



Outlook

---

## Port Richmond's Petition against PGW's Richmond LNG Plant Replacement

---

From Eric Stowers <ericstowers5@gmail.com>

Date Mon 5/4/2026 11:37 AM

To Gemela McClendon <gmclendon@phlgc.net>; Sandra Fontanez <sfontanez@phlgc.net>; Anna Rowe <arowe@phlgc.net>; Heidi Wushinske <hwushinske@phlgc.net>; Timothy Murtha <tmurtha@phlgc.net>; Roslyn Bell <rbell@phlgc.net>

Hi Gas Commission Staff,

My name is Eric Stowers. I've been at the last 2 Gas Commission meetings to speak against PGW's Richmond Plant replacement.

Thank you for taking the public's concerns seriously and recommending PGW to better engage the community for the replacement. We still are concerned that may not happen but we are grateful to have agreement that there hasn't been sufficient engagement yet.

I wanted you to make sure you are aware of the petition that Port Richmond residents have made addressed to the Gas Commission.

- Link to the Petition: [Deny PGW's Richmond Plant replacement until community concerns are addressed](#)
- We outline our continued concerns about PGW's plans as well as identify specific things PGW can do to address our concerns, particularly around our community's health.

If there is a better way to make sure all Gas Commissioners are aware of what Port Richmond is urging them to do, please let me know. Thanks!

---

## \$182 Million for PGW LNG Plant

---

From Peter Furcht <pfurcht@comcast.net>

Date Tue 5/5/2026 11:36 AM

To Sandra Fontanez <sfontanez@phlgc.net>

Cc Mark Squilla <Mark.Squilla@Phila.Gov>; Anne Kelly <Anne.Kelly@phila.gov>

Dear PGC Commissioners,

I attended the April 14th public meeting and was encouraged that you decided to table the approval of PGW's \$182 million funding request for an LNG Plant.

I have been a chemical engineer for over 40 years and I am very familiar with the term FEED study that the PGW spokesman, Andre Dasent, used in last month's budget hearing as a reason to approve the \$182 million LNG plant. A FEED study is a Front End Engineering and Design activity, Front End, i.e. first step. A FEED is the first step in the design process. A FEED study typically follows back-of-the-envelope discussions and early design concept discussions.

I have been an engineer involved in producing FEED studies as well as an engineer evaluating FEED studies done by others. A firm typically only spends capital on a FEED study is because the firm planning the project has neither the expertise nor the knowledge to write their own detailed design specification. The resulting FEED report provides the insights required to understand the process functionality, parameters, etc. so a Detailed Design Specification (DDS) can be written.

A Detailed Design Specification, created after a FEED, is the document a firm gives to vendors from which accurate construction estimates for a project are provided. An estimate based on a detailed design document produced following a FEED should result in a +/-5-10% estimate. Before that is done, a +/- 25-40% accurate estimate is the best you can expect.

How does PGW know the LNG plant will cost \$182 million if they still need to do a FEED and from that put together a DDS to send out for bids?

In my 40+ years of doing engineering projects, I have NEVER heard of a firm going to their management to get budget approval for a project when they had not yet completed a FEED study to be able to clearly define the scope and requirements of their project.

Following good engineering practices, the right thing to do now is to approve money for PGW to hire a firm to conduct the FEED. That FEED study report should clearly define the parameters of the LNG plant's functioning. Once complete, the Gas Commission and the public should all review and approve the report to be sure PGW is not asking for functionality the city does not need or want.

Following the FEED, the DDS should be written and then reviewed and approved by the Gas Commission and the public, again, to be sure PGW is not asking for operational functionality that the city does not need or want.

Only after these steps and vendors provide cost estimates, should the Gas Commission consider approval of money for building the LNG plant.

And while all this is going on, how about funding FEEDs for some reduced carbon pathways?

Peter Furcht  
pfurcht@comcast.net  
Private Citizen  
920 Clinton St  
Philadelphia, PA 1910

---


**Petition for Gas Commission Staff FYI**

---

**From** Patrick Houston <phouston@greenbuildingunited.org>

**Date** Thu 5/7/2026 11:27 AM

**To** Sandra Fontanez <sfontanez@phlgc.net>

 1 attachment (98 KB)

Petition on PGW Capital Budget FY2027.pdf;

Hi,

For the information of the Gas Commission staff, the attached petition to the Philadelphia Gas Commission, signed by numerous community and environmental organizations in Philadelphia, regarding PGW's proposed capital budget for FY2027 has been shared with each the five Gas Commissioners.

If there is a place for public petition letters to *go on the record*, would you kindly let us know and include this letter in that record?

Thank you,

**Patrick Houston**

Campaign Manager

[HEREforClimateJustice](#)

[Green Building United](#)

GREEN  
BUILDING  
UNITED

Petition to the Philadelphia Gas Commission:

We, the undersigned organizations, write regarding PGW's proposed \$390 million FY2027 capital budget. All Philadelphians deserve affordable and reliable energy, clean air, and a livable climate. The proposed budget does not reflect those values.

