observed that National Grid had not independently modeled scenarios with Marine Park and

Lake Success upgrades. The Company responds that its hydraulic studies confirm that with these upgrades in service, the system can accept the full 400 MDth/d of NESE capacity without adverse effects.

The Company states that cost estimates for on-system upgrades associated with NESE will be filed in its next Downstate New York rate case. The Company states that this will ensure transparency and allow for full Commission review.

The Company states that it has a statutory obligation to provide safe, adequate, and reliable natural gas service at just and reasonable rates. The Company states that the NESE Project is the most prudent and cost-effective option available to address pipeline constraints, reliability risks, affordability concerns, and emissions reductions. The Company states that the PA Report confirmed that the Addendum's conclusions are reasonable and that the NESE Project materially improves reliability, supports affordability, and reduces emissions.

The Company requests that the Commission issue an order confirming that incorporation of the Addendum into the Gas System Long-Term Plan complies with Commission directives, recognizing that the NESE Project materially improves reliability, affordability, and emissions outcomes compared with current supply options, and endorsing the NESE Project as a core component of the Company's Long-Term Gas System Plan.

Comments from Public Hearings

April 10, 2025, 1PM

The first speaker is Amanda Rouse of Brooklyn New York. Rouse opposes dangerous chemicals being moved through New York neighborhoods, especially within marginalized communities.

In this time of climate crisis, Rouse states we have not contended with what it means for us as humans as we continue to poison the earth.

Rouse states that Governor Hochul could be making initiatives to help residents contend with what needs to be done to reduce reliance on fossil fuels. Rouse points out that pipelines fail and that incidents are a daily occurrence in the US, and the country has almost three times more pipeline mileage than the next leading country. Rouse notes there hasn't been any accountability from corporations for maintaining this status quo.

Rouse encourages people to think differently and consider ways to use less energy or different kinds of energy, and believes Governor Hochul has an opportunity to show leadership in these times to reduce fossil fuel dependence. We should look at the choices we're making towards living beings and earth systems, as they are being destroyed by the fossil fuel industry.

Rouse also suggests consideration of the construction going on with the LNG terminal in Greenpoint that has already been opposed, as it is not legal to continue the construction. Rouse asks Staff to please listen to the residents in opposition to the pipelines and consider the direction the future of the planet is heading in.

The next speaker is Jane Fasullo with Sierra Club – Long Island Group. Fasullo comments that she has gas at her house and while it is a reliable fuel, it is dangerous, especially if there are leaks. The leak that had harmed her tenant went undetected by the gas company after three house visits, so it seems to her that their servicemen are not

properly trained. Fasullo also had a gas leak outside her home for eight years as the Company would not do anything about it.

More money going into new pipelines binds us into decades of having to depend upon that fuel source because of the amount of money going into it. Fasullo also wonders if there is a plan to address possible unused pipelines in the future if we do transition to other forms of energy that do not use those pipes.

April 10, 2025 6PM

The first speaker is Margot Spindelman. Spindelman states that the Company has not found a pathway for everyone in downstate territory that gets ratepayers to the climate goals laid out in climate law. Instead, the proposed is a chaotic scenario that will not achieve climate goals, will skyrocket bills, and likely crash the electric grid.

Spindelman claims the Plan continues to embrace an inaccurate design day, overestimate customer growth, ignore the impact of customer legislation and customer electrification on future gas demand, and misrepresent the role that Greenpoint LNG plays in the gas network. The PSC continues allowing large infrastructure investment that falls on ratepayers. The focus on replacing gas with RNG and hydrogen and replacing LPP will need to be paid for long after gas is turned off, and promotes throwing money into the dangerous and unnecessary Greenpoint Energy Center. None of the stored LNG was used even during the cold snap at the end of last year, calling into question its purpose.

Spindelman states the PSC must reject this LTP and launch a new proceeding that will include the formation of a community advisory group focusing on planning for the rapid decommissioning of the Greenpoint Energy Center. We need to

triple down on solutions like thermal energy and geothermal installations instead, similar to how Massachusetts and California are focused.

The next speaker is Kanwaldeep Sekhon. Sekhon questions why we are still making and constructing new gas lines when we have solar and wind that is more affordable and better for the environment, and that National Grid should take this into consideration. We should be taking advantage of the nearby water for power, and not into more gas infrastructure.

