

STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
Petition of New York Transco LLC and New York Power Authority
for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need, Case
24-T-0446
Pursuant to Article VII of the New York Public Service Law, to
Construct, Operate, and Maintain an Approximately 89.7-Mile
Underground Transmission Line through Suffolk, Nassau, Queens,
Bronx, and Westchester Counties.

Maryann Hojnowski

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO JOINT PROPOSAL

Dated: June 8, 2026

STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
Petition of New York Transco LLC and New York Power Authority
for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need, Case
24-T-0446 Pursuant to Article VII of the New York Public Service Law, to
Construct, Operate, and Maintain an Approximately 89.7-Mile
Underground Transmission Line through Suffolk, Nassau, Queens,
Bronx, and Westchester Counties.

Maryann Hojnowski

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO JOINT PROPOSAL

Linda and Andrew DelGaudio respectfully submit this Statement in
opposition to the Joint Proposal filed with the New York State Public
Service Commission (the “Commission”) on April 30, 2026 (the “Joint
Proposal”), by New York Transco LLC and New York Power Authority
(together, the “Applicant”) for approval by the Commission.

STATEMENT ON THE JOINT PROPOSAL

Having seen and reviewed the opposition of the Self-Consolidated
Parties, and the Village of Sea Cliff to the Joint Proposal, we have the
same concerns and would like to put forth the following additional
concerns to the Joint Proposal:

(1) As a homeowner, I am near to two highly trafficked schools in the community, and down a few roads from a third, I am concerned with the terms of the Joint Proposal with regard to the hours of construction as we are less than half a mile to all 3 schools. The stated hours do not sufficiently mitigate the impacts to human health, or safety of residents or the environment that we live in as the Applicant is planning to be in our roads both day and night. Clause 66 of the Joint Proposal indicates their activities will take place on our area between 10 am to 2 pm, and then from 7 pm to 5 am. These time frames also do not consider night time deliveries or the disturbance they will create. Further, my home is in a development that will be surrounded by construction on both Glen Head Road and Glen Cove Avenue. This means that in addition to the Applicant's overnight work schedule around schools, we will also have to contend with normal construction times for our other closely located access roads which are Monday-Friday 7am – 6 pm. If construction occurs on both of these roads simultaneously, not only will we be severely impacted, the other residents of our community will be as well. Further, our only way in and out of our development is through these roadways noted and the Applicant has not sufficiently provided for mitigation in terms of sequencing in the Joint Proposal to ensure we are able to get in and out of our community for regular activities or in the event of an emergency or if a situation arises where first responders are needed. My other concern is the fact that my home, as stated, is in close proximity to the schools and any construction outside of that close proximity, given the small size of our community and every roadway necessary to get my kids to school and in and out of the community, will create a dangerous detour on the streets in our community where kids walk to school and play outside of school hours. When construction will be taking place on the other roadways, it will create a dangerous traffic and safety nightmare in our area for us and our neighbors. In addition, we are concerned about staging, trucks, lights and deliveries with noise at all hours of the night for which the Applicant has not provided sufficient mitigation details or measures in the Joint Proposal. Further the Applicant is asking the PSC to not apply local laws in Exhibit 7 which protect resident safety and quality of life, for the Applicant's own cost and convenience purposes, which include noise, traffic, etc. thereby further exacerbating the situation. As such the commission should reject the Joint Proposal on the basis that the Applicant has not sufficiently mitigated quality of life, health and human safety issues that

are apparent at this stage of the process given the extent that our community is being severely disproportionately impacted.

Further the Applicant should be made to update traffic studies to periods that are not during holiday or vacation time frames as well as using employment stats that are representative of current circumstances, as Exhibit 6 assessments of workforce activities include Covid timeframes. Further, if the Applicant is working around the clock, there needs to be a better approach to timely handling issues that they create as we the residents are left to deal with the circumstances, and a 24 hour acknowledgment does nothing to appropriately mitigate any issues that arise timely, nor does a 10 day timeframe of resolution. Working from home this will severely impact my ability to do my job with the construction occurring at all hours of the day. This also disrupts our family life and my ability to get my kids to school on time, and then get home to work on time. Our roads are so narrow, and with only one main road out of the town, I don't see how this project is able to happen since we have no contingency plan to mitigate the traffic.

