NATIONAL GRID USA

Moderator: WILLIAM KHOUNSOMBATH
July 14, 2021
4:15 6m CT

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. Today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. All participants are in a listen-only mode until the question and comments section of today's conference. At that time, you may press star 1 on your phone to ask a question or make a comment.

I would now like to turn the call over to your host, Bill Khounsombath. You may begin.

Bill Khounsombath: Thank you, (Joanne). Welcome, everyone. My name is Bill Khounsombath. I'm National Grid's Corporate Communications Department. And thank you for joining the public information session for National Grid's, long-term capacity second supplemental report for downstate New York.

Tonight, you will hear from Rudy Wynter, President of National Grid's New York Business, and Steve Caldwell will take you through the context and background of the report. We will have both a question and answer session and the ability for attendees to submit public comments.

All participants right now will be in a listen-only mode unless speaking during the Q&A or comment portion of the meeting. We anticipate significant interest in participants seeking to comment. In an effort to accommodate as many individuals as possible, participants wishing to ask a question will be limited to one question only. During the public comment section, speakers will be held to a strict limit of two minutes and will be given a firm reminder at the 1:45 mark, to wrap up.

Additional opportunities for feedback are included on a micro site for the long term plan, located on the internet at NGridSolutions.com. We look forward to hearing from you. And now please welcome our New York President, Rudy Wynter. Rudy?

Rudy Wynter: Thank you, Bill. And good evening, everyone. Thank you very much for joining us this evening. As Bill said, my name is Rudy Wynter and I am the President of the New York Business for National Grid. And I'm also a proud member of this community. And it's important to me that National Grid is actively participating in the public process and delivering on our promises.

At National Grid we are committing to - committed to achieving a net-zero future while ensuring a safer, more reliable and cleaner energy future for us all. First and foremost, we're determined to ensure that none of our customers are left behind as we transition to that future.

To help define the short and long term energy needs of our customers we've issued a second long term capacity supplemental report that provides an update on our net zero planning, future energy demand forecasting, our efforts to deploy incremental demand reduction programs, and our progress on targeted infrastructure solutions that will safely and reliably meet our customers' energy needs.

We listened. Two years ago when we proposed a pipeline solution to meet gas demand for our customers, it was opposed. We rethought potential solutions and instituted the non-pipe alternatives of a distributed infrastructure solution. National Grid believes that its distributed infrastructure solution is consistent with the Climate Leadership and Communities Protection Act goals, the company's net-zero plan, and a clean energy future.

While it's our sincere privilege to provide energy to our approximately 2 million customers, we are determined to work together to develop the right energy solutions to ensure our customers' short term energy needs are met while we transition to the net zero energy future that we all want.

That said, energy transition is a process, a pathway that must be orderly and thoughtful, and include a number of solutions. National Grid had made significant corporate commitments to align with New York's ambitious climate energy goals, as well as our own.

In October of 2020 National Grid refined our plan to achieve New York's net-zero greenhouse gas emissions goal via our plan, which is available on our Web site. And we updated our Responsible Business Charter to include those ambitions. The gas we deliver today can be de-carbonized in the same way we de-carbonize electricity that we deliver for our customers. The potential is real.

The technology is evolving and we look forward to supportive policy and regulation on a pathway to net-zero. During the transition, existing infrastructure must be protected as we innovate, both to be able to service existing customers safely during the transition, but also to build the

infrastructure of the future to carry renewables as well as hydrogen. New York can be at the forefront of innovation and lead the country.

We can attract and retain business. We can spur economic development and workforce development. And we can achieve net-zero together. In our earlier reports in 2020, we explain our customers' energy needs; identified a range of options to meet them; and sought extensive public and stakeholder input. That effort resulted in a portfolio of demand-side as well as targeted infrastructure solutions that we're now implementing.

Despite all the progress, National Grid has made on its distributed infrastructure solution, permitting delays have created risks to infrastructure projects in service states. The demand-side management programs also can face implementation challenges. These challenges can create a real risk of National Grid being able to meet future existing customer demand, requiring an updated assessment of potential impact and consideration of alternatives if components of the distributed infrastructure solution fall short.

Given the ongoing challenges of meeting customer gas demand in downstate New York, the purpose of this second supplemental report is to do a few things. First, frame the downstate New York gas capacity needs and National Grid's distributed infrastructure solution in the context of New York sales EPA net-zero commitments, the company's net-zero plan, and the long term demand forecast.

It's also to provide an update of the company's long term demand forecast for downstate New York and the status of its existing capacity and operational constraints. We'll also provide an update on National Grid's progress in implementing the distributed infrastructure solution to solve potential demand-supply gaps.

And lastly, present an updated set of options in the event that the distributed infrastructure solution is significantly delayed or not fully implemented. Evaluate the cost and implementation feasibility of those options and explain the future risks to customers' connections and potential service disruptions to existing customers.

As with the original report, we invite you to provide your feedback on the recommendations. In addition to filing the second supplemental report with the New York Public Service Commission, we've published this report on our Web site and will deploy other options for sharing the report with stakeholders, including a reader-friendly summary and Web content.

As part of our commitment to work together, we want to hear from you on how best to meet the region's projected energy needs while leaving no customer behind. So thank you for joining us today to participate in this virtual information meeting, and learn more about the report's findings and share your thoughts.

We're seeking written feedback from all public stakeholders as well. With that, let me turn it over to (Stephen) Caldwell. Steve?

Steve Caldwell: Thanks very much, Rudy. Good evening, everyone. As mentioned, my name is Steve Caldwell. I'm our Vice President of Future of Heat here at National Grid. And I led the team that developed our second supplemental report at issue this evening. Thanks to everyone for taking the time to join this public meeting and giving us the opportunity to walk you through a summary of our latest gas capacity report; take your questions and your your public statements.

The foundation for National Grid's long term plans is our obligation to provide safe, reliable and affordable energy to almost 2 million homes and businesses in New York City and Long Island, while also advancing the clean energy transition. National Grid has been taking steps to advance key technologies and programs to drive this transition to cleaner energy, including supporting renewable natural gas, hydrogen, and heat electrification through our regulated utility business and making investments in wind and solar projects across the US, through our National Grid Ventures' competitive business.

Rudy mentioned in his opening remarks, that National Grid is committed as a company, on a global level, to achieving net zero greenhouse gas emissions for our own operations, as well as enabling the states where we serve customers to achieve their economy-wide net zero goals, including under the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act in New York.

Rudy also just mentioned National Grid's own net-zero plan, which is detailed in this report and available on our Web site. We also collaborated recently, on a landmark study with New York City and Con Ed, to explore different pathways for New York City to achieve its net-zero goal. The study was released in April of this year and informed the gas capacity report in question tonight.

We have an obligation to meet our customers' peak energy demand and to plan for the demand of both current and future customers. Customers' peak energy demand occurs on the coldest days when homes and businesses require the most energy or space heating and other uses.

And specifically, National Grid is a planning standard called the design day, which is the coldest day for which we plan. We also look at the design hour,

which is the hour of maximum demand during that hypothetical day. We need to ensure we can secure and deliver enough energy to meet our customers' needs under these severe cold weather conditions, and we plan accordingly.

This is well-established gas utility industry practice amongst ourselves and our peers, and our design day standard is squarely within the industry norms in terms of the likelihood of occurrence of severe winter weather and associated peak gas demand. Importantly, when we plan for design day, we do so with zero contingency.

