CAPE COD COMMISSION

Algonquin Pipeline Relocation, Bourne (CCC File No. 25012)
Development of Regional Impact Review
Subcommittee Hearing

Minutes | October 28, 2026 at 5:00 p.m.

Virtual via Zoom

APPROVED 11/12/2026

Summary of Actions Taken

- The subcommittee continued the hearing on the Algonquin Pipeline Relocation Project to Thursday, November 12, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. to be held virtually on Zoom.

Hearing Open

Robert Frangieh, as Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:00pm. He began by reading opening announcements. He noted that the hearing is being recorded for the purpose of taking minutes and asked anyone else recording to announce themselves. Three people identified themselves: Jeanette Barnes (WCAI), Steve Buckley (Chatham resident), and Taylor Fruzzetti (Sandwich Enterprise).

The Chair asked Jeffrey Ribeiro, Regulatory Planner, to call roll.

Roll Call:

- Robert Frangieh, Chair, Present
- Catherine Ledec, Present
- David Mead-Fox, Present
- Dennis Prebensen, Present
- Thomas Wilson, Present
- Anne McManus, Alternate, Present

Applicant Presentation

The Chair asked the Applicant to present the Project.

Richard Paquette, Principal Technical Director, SWCA Environmental Associates, presented on behalf of the Applicant, Algonquin Gas Pipeline, LLC, a subsidiary of Enbridge. He said that the Project is being undertaken in response to the Army Corps of Engineers requiring the existing gas infrastructure be removed from the existing the Cape Cod Canal Bridges prior to their replacement. He said Enbridge currently delivers natural gas to National Grid

on the land-side of the Cape Cod Canal, where it is taken over the bridges by National Grid. The new proposal will deliver natural gas to National Grid on both sides of the Cape Cod Canal. He said the delivery capacity to National Grid will remain unchanged.

He said that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is the lead federal agency regulating the Project, noting FERC has exclusive authority under the federal Natural Gas Act to determine if an interstate natural gas project is required for the public convenience and necessity, including the review of matters such as pipe diameter, operating pressure, and delivery volume. He said FERC reviews projects in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other relevant federal laws. He provided an overview of the timeline for federal and state permitting. He noted that FERC issues their Environmental Assessment (EA) on May 29, 2026 and the final FERC Certificate was expected soon.

Mr. Paquette showed a visual of the Project, including the segments of existing pipeline to be discontinued, new pipeline to be installed, and the locations of new Metering and Regulating (M&R) Stations. He discussed why this configuration was chosen as the preferred alternative. He discussed the proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) method to be employed, including its benefits and construction practices that will be utilized.

He noted that efforts had been made to reduce or eliminate potential impacts to Water and Wetland Resources, including the use of HDD to avoid impacts to the Cape Cod Canal. He outlined other protections that would be in place for work necessary within wetland buffers. He discussed efforts to protect Wildlife and Plant Habitat, including ongoing consultation with the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) since February 2025. He said a Comprehensive Management Permit (CMP) is expected in December 2026. He noted measures that will be taken to minimize and mitigate any potential impacts to protected species.

Mr. Paquette discussed how tree clearing and habitat impact had been minimized through utilizing existing utility corridors and the use of HDD. He said there is a significant amount of land to be permanently restricted as Open Space, which is being developed in consultation with NHESP. He said the negotiations are in progress, but the land restricted would conform with CCC standards. He also discussed the Section 106 federal process for historic and archaeological resources, including listing the parties that have been consulted. He provided an overview of the Project schedule, typical work hours, noise controls, and traffic management plans.

Blair Hastey, Manager of Marketing and Business Development for Algonquin Gas Pipeline, provided a background on the Project's history. He said that Project has been designed and is being permitted to meet existing capacity and is being reviewed by FERC. He said they cannot increase flow without prior approval. He said that proposed pipeline diameter is

necessary to maintain pressure to the system, which is larger than the existing pipelines due to the increased distance the pipeline will travel.

Staff Presentation

The Chair then asked Jordan Velozo, Chief Regulatory Officer for staff comments. Ms. Velozo addressed the federal agency jurisdiction and the scope of the Cape Cod Commission's authority. She noted that after a FERC certificate issues, the Commission will issue a staff report on consistency with the RPP's goals and objectives.

Public Comment

The Chair then asked for public comment, starting with public officials.

Liz Argo, Yarmouth Select Board, spoke on behalf of the Town of Yarmouth. She said it is important that the Project does not provide an increase in natural gas capacity. She said the Project should stay within the stated scope.

Hearing no further public officials, the Chair then asked for comment from the general public.

John Densler said that not constructing the pipeline would cause the loss of service for those on Cape Cod. He said that it could result in the use of other fossil fuels that produce greater emissions.

Barry Margolin said that the RPP supports efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. He said that the Project results in an increase in capacity, which may increase natural gas use.

Joyce Flynn said she was concerned about the Project resulting in an increase in capacity.

Reiner Kuhr said that natural gas use is more efficient than homes using electric utilities powered by natural gas generated electricity. He said natural gas is a good alternative to heating oil.

Chris Powicki spoke on behalf of the Cape and Islands group of the Sierra Club. He said he is concerned about global warming and efforts to limit source emissions. He said that the Project should be reviewed based on regional climate goals. He said the Project is not consistent with the RPP.