(2) The Applicant's Joint Proposal gives preferential treatment to both LICFA and colocated utilities for their infrastructure and gear and provides no such measures that would require the Applicant to timely mitigate a fix and for what they broke when it comes to our residential properties. Our home is right off the roadway with no shoulder and there have been no staging or lay down yards provided to sufficiently mitigate what could be on our property or construction activities that could change the water table or impact our septic system, foundation, or fencing. Nor has the applicant provided any studies in the application or Joint Proposal to address the infrastructure and environment of our community. Further, given the proximity of our home to where the construction will be, we are additionally concerned with debris and contamination impacts to our yard, outdoor property, and the quality of air and cleanliness of our home. We also have no details on the full to be used for all we know it's the next asbestos class action in the future – products are deemed fine until they are not and there are human and environmental issues. The applicant has not provided any details as to what they will use or what will be in the air that could impact our health. As such the commission should reject the Joint Proposal as it has not mitigated its impacts to colocated infrastructure as has been seen and is known to occur in other Article VII processes for such projects as

CHPE. Residents should not have to bear the cost of damages created by Propel and upfront mitigation should be done to address medical situations that can arise in our homes due to the contamination we will be faced with for extended periods of time not only next to our home but throughout the community.

(3) The Applicant in Joint Proposal condition 21 talks about relocation of utilities while doing construction, however the Joint Proposal and the Applicant's plans do not provide details as to where utilities will be relocated. Since our community has a high water table, narrow streets and 3 sets of cables with two on one road and 3 crossing an intersection, the Applicant fails to sufficiently mitigate this situation as they are silent on this issue. If they are moving at 50 feet per day, that would mean for any utility relocation that residents would be without utilities for some period of time each day during the construction. This is especially concerning given the length of the project that would likely span all seasons and the disproportionate impact on all our roads with one being dug up twice. Further there could be property damage if utilities are cutoff for extended periods of time during the winter season which the applicant has not sufficiently mitigated in the Joint Proposal as this has been seen in similar Article VIIs such as CHPE.

(4) The Applicant has provided insufficient EMF studies to date as they do not consider impacts to route changes previously provided which now have 3 cables converging at the intersection of Glen Head Road and Glen Cove Avenue. This is concerning since previous Case 13 was over the EMF standard at 230 milligauss when three lines were colocated. Their plans seem to keep changing and depth and routes are not clearly defined as they can change at any time with approval of the PSC. The Applicant has not provided the location of the centerline and clauses indicate it can be anywhere even encroaching beyond the roadway. The shallow depths and fills being used near our home are concerning especially since NYC is getting preferential treatment on burial depths. Also, placing the cables at shallow depths is deeply concerning as the side of our home and yard are on top of the road and within 30 feet leaving us exposed. We are concerned about the levels of EMF we will be exposed to and how that will affect our health. The shallow depths and close proximity of this to our homes at constant level will affect the health and safety of not only our family but of all the people in our towns along the route. Measurements at 3 feet above

ground do not sufficiently mitigate the impact to my young children that walk to school and whose bodies will be exposed to levels much higher. EMF has been directly linked to childhood leukemia, and the Applicant has not said they will pay hospital bills when my children become sick from exposure. The health and safety of my children and my family was never considered. The Applicant is employing an EMF standard from 1978 which is not a health standard and there are plenty of studies and precautions taking place around the world given the impacts of this constant exposure to human health. As such the applicant has not performed the requisite studies, planning for placement or taken at this time mitigating measures for known issues to protect the health and safety of residents along the route or for the purpose of protecting our young people. I have asked repeatedly for the applicant to provide updated EMF exposure records, but I am continually ignored.

(5) The commission should reject the Joint Proposal as it states Applicant at will can change our plantings and character of our yards, and restoration will not be done till the completion of the project. This is a 4 year project and the applicant should be sufficiently mitigating timely restoration at this stage of the process given the known environmental impact for not only our home but our whole community which is ground zero for this project.

CONCLUSION

Consistent with applicable regulations and State policy, the Commission should reject the Joint Proposal. The Commission should consider all the important points in the Self-Consolidated Parties and the Village of Sea Cliff Statements of Opposition, along with our above concerns. We respectfully request the Commission reject the Joint Proposal.