That means that in the event of actual peak demand is higher than projected design day demand, say because of more severe weather with the uncertainty inherent in the demand forecast itself, or in the event that there is an unexpected disruption to gas supply, our own infrastructure, or there are demands that resources are not available when we need them, and our option of last resort is customer curtailment.

We don't ever want to be in this position. However, if we do find ourselves in a position where we have insufficient gas capacity to meet customer demand, this leads to lower pressure conditions in the gas distribution network. That can cause heating and other end-use equipment to stop working for customers and create safety risks.

But having enough supply to match the demand, the only way to ensure the safety of customers and communities under such conditions, is to curtail that is to shut off large customers, and even potentially curtail service to entire sections of the gas network, which might affect many households and businesses with the restoration of service potentially taking a week or longer.

We might - we're all familiar with on the - a similar situation on the electric side where there's insufficient supply to meet demand and that can lead to rolling electric blackouts. Often those lead to restoration of service within a matter of hours. This is in stark contrast to what happens with gas service interruptions where during the most severe winter weather, customers could be without heat and that option of last resort for several days.

In this report we are refreshing our gas demand forecast based on the latest available data, comparing that gas demand forecast to the present outlook for gas supply capacity, and then showing what our projected demand/supply gap is. We then explain the progress we've made on the distributed infrastructure solution and explore the remaining risks, such as permitting risks that Rudy mentioned; the full and timely implementation of this long term solution; and what fallback options we have.

Lastly, we offer conclusions in terms of our recommended next steps to address the gas demand/supply gap and the risks and implications of delays to or outright rejections, of the components of the distributed infrastructure solution. But to put this report that we're talking about tonight in some more context, the report we released on June 30th is the series - sorry. The report released on June 30th is the third in a series.

Last year, we released two long term gas capacity reports starting in February of 2020, that explained in detail our demand forecast, our available gas capacity, our projected demand/supply gap, and the options to address that gap. After the first report we solicited and received extensive public and stakeholder input from a series of public meetings, and thousands of written comments.

With that input, recommended a long term solution to address the projected demand/supply gap. That's what we call the distributed infrastructure solution we'll be talking a lot about tonight. And we've been implementing that solution since last year. This latest report comes as an update to our prior reports, and includes another round of associated public and stakeholder engagement, including this meeting this evening.

Let's jump into the substance of the report now by looking at the projected demand/supply gap. We look at demand out 15 years and compare our long term gas demand forecast to our available gas supply capacity, to determine if and when we see demand/supply gap emerging and how large it is in each year. And that's what we see on this chart here.

Every year we refresh our long term gas demand forecast. This year the underlying economics and gas demand drivers have generally shifted the gas demand forecast up about one percentage point across all years versus what our demand forecast was a year ago.
Our demand - our gas demand forecast is based on independent economic projections of things like population growth, local GDP growth and other factors. And it reflects the gas demand savings from the aggressive gas energy efficiency programs that National Grid administers for our customers, and the new heat electrification programs that Con Ed and PSEG Long Island, operates under New Efficiency New York.

Even after accounting for New York step change in gas energy efficiency and these new heat electrification programs, we still do project robust gas demand growth, albeit at a slower rate than what we've seen in recent history. In terms of our projected need, absent any further implementation of the distributed infrastructure solution beyond what we have in place now, we project that demand/supply gap emerges for the winter of 2022, '23 and grows from

there. And that's the gap you see between the the orange bars representing our gas supply capacity and the blue trend line representing our long term design to gas demand forecast.

Arrived at the - our 2020 reports in the public and stakeholder engagement process, the distributed infrastructure solution is our approach to meet this projected demand/supply gap. The distributed infrastructure solution is a targeted plan that relies on enhancements to existing infrastructure paired with aggressive demand-side management initiatives.

The first of a kind of holistic solution for National Grid, we are attacking the problem from both the supply and the demand sides, in order to safely and reliably deliver energy to our customers. Distributed infrastructure solution is a portfolio of discrete components that work together and we've got them outlined here in this slide. And I'll move through them from left to right just so everyone's on the same page as to what exactly we mean when we talk about the distributed infrastructure solution.

Again, starting at the far left in terms of the pillars of the distributed infrastructure solution on this slide here, we are securing the maximum amount of available interstate gas transmission capacity to meet our customers' needs. Making sure that we can get the most gas delivered over the existing gas transmission infrastructure. We're making many enhancements to infrastructure.

Moving to the right, we're further expanding our reliance on portable CNG operations or compressed natural gas, to what we think is the reasonable limit imposed by operational complexity, sighting constraints and the ability of the market to support portable CNG. The operation we're standing up now would

put us at the forefront of CNG operations in terms of the largest in North America.

Moving to the next solution, the Greenpoint LNG Vaporizers Project expands our ability to vaporize LNG or liquefied natural gas, at our existing Greenpoint LNG storage facility in Brooklyn. The next of the distributed infrastructure projects is what we call the EXE project. With this one we're subscribing for capacity, along with Con Ed, on the Iroquois gas transmission system, where they're expanding through additional compression, the amount of gas they can deliver to us and Con Ed when our customers need it most.

And lastly, on the far right, we're relying on new gas energy efficiency, gas demand response, and eventually heat electrification programs, to fill out the distributed infrastructure solution. Under the distributed infrastructure solution, our plan is to make targeted enhancements to existing gas infrastructures to increase our capacity to meet customer peak demand growth in the next few years.

This is what you see in this chart with those light blue bars in the middle. The dark gray bars are existing capacity today and what you'll see is through the targeted enhancements to existing infrastructure will increase the amount of gas capacity that we have.

In parallel we'll stand up new demand-side management programs now, and scale them up such that it will effectively offset all projected gas demand growth after the mid 2020s. That's what you see in the chart in terms of the purple bars. So on net we can accommodate gas demand growth in the next few years through the light gray bars. And then thereafter, as we've gotten the incremental demand side management programs, as they've had time to scale up and grow, they would offset all future projected gas demand growth.

Now, of course, with the CLCPA and other New York policies on net zero, we might expect gas demand growth to not only level off as it would after accounting for our planned incremental demand-side management programs under the distributed infrastructure solution, we might expect it to actually slow, stop and reverse over time.

As such, in our report, we model just such a demand scenario. For this, we leverage this - the recent collaboration I mentioned a moment ago with the City of New York and Consolidated Edison, that generated the study entitled The Pathways to Carbon Neutral New York City.

And under this net-zero scenario, design day gas demand peaks in the mid to late 2020s and declines thereafter. What this means is that we would still face a projected demand-supply gap in the next few years that would necessitate investments in these enhancements to existing gas infrastructure. But thereafter, what we did was we looked at how would you rightsize the company's gas supply portfolio if you did see in the longer term a downward trend in design to gas demand.

And what we found in the report is that we had the flexibility to match an assumed future design day gas demand decline by unwinding the flexible elements of our gas capacity portfolio, starting most likely, with unwinding our portable CNG facilities and then optimizing our gas transmission capacity contracts as they come up for renewal, so the customers weren't paying or wouldn't be paying for gas capacity that isn't needed, in the event that gas demand does in the long term, go down.

This stress testing exercise against this net-zero gas demand scenario, finds that the distributed infrastructure solution is a no regrets approach under an

aggressive net zero pathway. With this latest report we also looked at what the best fallback options would be if the current distributed infrastructure solution cannot be fully implemented on schedule.

In last year's reports we cast a wide net across both large and distributed infrastructure, as well as non-infrastructure options, and evaluated them all in detail. This year's report doesn't present any new options that make the cut as reasonable fallbacks and we're still looking at the menu of options that we considered in last year's reports.