April 16, 2025, 1PM

The first speaker at this meeting was Nivo Rovedo. Rovedo resides in LaGrange, NY, and strongly opposed National Grid's LTP. Rovedo presented the LTP as an effort to expand fracked methane infrastructure that deviates from the intention of New York's climate goals and CLCPA. Rovedo asserted that the LTP would burden communities with pollution, health risks, and costs in the near and long term. Rovedo recommended that the LTP help to wean society from methane combustion for heating, cooking, and power generation and build out clean, renewable, and pollution-free energy sources. Rovedo recommended investment in thermal energy networks, energy efficiency, and electrification. Rovedo stated that investment in fossil fuel infrastructure would exacerbate affordability issues with utility bills. Rovedo claimed there were repeated findings of inflated demand forecasts in the LTP. Rovedo opposed continued operation of the Greenpoint LNG facility, citing both its location in a disadvantaged community and confirmation from a PSC consultant of possible retirement of the facility in 2035 through clean energy build out. Rovedo opposed the Iroquois ExC proposal, claiming that downstate New York did not need more

gas. Rovedo supported the New York HEAT Act as crucial legislation to cap energy bills.

The next speaker was Mary Finneran. Finneran protested the scheduling of this hearing during the most sacred weekend in the Christian tradition and a very holy time in Jewish tradition. Finneran challenged the need for the Iroquois ExC project as well as the possibility of moratorium without it. Finneran associated safety risks with increasing Iroquois throughput by referencing a supply service line explosion from 2018 in Merrimac, Massachussetts.

Finneran observed a cheaper alternative to this project: supply National Grid customers in Brooklyn and Long Island with space heaters. Finneran noted that the project would require turbine horsepower increases of 12,000 at the Athens conduction station; 12,000 at Dover; and 24,000 at Brookfield.

Finneran then asserted that these Brookfield increases have not yet been approved. Finneran affirmed that the Department of Environmental and Energy Projection in Connecticut denied the Brookfield project's request for Title 5 expansion. Finneran expressed concern that this and other potential delays to the Iroquois ExC project may culminate in the project's abandonment as with the northern access pipeline system. Finneran noted that National Grid currently has a twenty-year contract with Iroquois. Finneran challenged Rob Pearl's projection of twenty peak days during the winter.

Finneran expressed her appreciation for the PSC's work to make comments public and noted that the DEC does not. Finneran then advocated for in-person hearings, noting the coldness of looking at a computer screen.

Finneran supported Rovedo's advocacy for the New York HEAT Act. Finneran also supported the GAP Act.

The next speaker was Gabriel Recchio. Recchio identified as a campaign organizer with SC. Recchio supported Rovedo's and Finneran's comments and urged the PSC to reject National Grid's LTP. Recchio cited methane combustion for energy use in the building sector as the largest source of climate pollution in New York. Recchio recommends that the LTP grant greater prevalence to thermal energy networks, air and ground source heat pumps, and weatherization to increase energy efficiency in buildings. Recchio challenges RNG and hydrogen-blending as components of a clean energy vision in terms of availability, cost, and climate benefits. Recchio commends the work of the PSC but recommends more action to align the LTP with climate law and the climate crisis. Recchio affirms the dangers of gas with regards to indoor air quality. Recchio references a citizen science report which found that 77 percent of urban residence with gas stoves in Washington D.C. had nitrogen dioxide levels over the EPA's threshold for outdoor air quality. Recchio rejects proposals to maintain the status quo for the gas system as social Darwinism.

April 16, 2025, 6PM

The first speaker is climate justice volunteer Catherine Du. Catherine alleges the PSC pushed back and did not want to conduct a requested in-person hearing.

Du claims the Greenpoint LNG facility is an example of expensive infrastructure that pumps toxins into the lungs of the community and actively killing us. Investment into this facility must be denied as it is wasteful, dangerous, underused and we are already transitioning away from gas. She expresses concern regarding the climate crisis, how methane exacerbates

climate change, and how the future is on the line even for as soon as 2030. Rejecting National Grid LNG is the first step forward as it just brings profits to the richest off the betrayal of our rights.

The next speaker is AJ Ruther of Alliance for a Green Economy, and they urge the rejection of the National Grid's GSLTP. He states the purpose of these proceedings is to align gas utility planning with the CLCPA, though the proposed Plan does the opposite and does not adequately prove a reduction in GHG emissions and would worsen the energy affordability crisis.