Nearly all of PGW's proposed capital budget —\$350 million—is allocated to gas processing and distribution, while zero dollars go to affordable, clean energy alternatives. The largest single item, \$182 million to replace the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) plant in Port Richmond, emerged without any meaningful public information or input. **This project would increase LNG production—undermining Philadelphia's commitment to reach carbon neutrality by 2050.** It would also create a risk of future rate hikes to cover the cost of a stranded asset.

We recognize that PGW's existing LNG facility has provided some financial benefit to ratepayers. But given that gas demand in Philadelphia is already declining—and must decline even faster over the next 20 years—we need a full, public analysis of alternative strategies for managing winter peak demand. Approving a gas infrastructure investment of this scale without first assessing cleaner, more affordable options is imprudent. **Until PGW provides a full analysis of possible alternative pathways, we urge the Gas Commissioners to support the hearing examiners' recommendation and exclude the \$182 million LNG replacement line item from this year's budget.**

The public engagement process is broken. Many Port Richmond residents testified at the February Gas Commission hearing that they had never heard of this LNG project before that day. Community health and safety concerns must be addressed before approval. **We support the hearing examiners' recommendation about consulting the public and call on the Gas Commission and City Council to require PGW to meaningfully inform and engage the public before approving this or any similarly sized project.**

PGW's rate base is shrinking. That means the cost of maintaining and expanding the gas system will fall on a smaller group of ratepayers—those least able to switch away from gas. While declining demand does not automatically eliminate the need for gas infrastructure replacements and upgrades, it does mean that approving major new investments without a comprehensive plan

for a managed transition to affordable, renewable alternatives, irresponsibly risks worsening Philadelphia's affordability challenges.

We urge the Commission to scrutinize this budget proposal and to ensure that the budget is aligned with both our city's climate goals and ratepayer affordability needs—today, tomorrow, and for decades to come.

**We call on the Gas Commission to:**

- Reject funding for the LNG plant as part of the FY 2027 budget.
- Require PGW to publish a full risk analysis and explore cost-effective alternatives that account for declining gas demand, diversify Philadelphia's energy sources, and proactively reduce peak demand through efficiency investments.
- Ensure that this project does not proceed without meaningful public engagement.
- Demonstrate a path to mitigate rising costs on a declining customer base.

Signed,

BREWERYTOWN SHARSWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD COALITION

CITIZENS CLIMATE LOBBY PHILADELPHIA CHAPTER

CLEAN AIR COUNCIL

EARTHWORKS

GEODELPHIA

HUNTING PARK COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION CORP./NEIGHBORHOOD ENERGY CENTER

HUNTING PARK COMMUNITY SOLAR INITIATIVE

PENNENVIRONMENT

PENNPORG

PHILADELPHIA RENT CONTROL COALITION

PHILLY THRIVE

PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PENNSYLVANIA

POWER INTERFAITH

RECLAIM PHILADELPHIA

SIERRA CLUB PA

THE ENERGY CO-OP

THIRD ACT PENNSYLVANIA

THIRD ACT PENNSYLVANIA - PHILADELPHIA HUB

VOTE SOLAR ACTION FUND

---

Written comments for May 12th PGW meeting

---

From Pouné Saberi <poune@psrpa.org>  
Date Mon 5/11/2026 5:49 PM  
To Sandra Fontanez <sfontanez@phlgc.net>

**SECTION 1: CONTACT INFORMATION**

**1. Full Name (Required):** Pouné

Saberi \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Organization/Affiliation (if any):**

\_\_\_\_Physicians for Social Responsibility PA\_\_\_\_ (PSR  
PA)\_\_\_\_\_

**3. Email Address (Required):**

\_\_\_\_poune@psrpa.org\_\_\_\_\_

**4. Phone Number (Optional):** \_\_\_\_\_

**5. ZIP Code (Required):** \_\_\_\_19146\_\_\_\_\_

**PUBLIC COMMENT OR QUESTION**

**8. Please enter your comment or question below (Attach additional pages if necessary):**

I have lived and worked in Philadelphia, PA for more than 25 years now. I specialize in occupational and environmental Medicine as a physician and serve on the board of PSR PA. A city that has consistently received a failing grade for air pollution is ill advised to pursue any further development of a fossil fuel infrastructure for energy production. The asthma rates in children are high, and many workers do not have a transition plan to safe and clean renewable energy jobs. As a center city resident I personally am tired of suffering in the continually worsening heat island every summer.

It is poor planning to pursue a gas plant in Port Richmond, irresponsible to leave out safe, affordable clean renewable energy out of the development projects, and categorically against the economical and public health interests of all Philadelphians and the residents beyond to engage in expanding any fossil fuel dependance.

I am writing to voice my objections to any new gas plants in Port Richmond, and hold PGW accountable to include plans for safe and renewable energy

infrastructure.

### **SECTION 3: PUBLIC RECORD ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

#### **10. Public Record Acknowledgment** *(Required)*

X I understand that my submission will be considered a public record and will be shared with Commission members and may be posted publicly with personal identifying information redacted as appropriate.

Pouné Saberi, MD, MPH