The report does prioritize the next best fallback options after the current portfolio of solutions, we'll work on to implement under the distributed infrastructure solutions. These next best fallback options include those listed on the slide here starting from the top. I'll describe those. The first on the list is the Clove Lakes Transmission Loop Project, which would allow us to move more gas into Brooklyn, Queens and Long Island, where our customers need it.

This project consists of eight miles of new gas transmission main in Staten Island. It would remove a constraint on our system that limits our ability to receive gas from the existing interstate gas transmission system that delivers gas into Staten Island today.

The next option down is an LNG barge or perhaps multiple barges. This is a relatively novel option that is gaining more attention across a variety of potential applications around the country, given some changes in the availability of these purpose-built LNG barges.

These barges are self-contained LNG storage and vaporization operations that would locate offshore of New York City or Long Island, during the winters

and interconnect to our system to deliver gas into a point in the network where we could deliver to our customers. If you look at the next two rows on the chart we also look at incremental gas demand response and keep electrification over and above what is already baked into the distributed infrastructure solution, as well as our demand forecast.

Gas demand response includes a variety of programs that essentially pay customers to reduce their gas demand during peak periods, often by switching to a backup fuel, which in most cases is typically heating oil. Electrification programs would provide incentives to customers to fully electrify at least their space heating equipment with electric heat pumps, air source heat pumps, or ground source heat pumps.

Now this could focus on deflecting would be oil to gas conversions to go from oil heating to electric air source heat pumps instead. You could spur new construction to adopt electric heat pumps. Or you can even electrify existing gas customers to destroy gas demand. All of these fallback options come with substantial challenges and risks in terms of feasibility due to permitting, the time to scale them up, and other factors.

In the report, we looked at six contingency scenarios where we analyzed what the next best fallback solutions would be in the face of different setbacks, combinations of setbacks to the distributed infrastructure solution in terms of substantial delays or outright rejections. In particular, the Greenpoint LNG Vaporizers Project with EXE Project on the Iroquois gas transmission system.

We also looked at underperformance of our incremental demand-side management programs against the goals they have under the distributed infrastructure solution. The most immediate risk that the report found is around an extended delay or outright denial of permit approval for the

Greenpoint LNG Vaporization Project. That would create a demand/supply gap starting in the winter of 2023 to last 2024, even assuming that every other component of the distributed infrastructure solution is implemented fully and on schedule.

The timing and size of that demand/supply gap in the report doesn't tell the full story. Overlaying additional setbacks, such as an inability to expand the CNG capacity as we plan to, with delays in meeting incremental demand-side management gas demand reduction targets, would exacerbate this gap.

There could also be locational gas capacity constraints that aren't captured in this aggregate service territory-wide level analysis. In particular, to focus for a moment on the risk inherent in a delay or outward denial to the Greenpoint LNG Vaporization Project.

Under the distributed infrastructure solution, the incremental demand-side management components are intended to have time to scale up and further prove themselves, such as building out a reliable track record of demand reduction from a relatively nascent gas demand response programs, before they're essential to really rely on for reliability in a given winter.

In contrast, if we saw a delay or an outright denial of the LNG Vaporization Project those incremental demand-side management programs would be immediately thrust into the role of ensuring reliability years ahead of schedule, under the distributed infrastructure solution.

What we find is that in each of these contingency scenarios, the next best fallback option entails higher costs for our customers and also significant risk that we can't implement the fallback solution quickly enough to meet projected customer demand growth.

Where we have demand-side components to be next best approaches, those demand-side solutions would need to scale at unprecedented rates and would be more costly than the distributed infrastructure solution we're pursuing now. Where we have infrastructure fallback options, the (Clove Lake) Project or the LNG barge, what we find is that they would be more costly as well. They have lead times that extend beyond when we'd first see a demand/supply gap emerge. And they would likely be less feasible from a permitting perspective than the solutions we're pursuing today.

So if we jump now to - what I'll do next is just wrap up some of the key conclusions from the report before we go to the Q&A. National Grid has an obligation to plan to meet our customers' energy needs safely, reliably, and affordably. Gas utilities in New York, including National Grid, balance supply and demand with zero contingency in the face of potential supply disruptions and uncertainty in demand.

Addressing projected demand/supply gaps requires long term planning because it takes several years to implement an infrastructure project with the design and scale of the new demand-side management program. This report is fundamentally about providing safe, reliable, and affordable energy to our customers, while also addressing the long term need to achieve New York's net-zero goals.

The second supplemental report confirms our need for the distributed infrastructure solution; confirmed that it is the best available option to balance supply and demand; and confirmed that it is robust even under assumed aggressive net-zero policies that would slow, stop, and reverse gas demand growth in the mid to late 2020s.

None of the fallback options examined in the report are without even greater challenges than our current distributed infrastructure solution in terms of timing, regulatory, and permitting approval, and the ability to deliver them. Having to rely on such fallback options would create a risk that we could not meet projected customer demand, which would introduce the likelihood of having to put limitations on new customer connections. Or as a last resort, reliance on customer curtailment under peak demand conditions.

The most immediate risk to addressing the demand/supply gap is around an extended delay or outright denial of permit approval for the Greenpoint LNG Vaporization Project. That would create a demand/supply gap starting the winter of 2023/2024, even assuming that every other component of the distributed infrastructure solution is implemented fully and on schedule.

We're also preparing to file this summer, for regulatory approval of our incremental demand-side programs, especially those focused on aggressive new building weatherization offerings for customers. It's essential that we get approval and funding for the demand-side management programs so that we start to rapidly scale them up as part of the distributed infrastructure solution. As mentioned before, the long run the demand-side management programs actually constitute the bulk of the distributed infrastructure solutions.

Turning now to an overview of our stakeholder engagement approach. We're engaged now, in soliciting public and stakeholder feedback on our report and its conclusions via a variety of channels. We've taken several measures to make sure this report is known and accessible to the public and our stakeholders. The full report and some reports, are available online on our Web site.

We've sent hard copies to local public libraries. We've emailed our customers and included on bill messages, to alert them to the opportunity to provide feedback on our report. We're looking forward, of course, to tonight's Q&A and public statement session.

Members of the public and other stakeholders can also take a survey on our Web site; the one shown here, NGridSolutions.com. We also encourage everyone to submit written comments via the New York Public Service Commission Web site. Information on how exactly to do that is again, available on that dedicated Web site.

And then in mid to late August we'll issue another report subsequent to the one we issued on the 30th of June. And in that one we'll summarize and synthesize what we've heard from members of the public. In addition to this, to the public and stakeholder feedback on our latest report, energy experts from PA Consulting, will also be conducting an independent assessment of the content and conclusions contained in our second supplemental report.

PA Consulting's independent evaluation of our report will be issued by September 7th, to the New York Public Service Commission. And with that, I'll hand the mic back over to - for the next segment of our agenda this evening. And thank you, everyone, for your time and attention.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you, (Stephen). Good evening, everyone. I'm Bryan Grimaldi. I'm the Vice President of Corporate Affairs for New York, for National Grid. I'd like to thank all of our participants tonight, for listening to the presentation. We'll now move to the Q&A portion of the program. And if you've signed up to ask a question, you'll be called upon in the order in which your request was received.

Just a reminder, in an effort to accommodate the many individuals as we possibly can, participants wishing to ask a question will be limited to only one question. However, we would encourage you to the extent you would like to engage more, to go to NGridSolutions.com and submit your comments there, or to the PSE directly on their Web site.