AJ states the PSC must not approve a plan that fails to address the impending climate chaos of unprecedented levels and will kill millions of people worldwide. RNG is viewed as a false solution, as National Grid as admitted that they failed to buy and retire renewable identification numbers, or RINs. They cannot claim emission benefits if they don't intend to own the RINs.

AJ believes the Company must also include the true public health costs of burning RNG in their benefit cost analysis. It harms the public and costs the public roughly $2,500 in healthcare costs per person per year, and this harm is not considered in the analysis.

The PSC should investigate whether Greenpoint Energy Center is needed, according to AJ, as it is expensive, located in a flood plain, and PA Consulting determined it could be retired by 2034 to 2035 due to its disuse. Its unlikely to be the most cost-effective way to meet heating demand on extremely cold days. It is urged for National Grid's legacy of environmental racism to end, and for the Iroquois pipeline extension to be stopped.

AJ states that Governor Hochul and the New York State Assembly must pass the New York Heat Act now to cap utility bills and subsidies for gas expansion and fund the clean heating and cooling solutions we need for climate justice. The bill will enable National Grid to finally invest in real, proven climate solutions like heat pumps, thermal energy networks, and energy efficiency measures while protecting energy affordability, and prioritizing disadvantaged communities.

The next speaker is Monique Fitzgerald of the Long Island Progressive Coalition. She believes the GSLTP should be rejected and should stand for the people versus the corporate utility owners and shareholders. Utility bills are getting too high, and people are running out of options to pay their bills. Corporations should not be subsidized while ratepayers are struggling to pay for their services.

Due to the passage of the CLCPA, we should be getting off gas. Natural gas should also be called methane gas, as the name natural gas is a false narrative. National Grid should start decommissioning pipelines and focus on electrifying our homes, which also helps the people who are struggling the most with asthma and other health challenges due to such inaction.

The next speaker is City Council member Lincoln Restler. He states that the climate crisis is here, and now is the time to reduce our emissions, save our communities and save our planet. National Grid instead proposes to expand reliance on fossil fuels instead, which goes against recently passed city and state legislation. Energy providers must meet the moment to meet the ambitious mandates and the Greenpoint LNG facility does not seem necessary. Lincoln states that any long-term plan that does not propose working towards retiring this facility is not a long term plan that meets the needs of our community. The plan

is responsible in that it does not put all our energy and resources into renewable energy. The PSC is urged to reject this plan and work with the Company on a proposal that meets climate commitments.

The next speaker is Jeanne Bergman with Sane Energy Project, who asks the PSC to reject the Company's GSLTP. She hopes in the future DPS will again offer in-person hearings.

Jeanne notes that the Plan itself is the result of a determined failure to plan and any emergency is that of their own making, and is a result of the PSC enabling Grid's transition procrastination. Jeanne notes the imposed moratorium in 2019, then the end of the moratorium, resulting in the preservation and growth of the Greenpoint Energy Center, which has seldomly, if ever, been needed. This information is used as evidence that the investments into Greenpoint have nothing to do with demand reliability or safety, it is purely for profits.

Grid is aware that the gas business is dying, but wants to continue business as usual according to this Plan, Jeanne states. DPS treats it as if it just needs to be tinkered with and takes it seriously. Jeanne states it is fact that the demand for heat and hot water can be met by many gas free technologies and their adoption should have been initiated in 2019. Sane urges the PSC to reject the plan and demand a plan that shows how the Company will decommission its gas system as rapidly as possible. If it continues to delay, the PSC and governor should pull National Grid's license and transfer the gas utility to a competent utility.

The next speaker is Helene Filion Onserud, expressing concern for the young people in low-income neighborhoods. Helene explains the National Grid is an expert in greenwashing, using the threat of safety and reliability failures to claim a

growing need of natural gas, causing ratepayers to pay for profitable, soon-to-be obsolete infrastructure.

National Grid not only creates economic and public health hardships, but also an environmental disaster with a significant increase in emissions, exacerbating the climate crisis that has already started.