Jim Wolf said that the Project does not align with regional climate goals. He said the Project is an increase in capacity.

Ava Morgan spoke on behalf of the Sierra Club of Massachusetts. She said that they do not oppose the relocation of the pipeline, but they oppose any increase in capacity. She said that public funds should not be used to fund the Project.

Diane Turko said she is concerned about a capacity increase.

Steve Buckley said that he would like further clarification on the difference between capacity and flow. He said he would like an analysis of future capacity.

Subcommittee Questions

Hearing no more public comment, the Chair asked for Subcommittee questions.

Mr. Mead-Fox asked if the amount of gas coming through the pipeline will be the same as current conditions and why the pipe diameter is being changed.

Mr. Hastey responded that the diameter of the pipe is specifically selected to maintain pressures at the extremities of the system to meet obligations across the service area.

Mr. Mead-Fox asked if the existing capacity is sufficient.

Mr. Hastey responded that existing capacity does meet present need. The larger pipes are not an increase in capacity but are necessary to address existing system demands.

Mr. Mead-Fox acknowledged the response but noted that he still had questions.

Ms. McManus asked whether there is a distinction between capacity and flow and if the Project will increase flow.

Mr. Hastey responded that the system is built around meeting customer demand during a peak winter day.

Ms. Ledec noted that much of the discussions was related to definitions. She requested staff ask for clear definitions of terms from the Applicant. She would also like to differentiate between current capacity and permitted units.

Mr. Hastey noted that the Enbridge website posts pipeline capacity on any given day and that it varies based on demand.

Ms. Ledec noted that the Nighttime Noise Reduction Plan relative to the Species Protection Plan indicates night work. She asked whether large flood lights would be used and if potential impacts to species from those lights had been considered. She noted concern for the North American Right whale, which sometimes enter the canal.

Mr. Paquette responded that the work sites for the HDD are over 1000 feet back from the canal, so work lights would not impact species in the canal.

Ms. Ledec asked whether the impact of vibrations and noise from the drilling could impact whales and other species.

Mr. Paquette replied that the Applicant has consulted with NOAA and this was one of the review analysis topics that was discussed with them. They came to a determination of no impact.

The Chair asked for detail on the drilling and associated oils and other chemicals used in the process and requested more explanation of groundwater protection and monitoring.

Mr. Paquette responded that an initial study looked at groundwater impacts and determined that there was limited effect.

Mr. Frangieh asked how the Town would be affected in terms of traffic.

Mark Dorso, Senior Advisor for Lands and ROWs, responded that they expect very limited traffic impacts except for Canal Street, which is the only area with an open cut. They are timing their work on Canal Street so that it is completed prior to Memorial Day.

Mr. Frangieh noted that Bourne public school students regularly travel across both bridges and throughout the project area and he asked that the Applicant consider school bus traffic in their plans.

Mr. Mead-Fox asked what similar projects that the company has done and what lessons have been learned. He asked if there is a document that could be shared that would be responsive to this request.

Mr. Hastey responded that he did have an immediate response but would bring the question back to the team.

Mr. Mead-Fox asked how the proposed and existing system capacity compare.

Mr. Hastey answered that diameter does not equate to capacity. The length of the pipe requires a certain level of pressure to ensure the extremities of the system are served, requiring the proposed diameter.

Mr. Mead-Fox urged the Applicant to get that information to the public.

Anne McManus asked whether there were any changes in methane emissions.

Mr. Hastey replied that there were no changes though relevant reporting requirements remain in place.

Ms. McManus asked what will happen to the sections of pipeline to be abandoned in place.

Mike Granke, Project Manager, stated that the pipes will be filled with grout and noted that the steel would eventually rust and decay. The grout will prevent the pipes from collapsing.

Tom Wilson asked whether the 18" diameter pipe will be consistent across the new system.

Mr. Hastey confirmed changes in the pipe diameter across the Algonquin system. Mr. Hastey also talked about the nexus between the Algonquin system and National Grid.

Mr. Wilson asked about potential methane release on the Outer Cape.

Mr. Hastey replied that are no methane releases from the system.

Catherine Ledec asked what soils are expected to be encountered during the HDD and what will happen to the drill spoils.

Mr. Paquette responded that the spoils will be hauled away from the site. He noted the project plans provided show geotechnical information, but he did not know the soil profiles offhand.

Ms. Ledec asked about the disposition of the drill spoils.

Mr. Granke responded that the spoils will be hauled to an approved site that will be selected by the drilling contractor and approved by Algonquin.

Ms. Ledec requested a page number to reference the information related to soils.

Mr. Mead-Fox asked what would prevent Algonquin and National Grid from adding additional capacity via FERC approvals.

Blair Hastey responded that they operate an open access system and must provide capacity to customers as they request it.

Motion to Continue the Hearing

After brief discussion about scheduling, the Chair asked for a motion to continue the hearing to Thursday, November 12, 2026 at 5pm to be held virtually, via Zoom.

Mr. Wilson made the motion and Mr. Mead-Fox seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion carried, and the hearing was continued at 6:52 p.m.

Materials Used

- Subcommittee Hearing Notice/Agenda
- Applicant Presentation