During the Q&A all participants will be in listen-only mode and only the speaker asking the question will have the live mic. Our respective subject matter experts will then respond to a question to the best of our ability. With us this evening, we have Rob Moore, to talk about Supply Stack; we have Shira Horowitz to talk about the demand forecast; Chris Connolly on Greenpoint vaporization and MRI; Samara Jaffe on XE and the LNG Barge Project; Owen Tyrell, to talk about incremental gas ESM; we have Anntonette Alberti, to talk about gas energy efficiency and heat electrification; (Pete Medstor) to talk about the Clove Lakes Project; (Don Shabaz) for the New York City Pathway Study, RNG and Hydrogen; Rich Delaney on the Customer Curtailment Plan; and (Matt Sworn) on any moratorium management that we might need to discuss.

Now I'll turn it over to the operator to admit the first caller. (Jordan), please let someone in.

Coordinator: Thank you. If you'd like to ask a question, please press star 1, unmute your phone, and clearly state your name for question introduction. If you'd like to retract your question, please press star 2. Again to ask a question, please press star 1 and unmute your phone, and clearly state your name for question introduction. One moment. Our first question comes from (Christopher Miller). Your line is open.

(Christopher Miller): Hi. Can you hear me?

Bryan Grimaldi: Yes. We can.

(Christopher Miller): Okay, great. Thanks for taking my question. My question deals with the large infrastructure options that National Grid has addressed. In its reports, you know, over the last year or so, and specifically with the Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline Project, which is also known as NESE, and my question is simply is that option still on the table?

It seems to be noticeably absent from any of the options that are addressed, you know, in any detail in the report that was just issued or in the discussion tonight.

Bryan Grimaldi: NESE is not contemplated as part of the report.

(Christopher Miller): Does that mean that it's not on the table?

Bryan Grimaldi: Chris Connolly, do you want to take that?

Chris Connolly: Sure Bryan. Thank you. And thanks for the question. So with the permit rejection of NESE back over a year ago, we are not currently pursuing the NESE project. So we've chosen now as part of what we've outlined for the non-infrastructure options and solutions going forward, NESE is not part of that solution.

(Christopher Miller): Okay. Is it part of the contingency solutions? I'm really just curious about, you know, the possibility of it, you know, being implemented.

Chris Connolly: No. No. So NESE is not part of any of our planning for firm project or for contingency.

(Christopher Miller): Okay. Thank you.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your question. Next caller please.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Kim Project). (Kim), your line is open.

(Kim Project): Hi there. I'm just wondering, will our comments be recorded tonight and uploaded to the 19GO678 DPS docket for the long term solution? The docket that was created because you lied to New York about capacity issues to profit from the Williams NESE pipeline.

Bryan Grimaldi: I'm sorry. Is your question is the video being recorded?

(Kim Project): Are you...

Bryan Grimaldi: Yes, it is.

(Kim Project): Are - not is it being recorded. Is it going to be uploaded into the 19GO678 filing? Are you making a filing of our comments, of our public comments, so it's on the record? Because this is...

Bryan Grimaldi: Yes. All of your comments will be on the record. Thank you for your question.

(Kim Project): In the 19GO678 DPS docket?

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...docket. That is the docket, yes.

Bryan Grimaldi: Yes. Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Susan Albrecht). (Susan), your line is open.

(Susan Albrecht): Thank you very much. I have a couple of comments before I ask my question. First of all, I'm a long term resident of Greenpoint and very concerned about all of the environmental impacts of this, that have - our (unintelligible) has been exposed to, especially the prospective impacts of the LNG plant.

And I'm concerned also about the way that you portray the cost to the customers. I certainly understand the inherent risks of, you know, being short on fuel, as well as the concerns of, you know, the overall climate. My biggest concern, of course, is the climate. And my question for you is, when will - what is the date that National Grid projects to be net-zero, since that's one of your objectives.

Bryan Grimaldi: Steve, do you want to take that?

Steve Caldwell: Sure. So as Rudy mentioned and I think I talked about too in the presentation, National Grid has a corporate commitment to achieve net-zero by 2050, which is aligned with the science based targets that are essentially being adopted by, you know, governments and corporations, other entities around the world. And so we've made that commitment at the global corporate level for our own operations, if you're familiar with the different scope of emissions, right, sales and scope one and two emissions.

And we've also made a commitment to support the greenhouse gas reduction policy goals of the states in which we operate. And so with New York under

the CLCPA setting a net-zero goal for mid-century, for 2050, that's the target that we'd be operating toward. And we've been exploring the different ways to get to that.

So we've got the Carbon Neutral New York City study, which was a path-breaking study that we did collaboratively with the City of New York and with Consolidated Edison, that laid out different pathways to get to net-zero by 2050. We also have a commitment under the pending rate case settlement for our downstate New York gas utilities, to conduct a detailed CLCPA implementation study specific to our gas utility business in New York City and Long Island, that would lay out what the approach would be to further the CLCPA reduction - greenhouse gas reduction targets.

(Kim Project): Okay. I realize I only had one question, but I'm sorry that those are just studies and we really need action. And I know that all of this takes a long, long time. So, you know, putting into place these different measures that are just going to harm our environment and harm our community is really not sufficient.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your question. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Corwin Duncan). Your line is open.

(Corwin Duncan): Hi. Thank you so much. My question is quite simple. It's why are further fossil fuel infrastructure projects being considered when that is what the community wants, it is not what the environment needs, and there are any conceivable alternatives? Why is that in any way, being an option that is on the table, instead of pursuing anything besides further infrastructure around fossil fuels and natural gas?

Bryan Grimaldi: So thank you for your question. Your net-zero is something that is fully embraced by National Grid. It's essential for our planet clean energy projects. Now we're aligned with the city's and the state's clean energy goals and we're doing our part to ensure that we're mitigating our emissions and those of our customers, as shown by our own net-zero plan.

For our part now, net-zero emissions are built on various principles, including targeting the highest emitting fuels in sectors, optimizing the utilization of existing networks, and maintaining affordability through the use of strategic electric and natural gas. However, to get to that future, we'll need to target natural gas infrastructure investments now and upgrade the system so we continue to provide safe, reliable, clean and affordable service to our nearly 2 million customers downstate.

((Crosstalk))

(Corwin Duncan): ...away from natural gas, do we need to increase natural gas?

Bryan Grimaldi: I'm answering your question, sir.

(Corwin Duncan): But you're not. You're not answering my question though.

Bryan Grimaldi: As promising as those goals are, from a technical and engineering perspective, we're not there yet. We'll get there and we're making strides, but they're not there in sufficient scale to be able to meet the energy of the customers that are on the gas system for the indeterminate future. Thank you for your question. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next caller is (Marty Goodman). Your line is open.

(Marty Goodman): Yes. I don't know what happened to the commentary period. I have a lot to say. You said two minutes would be allowed. Do I have that two minutes?

Bryan Grimaldi: No, sir. This is the question and answer portion. You get to ask your question and we'll answer it. After question and answer is done, we'll go to an open forum where you'll have two minutes to make a statement.

(Marty Goodman): Okay.

Bryan Grimaldi: Did you have a question that you wanted to ask?

(Marty Goodman): Yes. I'm wondering if green washing actually works anymore. Methane is methane. Fracking is fracking. And what about fracking has changed? I haven't heard about it. The environment needs to be protected. Hell no to fracked gas is what I say. What do you say?

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your comment. Next question, please.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from...