Helene urges the PSC to reject the GSLTP as it violates NY's climate laws and endangers public health all to protect corporate profits, while New Yorkers are struggling to afford basic utilities. Investments should be in local, sustainable solutions such as thermal energy networks, solar, wind technologies, electrification, better storage, and greater efficiency. They are cleaner, safer and more affordable options, and create good local jobs. Additionally, Helene demands that Governor Hochul pass the heat act and that the PSC reject the GSLTP.

Next speaker is Judith Canepa from Sane Energy Project. Judith states that National Grid's GSLTP was crafted for one reason, to prolong dependance on fracked gas and make money for investors. They plan to do this by increasing the lifespan of the Greenpoint Energy Center that despite the company's claims on how crucial these tanks are have not been used even once this past winter, despite the frigid weather.

Judith comments that New York regulators but continue resisting climate denialism and must stay focused on moving in the right direction, which includes the rejection of the GSLTP and decide that Greenpoint is no longer needed. Other steps in the right direction include enforcement of the CLCPA, initiating a new proceeding on National Grid's LTP, reduce gas flow, respecting the voices of those in DACs. Or rejecting the

Iroquois expansion. Passing the Heat Act would also be a positive step.

The next speaker is Kim Fraczek of Sane Energy Project, who is also participating as a local resident close to the Greenpoint facility. Kim states that DPS has failed to provide basic transparency in this proceeding and it's let National Grid run unchecked.

Kim remarks that the LNG plant is counter to the intent of the Gas Planning Proceeding and the CLCPA and it instead represents business as usual wrapped in bureaucratic spin. Kim states Sane has to fundraise to hire an independent gas consultant, and is not allowed to ask PA consulting questions or see their data. Taxpayers should be able to see what the independent consult ratepayer dollars paid for, meanwhile DPS sent a letter to the DEC supporting the Company's need for more gas for the Iroquois pipeline without completing the necessary analysis. Sane was also told that their expert comments were never read that were filed in this case as intervenors.

Kim goes on to state that there were do answers received about the 2022 explosion at the Greenpoint LNG facility at Maspeth Ave. Simply fining the Company is not leadership and is disrespectful to the communities that are putting in the work.

Kim states the Greenpoint LNG facility should be retired, and a transparent, equitable, and just retirement plan should be developed. We need utility watchdogs, not corporate lapdogs.

The next speaker is Stef McGraw, testifying on behalf of Assemblymember Claire Valdez. Stef states her constituents face persistent problems of rate increases for investor-owned

utilities. The utilities are financially motivated to continually increase the reach and lifeline of the gas system not because it is needed, but because it makes investors and executives rich. There are better ways to meet heating needs, such as energy efficiency programs, electrification, and thermal energy networks. Implementing these would not only eliminate the need for Greenpoint LNG, but improve health and safety, are more affordable, and better for the climate. On behalf of her constituents, Stef urges the PSC to reject National Grid's proposal, and to order DPS to initiate a new, transparent, community engaged planning process focused on reducing gas infrastructure and transitioning to clean, healthy, affordable, renewable solutions.

Joe Leone is the next speaker who focuses his comments on the historic impacts on communities from pollution and against the Greenpoint LNG facility. Mr. Leone points out a long history of the negative environmental impact related to pollution in Greenpoint. Mr. Leone calls for the PSC to lead a decommissioning of the Greenpoint facility.

Bianca Cunnigham urges the PSC to deny National Grid’s long-term plan on the grounds that New Yorkers cannot afford the continued use of fossil fuel infrastructure that burdens ratepayers with ever-growing costs. Ms. Cunnigham points to this gas infrastructure’s location in disadvantaged communities as an example of environmental racism. Ms. Cunnigham calls for green jobs and housing that is safe, affordable and climate resilient.

Hennessy Garcia is a member and organizer for the No North Brooklyn Pipeline and Sane Energy Project. Ms. Garcia shows concern with the future of the climate due to the continued use of fossil fuels. Ms. Garcia believes that National Grid’s

expansion of its gas infrastructure is not in compliance with our climate law and thus the Company's LTP must be denied.

Elliot Figman is a part of both the Sane Energy Project and the Jewish Climate Action Network. Mr. Figman's comments comprised of a quote from a previous Sane Energy comment filed in September. He begins by discussing the history of National Grid's relationship with the State of New York, specifically National Grid's threat regarding instituting a moratorium in 2019 and the blowback the Company received from then Governor Cuomo who threaten to revoke the Company's certificate to operate in the State. Mr. Figman then begins to discuss his concerns with the Company's demand modeling being portrayed in a way that supports continued investment into Greenpoint, Iroquois, and NESE. Mr. Figman believes that the PSC must reject the LTP to focus more on renewable energy solutions and energy efficiency measures rather than the continued investment into natural gas. Mr. Figman's last point is to call for the expedited decommissioning the Greenpoint facility. He points to PA Consulting's timeline of decommissioning the facility by 2034 or 2035 as proof that the National Grid system can function without Greenpoint despite believing that it should be decommissioned even faster.

Sarah Gronim speaks on behalf of C350 Brooklyn in calling for the PSC to reject National Grid's LTP. Ms. Gronim cites the CLCPA and Climate Action Council's scoping plan to show that National Grid is not in compliance with NYS Climate law. Ms. Gronim notes the age of gas lines of New York City and the large replacement costs for gas line becoming a growing burden on ratepayers. She believes National Grid's rehabilitation and expansion of the natural gas system is unnecessary and delays the adoption of cleaner options.

Laura Hofmann is a lifelong Greenpoint resident who was among the six original co-plaintiffs in the Riverkeeper lawsuit against the Company on Newtown Creek which included National Grid. Ms. Hofmanns comments are focused on her calling for the rejection of National Grid's long-term plan as well as calling for the continued preservation of Newtown Creek.

Piper Werle is a member of No North Brooklyn Pipeline Alliance and calls for the rejection of the National Grid LTP. Ms. Werle believes that National Grid's business model is based on taking on all possible gas infrastructure projects to receive the return for placing it into service. Ms. Werle calls for state regulators to allow those impacted by National Grid's LTP and rate hikes input into where their utility bill goes. She notes concerns from Mark Henning in a 2023 analysis with National Grid's continued investment into the Greenpoint LNG facility despite its limited use. Ms. Werle cites a 2016 PSC report which read that utilities shouldn't cost more than six percent of annual household income when discussing the affordability issue this LTP could raise.

Laren Roper is a member of the No North Brooklyn Pipeline Alliance and a licensed environmental engineer. Ms. Roper raises her concern with the Greenpoint facility's continued operation and any detrimental harm to health and the environment. Ms. Roper cites the history of the LNG facility dating back to 1870 including as a glue factory and manufactured gas plant among a variety of other purposes as reason enough to remediate the cite. DEC classifies the site as a class two inactive hazardous waste disposal site and Ms. Roper notes all the potential pollutants associated with this classification and the harms they can cause. Citing a 2016 report Ms. Roper describes the soil down to twenty-five feet as saturated with

black liquid presumed to be from an oil spill in the 1970s. In 2022 National Grid introduced a project to prevent toxic vapor being inside their buildings, Ms. Roper cites this as further reason the site should be shut down and remediated.

Marina Tsaplina is an artist and disability culture activist as well as a resident of Greenpoint. Ms. Tsaplina begins her comments by discussing the environmental conditions around the Greenpoint facility specifically the 2016 Environmental Research publication describing the industrial pollutants found in the soil. After this discussion of the health impacts of these pollutants Ms. Tsaplina calls for the rejection of the LTP and for the New York Heat Acts passing.

Katherine Thompson is a longtime resident of Greenpoint as well as a member of Sane Energy and No North Brooklyn Pipeline Alliance. Ms. Thompson's comments focus on her opposition to the continued operation and investment in the Greenpoint facility. Specifically, Ms. Thompson is concerned with the environmental conditions of the site and the continued investment of ratepayer dollars towards an asset that could feasibly be decommissioned by 2035. Ms. Thompson calls for the PSC to reject National Grid's LTP and for a transition away from natural gas and towards the adoption of thermal energy networks.

Justine Ferretti's comments focus on her rising utility costs and the continuation of natural gas investment driving bills ever upward in her view. Ms. Ferretti calls for building electrification and the passing of the New York Heat Act.