(Louise Ishi): (Louise Ishi), North Brooklyn Pipeline Coalition. Hi. Thank you for answering questions. My question is around the compressed natural gas that's in this plan. It's clear that you've already started moving forward with that. And you said this plan aligns with the CLCPA. So I'm curious in your assessments and in DEC permitting, did you do - did you look at the full lifecycle emissions and any impacts on communities that you will be trucking gas through?

Bryan Grimaldi: Chris Connolly, do you want to take that?

Chris Connolly: Yes. Absolutely. So thanks for the question. In regard to our portable CNG assets, we have followed all of the requisite permitting requirements to construct and operate those facilities. We do have four facilities that are currently in service, ready for winter operations on Long Island, to support the needs of our customers, over the winter.

And again, we've supported the process thoroughly with (CTC) and all the local agencies and state agencies, to support construction and operation of those new assets that we have.

(Louise Ishi): So but what I asked though, is in compliance with the CLCPA, did you do a full lifecycle emissions? Because I'm pretty sure everything I saw only looked at the, like the leakage from that and not the burning of the gas for upstream.

Chris Connolly: So as part of the development and construction of these assets, these have been in service now for a couple of winter heating seasons with the most recent coming on this past year. And we have had no requirement to conduct studies aligned with CLCPA to this date.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your question. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Barbara Hatal). Your line is open.

(Barbara Hatal): Hi. I was just wondering about the erect - I'm just - I'm from North Brooklyn and I'm also concerned about Indians, you know, being shortchanged so much in our world today. Are you aware that these two erected pipeline (extensions) would harm local organic farms and businesses and

(unintelligible) Nation? And have you reached out to the (unintelligible) Nation?

Bryan Grimaldi: I'm sorry. I'm unfamiliar with the subject matter. We'll have to take your name and get back to you on that.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Jed). (Jed), your line is open.

(Jed): Hi. I was curious - I saw in your reports that you're converting some existing gas lines to electric and I don't understand why you would go to electric instead of renewable resources like solar or wind power turbines.

Man: (Unintelligible), you want to give that one?

Man: Oh, sure. Go ahead.

Man: Okay, then. So I'm not - there just might be - that might be a question based in some confusion. So when we talk in the report, if I understand the reference correctly, to converting customers to electric heating, what we're talking about is conversion to electric heat pump technology which is a relatively recent technology that allows in cold climates, for very efficient under some circumstances, of heating. So not like electric resistance heating.

And that would be powered by grid energy. So as New York State's CLCPA policies drive down the carbon intensity and ultimately hopefully to, you know, to zero carbon off the power grid, then essentially you'd be using wind, solar, other carbon-free energy sources to run your ground source or air source electric heat pump.

So when we talk about transitioning to electric heating that is essentially a way of using clean electric resources like wind and solar, to provide space heating.

Bryan Grimaldi: Okay. Thank you for your question. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Nicholas Sherman). Your line is open.

(Nicholas Sherman): Hello, yes. Thank you for the opportunity. My question is about the Clove Lakes transmission loop. Clove Lakes on Staten Island is protected, near city park land. It's historic. It's been park land for quite some time. And I believe there are freshwater wetlands there regulated by DEC. Could you speak more about the route of the transmission pipeline you're proposing and how that would affect the park land there? And are you looking to try to take an area of the park land? Thank you.

Bryan Grimaldi: (Pete Medstor)? Can you take that?

(Pete Medstor): I'd be happy to. Thank you for your question. So the route of the Clove Lakes transmission loop has not been determined at this point, but it would not be veering off of public right of ways as things stand today. So we would be following existing roadways and existing developed areas. And we would look to limit any environmental impact of the pipe as it would be installed.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your question. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from...

(Judith Canevra): (Judith Canevra), (Payne) Energy Project. Hi. Yes. I'm questioning the choice of the route of the MRI, what we call the North Brooklyn Pipeline, and

its lack of adherence to the principles of the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act which requires that pollution be measured and reduced. That high risk communities are identified and the air quality is being monitored for exposure to contaminants and criteria pollutants.

And that the state must prioritize projects that reduce the greenhouse gas emissions and eliminate these criteria pollutants, such as PM 2.5. And I don't see any evidence that the construction that took place in these disadvantaged communities of Brooklyn, were monitored in any way that is accessible to the public. I don't see any way that the public was notified or consulted about the construction that was being imposed on them.

So I'm asking the question, how do you resolve the lack of adherence to the provision in the CLCPA regarding disadvantaged communities?

Bryan Grimaldi: (Pete Medstor), do you want to address that?

(Pete Medstor): So the MRI project was constructed in accordance with all of the rules and regulations that were in place at the time that the project was conceptualized and permitted. So everything that was installed was in keeping with what was in place at that time.

As far as emissions from the project go, the project is a brand new length of high pressure steel gas main. And it is - has, was tested for leakage and it does not have any leakage activity on it. And so therefore, it is not contributing to any pollution with any of the - within any of the communities that it is going through at this time. Thank you for your question.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from...

(Billie Roberti): (Billie Roberti), Mothers Out Front.

Coordinator: Your line is open.

(Billie Roberti): Hi. I attended a wonderful webinar earlier today and heard about Massachusetts utility, Eversource, talk excitedly about a pilot district geothermal project on the horizon. They get it. They see a way for their gas utility to stay viable in this changing world. There is a video of it that you all should watch.

If you show the same enthusiasm for these kinds of projects we could join you in asking the PSC to allow National Grid to enter the thermal energy market. Given that you did a geothermal demonstration project in Riverhead to great success, which has been reported in newspapers, why are you not aggressively pursuing a pilot district geothermal project like this?

This would reduce gas demand, advance the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act goals, and show you are serious about helping reduce greenhouse gas emissions and perhaps ameliorate the kind of emergency we're in. So why are you not aggressively pursuing such a project?

Bryan Grimaldi: Steve, go ahead.

Steve Caldwell: Thanks. That's a great question. So we're very familiar with Eversource's demonstration project in Massachusetts, because one of our New York City and Long Island gas utility affiliates is Boston Gas that National Grid also owns. And so our Boston Gas company actually has a companion project to Eversource's, right, to test other aspects of geothermal. And that pilot proposal is pending now, before the utility regulator in Massachusetts,

and we're hopeful - we're excited that we can join Eversource hopefully, in demonstrating that in Massachusetts.

But here in New York too, as the caller mentioned, we were a leader on ground source heat pump deployments. We've got our Riverhead Long Island pilot project that's been in the ground and operating for a couple of years and had been successful. And we've also been pushing expansions of geothermal in our rate cases and other venues.

We are making headway in a couple of different ways. So we have in the pending rate case before the New York Public Service Commission. We have provisions that would have the company do a minimum number of what is so-called non-pipes alternatives, solicitations each year. And those could be for different purposes.

One of the anticipated purposes is to identify some of our leak-prone pipe replacement where we have older mains that are scheduled to be replaced. And we'd like to try and find some of those where we might be able to instead of spending money, to replace them.

We could essentially cap them and take all the customers served by the - a segment of the network now, and convert them to likely electric heating. And one of the great opportunities potentially to explore to do that, would be to create these geothermal networks.

We could move customers en masse in a targeted part of the network, to geothermal heating. And then retire the gas mains that had been serving them. And that's, you know, also we would see a role generally potentially as part of the heat electrification that needs to be pursued in the longer term

under the distributed infrastructure solution. We could see a role for geothermal network there too.

So we are, like Eversource, exploring that and see some potential for it to...

Bryan Grimaldi: Okay. Thank you for your question. Next caller please.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from...