Katerine Denby delivers comments on behalf of Senator Kristin Gonzalez who is the State Senator that represents North Brooklyn as well as parts of Queens and Manhattan. Senator Gonzalez's comments focus on her opposition to National Grid's

LTP on behalf of her constituents who are increasingly becoming vulnerable to flooding risks associated with climate change. These same constituents are already burdened by their utility bill and cannot afford further rate hikes in the Senator's view. The Senator believes that National Grid is not committed to NYS' CLCPA goals and in fact that this LTP is a step in the wrong direction. Senator Gonzalez points to National Grid's continued investment in Greenpoint and the Company's proposal to build two new vaporizers as reason to believe that National Grid is not focused on electrification. The Senator raises opposition to the Company's proposal to utilize RNG and transition from traditional gas by 2050 which she doesn't believe fits the CLCPA timeline or requirements for electrification.

Vincent Vespole is a sixty-year resident of Greenpoint who speaks in opposition to the Greenpoint facility as he believes it is a health risk for the facility to be located in the Greenpoint community and calls for renewable energy as an alternative.

Kevin Lacherra is a fourth-generation resident of Greenpoint and calls for the PSC to reject the National Grid LTP. Mr. Lacherra believes that fossil fuel infrastructure and especially the Greenpoint facility has led to long-term environmental damage in his community. Mr. Lacherra calls for the rejection of the LTP and investment into local sustainable solutions as well as returning the land the Greenpoint LNG facility stands on to the community.

Steve Chesler is a twenty-three-year resident of Greenpoint and serves as the Environmental Protection Committee Chair for the Brooklyn Tea Board number one. Mr. Chesler calls for the rejection of National Grid's LTP on the grounds that it is insufficient for combatting a warming planet. Mr. Chesler

calls for a transition to renewable sources and for the Greenpoint facility to be converted to be used safely by the community, proposing using the site for alternative energy production or as a public open space.

Willis Elkins is the Executive Director of the Newtown Creek Alliance and focuses his comments on specific issues as the Newtown Creek Alliance submitted comments to the PSC prior to this meeting. Mr. Elkins begins by focusing on the environmental conditions at the LNG facility, particularly the two federal superfund sites connected to the facility in Newtown Creek and the Meeker Avenue flume. Mr. Elkins believes that while this site is still being operated as an LNG facility there is no way to properly remediate the site. He continues by noting the potential cost of remediation being a financial incentive for National Grid to continue operations at the site to avoid a cleanup. In Mr. Elkins view there is no way to understand the scope of the environmental damage caused to Newtown Creek while the facility is in operation. Mr. Elkins final point regarding the Greenpoint facility is calling for the rejection of continued capital investment into the future. Mr. Elkins calls for reform in the LTP process to allow community members with full time jobs to properly participate.

Jane Pool stated they are not an expert and have come before the PSC in the past to fight the trans gas power plant. Pool stated they think it’s the PSC responsibility to look at issues through various lenses, including environmental impacts. The commenter further stated that other countries believe there is a climate crisis, and that the world is not appreciating the way we are handing things environmentally. They continued to discuss fracking in Ohio and water quality changes. Pool further stated that they saved a newspaper from Ohio which described

earthquake activity and local drinking water alerts for surrounding townships. Pool stated that in the town where their family lives in Ohio they do not recycle or drink the local water but buy bottled water.

Gabriel Recchio stated that they are the electrification campaign organizer with Sierre Club in NY and noted that it is not only the climate crisis that Sierra Club is opposed to but also Grid's LTP. Recchio stated that the level of policy inaction is almost a gaslighting level from the State after passing the boldest piece of climate legislation in 2019. They note that we are not on track to meet climate goals. When Grid originally started putting forth a clean energy vision and then when challenged to provide details the outcome was not as anticipated. The commenter stated that the climate crisis is simple and requires decarbonizing the building sector. They urge the PSC to reject the Grid LTP and say that we can do better.

Mary Finneran: The stakeholder stated that the Green Point LNG facility needs to close and that it was not used this winter. They also state that the Grid LTP should be rejected. They further state that the ExC is not needed and that expansion by compression is not needed. They note that the pipeline is dangerous and state that after the original building of the pipeline it received the second biggest fine in EPA history in the 90's. They cite an explosion in Massachusetts which resulted in private property damage. They further state that there are compressor stations within 2,000ft of a school, and elaborate by stating the increase in horsepower will lead to explosions. They also state that the natural gas anticipated to come through ExC will be from the TransCanada pipeline and this creates worry about potential tariffs.

Dan Wiley from Congresswoman Valasquez's office stated that they are the Director for Congresswoman Valasquez and stated that in 2020 she stood in North Brooklyn amongst others to provide statements on pipeline infrastructure. They read the statement from 2020, which entailed mention of decreasing reliance on fossil fuels. They further state that they strongly urge Grid to be proactive and implement clean energy alternatives. They cite community offshore wind as an example for Grid to pursue. They also state that there should not be expansion of the Green Point LNG facility. They state that funding gas infrastructure means more rate hikes. They state that Grid needs to prioritize clean up of Green Point. They urge all governmental level to support transformational investment into green energy. They also urge the PSC to initiate a new transparent planning process focusing on reducing gas reliance.

Margot Gregory identified themselves as a resident of Brooklyn and a member of the No North Brooklyn Pipeline Alliance. They state that the PSC must say no to expand fossil fuel consumption in NYS. They state that the PSC must stop the UK owned company, National Grid. They then continue to discuss cancer and water contamination associated with climate change. They state their demand to stop fracking gas in NYS.

Clifton Smith: They identify themselves as one of the facilitators of the North Pole Pipeline. They state that there is need to pass the New York Heat Act. They note fires in LA and also bus fires happening followed by the claim that pollutants pay.

Miguel Fesqueda identified themselves as a resident of North Brooklyn. They recanted a story of being notified by Greenpoint residents of the smell of natural gas. They continue

to state that people have reached out for their opinion to switch to electric appliances. They note that discussing funding for a fossil fuel company is useless and further state that investment could be put into clean energy.

Gloria Baksh stated they want the Grid LTP to be rejected. They state that gas is as bad as coal and petroleum because they increase greenhouse gases. They state that they were helped by the PSC in the past to upgrade electricity when requested in writing. They state that they are here tonight to request for investment in the community. They state that the soil is being contaminated and that there are holes being drilled to let out gas from the ground nearby their residence.

George Colval: They identify themselves as the Executive Director of Polar Energy and stated that there is no need for ExC. They stated that if Grid were to be held accountable for the undone efficiency programs, then there would be no discussion needed. They continue by stating that the PSC has not held Grid accountable. They state that the Grid LTP should be rejected.

"No One" did not like the LTP and did not want it to be passed.

Ralph Rahman identified themselves as a college student from CSI. They state they don't care about this nonsense. They state that they work with a network of student government and that they should be making calls but sometimes they forget. They also state that they must work for themselves and that they can withstand the fact that this is not being fixed for now.

Ms. Sanders stated they wanted to add that they support this fight because ultimately it is for us and that we are killing our own kind by not being mindful.

Mr. Kreisel identified themselves as a Brooklyn resident and state that Sane Energy has done a good job of discussing environmental data. They recited a story about a lighthouse.

Caroline Abel: They state that they want to fight fossil fuel companies that are poisoning water and air and making generations of citizens sick.

April 17, 2025, 1PM

Ken Schles expressed strong opposition to National Grid's long-term gas assessment. He stated that National Grid's long-term assessment is not credible and that extending the life of gas infrastructure is not a viable response to long-term energy needs or climate goals, adding only to the utility affordability crisis in the short term. Schles mentioned his gas bill was just shy of $500 despite energy-efficient upgrades to his home. Ken voices specific concerns with the implementation of Hydrogen into the system alongside a call for the Greenpoint LNG facility to be retired by 2035. He urged the Commission to reject National Grid's long-term gas proposal and focus on sustainable solutions like thermal energy networks, energy efficiency, and electrification for cleaner, healthier, more affordable energy solutions.

Mary Finneran reiterated concerns about the lack of need for the Iroquois ExC project, pointing to Greenpoint's gas usage during a strong winter as evidence that the gas was not needed despite the harsh conditions. She questioned whether the PSC would reconsider the project before permits from Connecticut are in place and before construction commences, urging them to stop the project if no need is demonstrated. She concluded her comments by singing a song asking, "Which side are you on, folks?" and pleading with the PSC to listen.

Roger Caiazza expressed concerns about the Climate Act's mandates and raised several technical issues with the plan. Specifically, he noted that the plan does not acknowledge the safety valves in Public Service Law section 66-P.4, which allows the Commission to temporarily suspend or modify Climate Act obligations if they impede safe and adequate service or cause significant increases in arrears or service disconnections. He also provided technical comments on what he considered an incorrect method used for calculating the societal cost of avoided greenhouse gas emissions, stating that the plan inappropriately calculates societal benefits based on avoided emissions over a time frame rather than using the proper social cost of carbon calculation.