(Anna Somo): (Anna Somo), No North Brooklyn Pipeline Coalition.

Coordinator: Your line is open.

(Anna Somo): Hi. Good afternoon. Thank you for taking questions. My question is in regards to the LNG barges, which I understand is a proposed backup plan if the pipelines are not able to be built. Can you please tell us where these LNG barges are planning to be located? Thank you.

Bryan Grimaldi: Sure. Thank you for your question. Samara, can you take that?

Samara Jaffe: Yes, Bryan. I'm happy to. So at this point it is kind of a high level concept that we're exploring. I think that Steve pointed out earlier, it's a technology that we know throughout the - throughout North America, it will (tend) to be repurposed to meet (LBC) needs as well as other needs.

So at this point, it is something that we are just exploring to see if the market could support it. And from there we will start looking at what point of our system it would make sense to bring it in at.

Bryan Grimaldi: Good. Thank you, Samara. Next question, please.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from...

(Marva Spindleman): (Marva Spindleman).

Coordinator: Your line is open.

(Marva Spindleman): Hi. Since all of these projects would break our (assignment) law, have you offered a request for proposal for the energy efficiency and electrification options?

Bryan Grimaldi: (Unintelligible), do you want to take that?

Woman: Sure. So we are going to be launching our weatherization programs this fall that will be available for residential customers. And there will be a custom program available for commercial and industrial customer and multi-family customers, beginning this year. And then our proposal is that next year we include new prescriptive programs for our multi-family and small business sectors.

So we will be offering for the residential portion of this weatherization program incentives for homeowners to engage in weatherization. And we're also incentivizing the energy efficiency implementation community with performance incentives, so that as they bring on new weatherization programs that bring us demand reduction, they will also be incentivized. So yes, we're working with the markets in order to bring those weatherization programs to life.

In terms of the incremental electrification program, we're in the process of working collaboratively with Con Ed and PSEG Long Island to find a way

that we can work together with their existing programs, to scale up an incremental program that can deliver more demand reductions through heat electrification.

Bryan Grimaldi: Great. Thank you for your question. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: If you'd like to ask a question, please press star 1, unmute your phone and clearly state your name for question introduction. One moment.

Bryan Grimaldi: If we have no other questions, we'll take a five minute break and we will come back and engage in the open floor for public comment. No more questions?

Coordinator: I do have a couple more questions. One moment. Our next question comes from...

Man: Name not recorded.

Coordinator: Your line is open. Caller?

(Andy Carlson): (Andy Carlson), (Southwick) Gas.

Coordinator: Your line is open.

(Andy Carlson): Hi guys. I have a question for you regarding your pathways program that you mentioned. Can you expand on what the specific criteria is for the pathway that you guys are exploring? Is it a high bio gas option, high - a high electrification option? Hydrogen? Just any information on that would be awesome.

Bryan Grimaldi: Sure. (Don Shabaz), can you address that? (Don), are you with us?

Steve Caldwell: Bryan, if (Don)'s not - he's having some trouble, I can take that one.

Bryan Grimaldi: Go ahead, Steve.

(Don Shabaz): Hey Bryan, this is (Don). I just came back. Was there a question? I thought we took a five minute break. I apologize. I walked away.

Bryan Grimaldi: (Don), we had three more callers in the queue, so we're going to take those three callers and then we're going to go to the break.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Caldwell: (Don), can you just explain a bit about the pathways we explored in the New York City study; what they were?

(Don Shabaz): Sure. We looked at sort of an analytical body of work to get to at least 80% emission reductions. When we started at the time, more than two years ago, New York City had an emission reduction target of 80%. Beyond that we have moved to net zero. But we looked at sort of three technology pathways that would at least reduce emissions by 2050, by 80%.

And we looked at using various levers - different technologies. One pathway was the electrification, relying mainly on the electrification of heat in all the other sectors. The second was the low carbon fuels pathways, to use also electrification and also low carbon fuels. And the third pathway was a diversified pathway that was a combination of the two.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you, (Don). Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from...

Man: Name not recorded.

Coordinator: Your line is open. Caller, your line is open.

Bryan Grimaldi: Operator, if there's no one there, can we go to the next question?

Coordinator: (Kim Frachek), your line is open.

(Kim Frachek): Hi. I just wanted to ask why you turned off the video and sound during the process of this event; why you turned off the video and sound when you had cameras on before the meeting started, and you clearly had sound with each other? This creates a lack of accessibility when we need two devices to participate in this event.

And it creates sort of a lack of trust with the community. So I'm just wondering like, why you are choosing to (keep) video off. And also just wondering if you know about our gas bill strike?

Bryan Grimaldi: Our cameras are on. You must be having technical problems. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: I have no additional questions at this time.

Bryan Grimaldi: Okay. We'll take our five minute break and we'll come back for the public forum. Welcome back, everyone. We'll now move to the public comment portion of the program. And if you've signed up to make a statement you'll be called on in the order in which your request was received. To be able to accommodate all those who requested participation, during the public

comment section speakers will be held to a strict two minute limit and will be given a warning at the 1:45 mark to please wrap up.

At the 2:00 mark we'll move to the next speaker in line. So please keep your comments succinct and be mindful of the time limit. Additionally, individuals will only be permitted one turn to have the floor. Additional opportunities for feedback are included on the micro site for the long term plan, located at NGridSolutions.com. I'll now turn the floor over to the operator to admit the first caller.

Coordinator: Thank you. If you'd like to leave a public comment, please press star 1, unmute your phone, and clearly state your name to request comment introduction. One moment. Our first public comment comes from (Nicholas Sherman). (Nicholas), your line is open. (Nicholas), your line is open.

(Nicholas Sherman): Hello. Yes. Hi. My name is (Nicholas Sherman). I'm a lifelong New Yorker who lived on Long Island for over 20 years, and currently live in Queens, New York. I am currently a Con Ed customer, but am commenting today as someone who has friends and loved ones who are National Grid customers.

And as someone who previously lived within National Grid service zone within a few miles of the Iroquois Pipeline, the Northport power plant area, and the Greenpoint Energy Center. I'm a volunteer of Clean Energy Project and a citizen advocate for climate action. I also have asthma which is worsened by bad air quality working by fossil fuels.

Tonight I'd like to express my significant concerns about your company's Natural Gas Long Term Capacity Second Supplemental Report. National Grid's proposal to add two new LNG vaporizers at Greenpoint Energy Center,

will increase emissions of air pollutants including particulate matter, VOCs and nitrogen oxides.

I live only a few miles from this facility. The air quality in the region does not currently comply with federal standards in this project, in the CNG trucks, LNG barges, and Clove Lakes loop which you also proposed, would worsen air quality. This project also violates the greenhouse gas emissions renewable energy and equity mandates of the CLCPA; in a designated potential environmental justice area, no less.

These acts go against your spokesperson's claims that National Grid is looking at being a responsible community partner and trying to meet the net-zero greenhouse gas emission goals of the CLCPA. Personally...

Bryan Grimaldi: Fifteen seconds to wrap, please. Thank you.

(Nicholas Sherman): Okay. I think your proposals are morally wrong and deeply disturbing. Thanks for the op...

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your comment. Next caller.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Margo Spindleman) (Margo), your line is open.

(Margo Spindleman): You know, I had a comment to read, but this is such - clearly such a farce that my comment is that I object to this entire sham and that I've joined the gas bill strike and won't pay for any fracked gas infrastructure.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your comment. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from...

(Mary Finnerman): (Mary Finnerman), sales company. I'm done.

Coordinator: Your line...