Bill Nowak encouraged the Commission to push for both KEDLI and KEDNY to devote more resources to electrification rather than maintaining the gas system and using renewable natural gas and hydrogen to reduce climate impacts. He cited gas projection studies from March 17, 2023, showing that under a high electrification scenario, KEDLI would save $6.3 billion compared to a medium electrification scenario. Nowak argued against hydrogen as a solution, referencing a report called "Debunking the Hydrogen Hype: Why Europe Should Pursue Electrification Instead of Hydrogen for Cooking and Heating" by Michael Scholand from April 2024. He noted that hydrogen energy is less dense than methane, requiring more supply for the same heat output, and that hydrogen can catch fire 13 times more easily than methane, making any home leaks more dangerous.

Diana Abadie, who lives in Athens, New York, highlighted concerns about carcinogens including various VOCs such as formaldehyde and benzene, and noted that particulate matter 2.5 is a grade one carcinogen. Living within two miles

of the Iroquois compressor station, she expressed concerns about the New York State DEC's approval of air facility permits for the Iroquois pipeline and the need for comprehensive health assessments. She emphasized the importance of affordable energy and urged that the Governor and lawmakers pass the HEAT Act to cap utility bills and end subsidies for expansion, noting that New York is at a critical crossroads regarding its primary energy source for the next 20 to 50 years.

Micheal Davis stated that he was not going to thank the commission for the opportunity to give testimony via the remote Webex platform, as these hearings should be in person with the commissioners present. He believes the public's right to be heard regarding National Grid's long term fracked gas plan supersedes the Department of Public Service's (DPS) desire to ignore the public and deal in secret with lawyers. Davis claims he has witnessed massive corruption in New York State in his 69 years and considers the DPS' consideration of National Grid's plan as perpetrating unthinkable economic injustice and human suffering well into the future. He accused the DPS of treating the public like children, while asserting concerns over the acceleration of global warming. He stated that the long-term plan will keep the public dependent on National Grid's fracked methane well into the 2080s, noting that while National Grid has included some renewable elements, hydrogen and biogas are not real solutions. He urged that the long-term gas plan must be killed because it ignores the CLCPA (Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act). He also advocated for the passage of the New York HEAT Act and the rapid development of wind, solar, geothermal, and thermal energy networks.

April 17, 2025, 6PM

Commissioner Maggiore called into the hearing. ALJ Belsito named the seven registered speakers: Arrie Hammel, Gabriel Recchio, Miguel Peschiera, Catherine Du, Mary Finneran, Maggie Lee, and Marina Tspalina. ALJ Belsito then learned that none of them had joined the call. ALJ Belsito directed to keep the line open for another twenty minutes. Lee and Finneran eventually joined.

Lee located her residence in proximity to a National Grid plant in Brooklyn. Lee opposed National Grid expanding gas infrastructure according to community health and safety risks and state climate goals. Lee affirms that they suffer from health effects from growing up in the area. Lee notes that they receive gas bills over $250 in the winter-time despite lowering the heat at night and drawing heavy curtains over their windows.

Finneran stated that she called on behalf of Tsaplina to notify the hearing that Tsaplina couldn't call in. Finneran stated that she did not plan on making a statement. ALJ Belsito provided Finneran with a phone number to share with Tsaplina for assistance with technical difficulties.

ALJ Belsito offered George Coffin the opportunity to speak upon their entrance to the call but they declined.

Tsaplina eventually joined and identified as an artist, disability culture activist, and Greenpoint resident. Tsaplina recited a self-written prayer poem called Into that Ruptured Place. This poem calls upon each person to enter a liminal space between flesh and earth that traces the alienation of the human individual from the earth; this poem envisions the alienation of each who enters this space turning upon itself to recover strength from the trauma of the amnesic imperialism

which wrought this alienation and to redirect each toward a bygone harmony with the earth.

A community-led stakeholder group must be created to plan to retire Greenpoint LNG, Rachel comments. The Company's gas network perpetuates a racist legacy of polluting black and brown communities and contributes to the climate crisis, in conflict goals to reduce GHGs.