(Mary Finnerman): Hi. I'm (Mary Finnerman). That came across very loud and weird, but I live up by the Iroquois pipeline, not far where that would be. And one of my first things that I wanted to say is can you say pipeline instead of transmission system, because there's a lot of different transmission systems and I think the public would be confused if they don't understand that it's gas pipeline when you're talking about the Iroquois system.

But I also - I was wondering - I have the second report and I perused the second report and I saw some new charts that you showed that showed how for the net-zero chart how that's going to - what will happen as things get withdrawn as you're heading towards net zero. And that's not in that report. Will it be in your third report that comes out in August?

That was a question that I wanted to ask. I was signed up to ask questions and you couldn't hear me so I was passed. But I want to, you know, say it's - this has got to stop. I mean, you know, I have family in Portland, Oregon. You know, when the high was 40 degrees, when the record-breaking high was 40 degrees higher than the last record, it's getting to be really scary, and we have to do something about this.

But I also wanted to just make a comment about your - I saw this also too, you seem to be very proud that you've got the largest CNG network which means trucks carrying compressed natural gas. And upstate we've been calling them

bomb trucks because these are extremely dangerous. And you're going to be having them go through New York City where I think...

Bryan Grimaldi: Fifteen seconds to wrap, please (Mary). Thank you.

(Mary Finnerman): Thank you.

Bryan Grimaldi: Next caller, please. Thank you for your comment.

Coordinator: Our next comment comes from (Barbara Hatal). Your line is open. (Barbara), your line is open.

(Barbara Hatal): Hi. Hi. I just want - my name is (Barbara Hatal) and I'm a North Brooklyn resident. I'm opposed to the Greenpoint LNG vaporizers by CNG on Long Island, the expansion of the Iroquois pipeline and other fracked gas projects. These projects represent financial greed, not working toward a net-zero solution whether (unintelligible) fracked gas gas.

You have been gaslighting your customers. If you really wanted to meet net-zero you do not need these polluting construction projects. Your projections are incorrect as more people choose heat pumps and the thermal heating. Please listen to the people and not National Grid.

And also you've got to stop picking on Indians. Everybody does. (Unintelligible) they're out there, you know, building oil pipelines, and you're going to go do more on Long Island. That's insane. So please stop, you know, doing all this racial crap and start - just go to your net-zero solutions. Thank you.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you...

Coordinator: Our next...

Bryan Grimaldi: ...for your comment. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Eric Sherman). (Eric), your line is open.

(Eric Sherman): Hello. Can you hear me? Hello?

Bryan Grimaldi: Yes. Yes, we can hear you.

(Eric Sherman): Okay, great. So my name is (Eric Sherman) and I'm calling today. I understand the limitations of the existing system that we have, and I understand that the potential shortfalls could cause a lot of havoc within existing infrastructure. But my position is that all new fossil fuel projects must not be built.

We are not acting in correspondence with the emergency at hand. I understand all of the challenges that you guys have to go through with your existing networks and all the challenges to maintain service to all of your existing customers. But we need to act as if the house is on fire. Our house is on fire.

And what we need from you is strong leadership to be able to pull us out of this potential mess that by 2050 is going to be too late. I understand that you have several interesting opportunities with respect to geothermal and wind, but I just implore you to please push as hard as you can and to investigate all these options and not even investigate, to implement as many of these renewable energy options as we possibly can, and pull away from all the fracked gas projects that we possibly can.

Because we know that they are destructive. We know that they hurt people. We know that they destroy the environment. And the more that we do them, the more we are hurting ourselves. So please use all of your power in any way that you possibly can, to help push away from fracked gas and other fossil fuel projects. And help push us into a more sustainable future. Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from...

(Louise Ishi): (Louise Ishi), National Grid customer.

Coordinator: Your line is open.

(Louise Ishi): Hi. Yes. I have to agree with (Margo) that this entire hearing is a farce. You have completely ignored in this second report, the thousands of public comments and the people that showed up during a pandemic, when New York City was being ravaged by a pandemic, to speak out against any of these fracked gas distributed projects.

You have not addressed any of our concerns about the health of these projects. And you have not addressed any of our concerns about the climate impact. So that is why I am one of now over 200 people who have joined the gas bill strike. I will never pay for the North Brooklyn pipeline. I will never pay for any of your racist ass fracked gas infrastructure that is hurting people.

So that's what you guys have to deal with now. And that's what we're here today to say. Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Susan Albrecht). Your line is open.

(Susan Albrecht): Thank you. You know, I left a message or a question earlier. I'm a 30 year resident of Greenpoint, and I'm very concerned about the environmental impact of both the LNG facility and the pipeline. I have significant concerns about the lack of truly sustainable new initiatives that you are trying to pursue, and the lack of transparency about the new pipeline and the fracking.

In New York City and New York State, they are committing to a 70% renewable energy goal for 2030. And I think that you should be showing us what you're doing to try to work towards those goals, as opposed to showing us the scary bills that we're going to pay, and the bills that are going to be most significantly impacted in the lower income communities.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Lisa Marshall). (Lisa), your line is open.

(Lisa Marshall): Yes. Hi. Thanks for calling on me. So a year ago National Grid, when the final denial of the Williams Pipeline came down, you presented three alternative options, including Option C, the no infrastructure option. And at the time, you pointed out that the cost of the no infrastructure option to the ratepayers was actually less than the cost of the proposed Williams Pipeline.

So I noticed today that you emphasized the cost of the alternatives versus the cost of your expanded gas infrastructure. But you didn't really mention the fact that your original Plan A would have cost us all a whole lot more than any of the options that you're putting on the table now.

Further, you also noted in that - in your own proposal at the time, that the energy efficiency upgrades to homes and buildings, would be a $2 billion dollar investment in the local economy. And so - and would stimulate local

economies a $1.8 billion investment through 2035. No mention of that benefit was brought up today in your presentation, and I'm really wondering why.

And lastly, you know, the benefits of electrification and energy efficiency and demand response benefit customers in the short term, but also in the long term with more comfortable homes, lower energy bills, and reducing fossil fuel use overall. Again, no mention whatsoever of those benefits in your presentation today.

I'm absolutely outraged. I have no reason to trust you as a company, to take care of me and my children and other New Yorkers. I live upstate. I'm not in the downstate case. But you sold a pipeline right in my town to the Dominion Company and then you posed as the customer for the gas.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Corwin Duncan). Your line is open.

(Corwin Duncan): Thank you. I also object very strongly to any further natural gas infrastructure. I would ask you seriously, to consider - oh, I'm sorry, one thing as well. There was a question earlier in the question period about the videos not being on for the presenters, and the answer was that the video is on. That is not true for me either. And I'm not sure why you would - like I'm not sure what's happening there.

But either there's a consistent problem with that or you're just not - you don't have your video on. And I agree that that decreases trust in the community. Not that there's a lot there to begin with. I think the refusal of National Grid to take strong action away from further fossil fuel infrastructure, is fundamentally cowardice in the face of an emergency.

And I ask you to look at what actions you can take, not words you can use, not studies you can explore, but what actions can you take that will impact the communities you are ostensibly certain to reduce? Absolutely reduce, not increase fossil fuel infrastructure and reduce fossil fuel usage. For example, not having any more new hookups. And I know that's not what you're doing right now.

You're talking about increased usage over the next few years by stopping new hookups, or reducing your hookups, that will reduce your usage and force other energy sources. Please take strong action as leaders rather than acting from a place of cowardice and going with what you believe is the only way to move forward. Thank you. That is my time.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your comment. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Kim Frachek). Your line is open.

(Kim Frachek): Thank you so much. National Grid CEO makes $3600 per hour. Per hour. So there's no incentive for your company to move to renewable energy because John Pettigrew is profiting off making mass purchases of local energy systems like two of them here in New York State and Massachusetts and elsewhere.

We see our energy system as a human right. And this is not a commodity for John Pettigrew or any of you that are working for him. We already gave tens of thousands of comments against your fossil fuel proposal when this investigation for long term solutions was mandated for you. And you have not implemented any of them.

You've also - you never put out a request for proposals for the energy efficiency options. So it's clear you're not really serious about it. You're ignoring our support for energy efficiency on a mass scale. So it's just really like us people up against a massive corporation that's trying to capitalize on our our lives.

And we're going to fight you and we're going to fight for public power, because we don't want you in our state anymore. You guys can go back to the UK. I know some of you are local folks working for National Grid, but we can get you better jobs, you know, working for a much more equitable community focused on, you know, energy company that's owned by the people.

And I have joined the gas bill strike because I am not going to pay a dime to any of you for fossil fuel infrastructure so John Pettigrew can continue to make $3600 per hour. Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Judith Klepper). (Judith), your line is open.

(Judith Klepper): Yes. I truly wish that I had been able to ask this as a question, but I'll take it as a comment. So let's talk about the great savior hydrogen, and your assurance that the wonders of hydrogen are just around the corner. I have no reassurance on that score. I don't see anything in the literature that reassures us that hydrogen is the answer to continuing to build all these pipes.

The production of hydrogen, it includes the continued burning of natural gas or fracked gas, as we call it. Ninety-five percent of hydrogen being used in industry right now is what we call gray hydrogen. It's gray because it comes from methane. Then there's the dream of carbon capture and sequestration

with carbon capture and storage with what we call blue hydrogen. Still involves methane.

And then there's the mythical answer of green hydrogen using renewable energy to produce this hydrogen. That doesn't address the question of how are you going to scale up renewable energy to the point that it's going to be used to make hydrogen, which is like using a middleman when we could eliminate these pipes and just use the renewable energy directly.

So it's just mystifying to me for anybody to go along with this idea that these pipes are going to be useful in the future because we're going to run hydrogen through them, which is a molecule of two atoms so tiny that what pipe that you're building now could possibly prevent leakage by hydrogen, or damage by this molecule?

So that's it. That's what I have to say. And I certainly wish that I had asked it so that you could respond to it.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your comment. Next caller, please.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Jonathan Jackson). (Jonathan), your line is open.

(Jonathan Jackson): Hello. Thank you for taking the time to hear our comments. To Greenpoint 20 years, I'm originally from England. (Unintelligible) about Greenpoint is the long history of environmental injustice and burdens that have happened and of course the longest one is the one from the petrochemical oil and gas industry.

And, you know, also we have a (super fund) site like half a mile from where I live in (Unintelligible) Creek. And that one got sued to clean it up, all around where the LNG facilities that you're proposing and I don't know if you've got permits for it and so it's going to need cleaning up. And I know in the rate case that that remediation cost was kind of unknown.

So, therefore, if the ratepayers of National Grid are going to have to pay for the project, the unfinished project, as it sounds and god knows how long it's going to take, after all the remediation, I would, you know, I'm definitely going to look into how much the extra cost this is going to cost us.

And it's a horrible irony, right, a horrible irony that the ratepayers have to pay for the cleanup of another oil and gas corporation coming in after 100 years of oil and gas and petrochemical industry causing the original pollution. It's a horrible irony and the last 30 seconds, I'm - in the Quaker tradition, I'm just going to say what are we going to do about climate change? And maybe just we can have some silence and think about that.

Coordinator: Our next...

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your comment.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Billie Roberti). (Billie), your line is open.

(Billie Roberti): My name is (Billie Roberti) and I live in Huntington Station. I'm addressing you tonight as a member of Mothers Out Front, speaking out for the children and their parents who worry about what kind of world they're leaving to their kids.

I normally would thank National Grid for this opportunity to speak, but I'm really tired of coming to you saying we don't want more gas and then being ignored. You tell us at stakeholder comments are being heard. But that's not really true, is it? If you had, we wouldn't need this meeting.

We New Yorkers have already made it clear that we oppose Greenpoint LNG Vaporizers, CNG on Long Island, expansion of Iroquois Pipeline and any other fracked gas project. And we say no to the Clove Lakes pipeline and LNG barges if National Grid moves towards these fracked projects. When are you going to get it? No means no.

The climate crisis has escalated to a climate emergency, in case you have not been aware of the record breaking heat waves in the Pacific Northwest and other devastating weather patterns. The time for delay is over. We can't be looking at 2050. We have to look at 2030.

Multiple reports have already proven National Grid is overestimating the gap between supply and demand. Demand will not follow the trends you project. Areas you hope to expand into with gas will be switching to ground source heat pumps. This latest report is more of the same non-solutions you have presented in the past.

You are also ignoring the health impacts of fracked gas. Communities near Greenpoint LNG facility have suffered from decades of environmental pollution. They need healing, not more. Even those of us who live far from these facilities have had our indoor air polluted with fracking chemicals in the gas that is released when we cook our meals.

Respiratory problems are worse now due to COVID. The game has changed. You need to update your game. The gas bill strike is gaining

momentum. Maybe the strike will change your mind. I certainly hope so. Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next public comment comes from (Eric Alexander). (Eric), your line is open.

(Eric Alexander): Hi. Can you hear me?

Bryan Grimaldi: Yes, we can. Thank you.

(Eric Alexander): Great. Thanks. (Eric Alexander) Division of Long Island. Also, Long Island Main Street Alliance which is 45 downtowns. Before the pandemic, in prior years, there had been challenges getting transitory development in affordable housing projects online with gas, with natural gas, during your moratorium period, which we ended up supporting the NESE pipeline because, you know, a lot of our small businesses and transitory development projects, also need to come online.

So we don't want to see that again. We hope you meet some of your demand goals. We obviously support renewables on a whole level, but we'll get to that in a second. We have 15,000 units of transitory development coming. Three thousand of those are affordable. We need 50,000 to 100,000 affordable units on Long Island like tomorrow, largely due to the exodus of folks from New York City, which they're causing a massive affordability problem in our region, which we already had.

So that gets me to affordability. We'll leave it to the regulators and others to figure out the demand side. The affordability for us, big problem. We're concerned that if you don't meet your goals home heating oil and propane will be a use that folks are going to look for because we support wind but there's a

cost with that. Electric heat pumps they are still more costly. Geothermal is really, unfortunately right now, for millionaires and not for all building types.

Bio gas isn't here yet. So in the end we want to get to net-zero as quick as possible, closer than 2050. And we're lobbying for subsidies with other environmental groups. But we don't want to see our small businesses or residents, hurt in the process also, with the cost of everything going up. Affordability is very important for folks.

So I just wanted to make those comments. Thank you.

Bryan Grimaldi: Thank you for your comment. I see that there are no callers left in the queue.

Coordinator: We have no additional comments at this time.

Bryan Grimaldi: Okay. Well, thank you, everyone, for participating in our public meeting. We hope you found it informative. We will take your comments to heart and incorporate them into the supplemental report. And we look forward to receiving the public comments from those who were unable to make this meeting. Thank you so much for your time and have a good evening.

Coordinator: This concludes today's presentation. You may disconnect at this time, leaders, please stay on the line for post-conference. One moment.

END